



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1346th

MEETING: 3 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1346/Rev.1)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)	} 1
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907)	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)	

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 FORTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 3 June 1967, at 10.00 a.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/1346/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902).
3. Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907).
4. Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910).

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: Before the Council proceeds with the business for this morning's meeting, I wish, in my capacity as President of the Council, to say a word of appreciation to last month's President for the manner in which he conducted the business of the Council.

2. Mr. LIU (China): Mr. President, I just want to say how much I appreciate your kind words. I am sure that under your able Presidency the deliberations of the Council will be brought to a swift conclusion—and, I hope, a fruitful one.

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)

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, and with the consent of the Council, I now invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Lebanon, Iraq and Morocco 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. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan), Mr. A. Daoudy (Syria), Mr. G. Hakim (Lebanon), Mr. A. Pachachi (Iraq) and Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco) took the places reserved for them.

4. The PRESIDENT: Since the last meeting of the Council, two additional requests, dated 1 June, for invitations to participate in the discussions have been received from the delegations of Saudi Arabia [S/7920] and Kuwait [S/7921]. If there is no objection, I propose to invite those two representatives also to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council table in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. Al-Rachach (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. G. A. Al-Rashid (Kuwait) took the places reserved for them.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its discussion of the three items inscribed on its agenda. I should like to call to the attention of the members of the Council the two draft resolutions which were presented at the 1345th meeting, the first one sponsored by the United States of America [S/7916/Rev.1] and the second sponsored by the United Arab Republic [S/7919].

6. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, and I would ask him to take a place at the Council table in order to make his statement.

7. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The crisis in the Middle East erupted without warning on 16 May 1967 when an Egyptian general sent an ultimatum to the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF). At the same time that he asked for the removal of the United Nations Force, he moved his own forces into the positions held by the United Nations. The course of the events that followed is by now common knowledge and well documented in the reports of the Secretary-General.

8. The Secretary-General tried to prevent the crisis from getting out of hand. He failed. It was not his fault. Alarmed by the gravity of the situation, the Governments of Canada and Denmark asked for the Security Council to be urgently convened. For eleven days now the Council has debated the matter in an effort to resolve the immediate crisis. At the same time one Arab spokesman after another has come to this table not to alleviate the dangerous tensions, but to fan the flames of violence and hatred.

9. In their effort to obscure the real issue and the true causes of the situation created by their own arbitrary action, they have raked up the most far-fetched allegations and have advanced arguments of monumental irrelevance. I have no doubt that more will come. The volume of this exercise is equalled by its transparency.

10. Behind these verbal assaults three major Arab objectives can clearly be discerned: first, to lay a dense smoke-screen behind which their own aggressive activities can be concealed; secondly, to portray the intended victim of their aggression as the aggressor and thirdly, to hypnotize, paralyse and intimidate the whole international community so that no one will interfere with their preparations for aggression.

11. This is not the first time that this manoeuvre has been practised. It presents a very serious challenge to this Organization. No one has expressed this in more stirring terms than His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie, in his memorable address before the General Assembly on 4 October 1963, when he said:

"Twenty-seven years ago, as Emperor of Ethiopia, I mounted the rostrum in Geneva to address to the League of Nations an appeal for relief from the destruction which had been unleashed against my defenceless nation by the Fascist invader. I spoke then both to and for the conscience of the world. My words went unheeded, but history testifies to the accuracy of the warning that I gave in 1936.

"...

"In 1936, I declared that it was not the Covenant of the League that was at stake, but international morality. Undertakings, I said then, are of little worth if the will to keep them is lacking."¹

12. While this debate has taken that course, events have not stood still. First Egypt and then one Arab country after

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. I, 1229th meeting, paras. 2 and 4.

another have rushed troops and armaments to our frontiers and created a most severe threat to Israel's security and to the peace of the region. At the same time the spokesmen, first of Egypt and then of one Arab State after the other, have been getting into line to hurl their shafts of invective against Israel and of intimidation against the whole world. Claiming that they would not initiate offensive action against Israel, they have launched a campaign of unrestrained political warfare here in the Security Council in preparation for the total war which they openly proclaim to be their ultimate objective. As the Foreign Minister of Iraq himself said, "The conflict will be total and uncompromising . . . there will be no retreat" [*1345th meeting, paras. 18 and 19*]. I say to him, you need not retreat if you do not advance.

13. As violent and threatening as these Arab statements may sound, they are but a diplomatic echo of the venom which is being poured out twenty-four hours a day by the Arab propaganda machine. I would not take up the Council's time by quoting from the Arab radio and Press were it not necessary to leave no doubt as to the extent to which the Arab Governments are inflaming the passions of their own people.

14. On 25 May, Radio Cairo in its broadcast at 2 p.m. proclaimed: "The Arab people is determined to wipe Israel off the map."

15. On 26 May, the radio station of the Palestine Liberation Organization broadcast a press conference by Mr. Shukairy in which he said, "D-Day is approaching. The Arabs have waited nineteen years for this and will not flinch from the war of liberation."

16. And on 29 May, the same Mr. Shukairy was even more explicit: "The struggle has begun at the Gulf of Aqaba and will end at the Bay of Acre."

17. At 8 p.m. on 30 May, Radio Cairo had this to say:

"Faced by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel has two choices, both of which are drenched with Israel's blood: either it will be strangled by the Arab military and economic siege or it will be killed by the bullets of the Arab armies surrounding it from the south, from the north and from the east."

18. On Egyptian television, on 1 June at 6.30 p.m., the Commander of the Egyptian Air Force told his audience that "The Egyptian forces spread from Rafah to Sharm el Sheikh are ready for the order to begin the struggle to which we have looked forward for so long".

19. That is the background against which the present military confrontation is taking place.

20. There comes to my mind a very fitting sentence by the late Adlai Stevenson. When his country found itself threatened, he said here in the Security Council: "Were we to do nothing until the knife was sharpened? Were we to stand idly by until it was at our throats?" [*1025th meeting, para. 18.*]

21. Faced by the combined effect of the headlong rush to arms in the Arab States, a propaganda barrage of unprecedented violence and proclamations of a holy war, it is only natural that my Government found itself under the elementary duty to place the country on a full defence footing. Two heavily armed armies are facing each other, one poised to invade and destroy Israel, the other to defend it. This is a most explosive situation which has been created by the Arab Governments. In this situation any incident could have the gravest consequences. Yesterday, the first clash of the present crisis occurred. Two Israel soldiers were killed and two were wounded in an encounter on Israel territory with an armed group of marauders from Syria. I have drawn the attention of the Security Council to this in my letter of last night [S/7924].

22. The mutual reduction and withdrawal of armed forces to their normal levels and positions is the obvious first step towards alleviating this crisis.

23. This is not the first time Israel has found itself facing such an emergency. The Arab spokesmen have been saying that Israel was born out of aggression. Aggression by whom? By Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iraq.

24. This is fully documented in the records of the Security Council for the summer of 1948. The Arab Governments are using today the same arguments to cover up their aggressive intent as they used then. At the 302nd meeting of the Security Council, Mr. Austin, representative of the United States, said, with reference to the Arabs:

"They tell us quite frankly that their business in Palestine is political. . . . Of course, the statement that they are there to make peace is rather remarkable in view of the fact that they are waging war.

". . .

"Therefore, here we have the highest type of evidence of the international violation of the law: the admission by those who are committing this violation."²

25. The representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, the present Foreign Minister, at the 309th meeting of the Security Council addressed himself to the same situation. He said:

"This is not the first time that the Arab States, which organized the invasion of Palestine, have ignored a decision of the Security Council or of the General Assembly. The USSR delegation deems it essential that the Council should state its opinion more clearly and more firmly with regard to this attitude of the Arab States towards decisions of the Security Council. It is not in the interest of the United Nations in general, or of the Security Council in particular, to tolerate such a situation, where decisions of the Council, designed to put an end to warfare . . . are being flouted."³

26. This invasion by five Arab armies was thrown back by the young army of Israel which had grown out of Haganah, the Jewish defence organization, of which I am proud to have been a member. This war was terminated by the conclusion of General Armistice Agreements. These Agreements established the borders between Israel and the neighbouring States. I would remind the Arab representatives that the only valid basis for the Egyptian presence in the Gaza area and for the Jordanian presence on the west bank is in the armistice régime. They should therefore be more prudent before they disregard the significance and sanctity of the armistice demarcation lines.

27. The Armistice Agreements contain two fundamental and inalterable provisions. They were concluded with a view towards promoting the return to permanent peace. They stipulated the complete cessation of all forms of aggressive and hostile action. The Secretary-General, in paragraph 17 of his report of 26 May 1967 [S/7906], has called attention to Security Council resolution 73 (1949) of 11 August 1949 which declared that "the Armistice Agreements constitute an important step towards the establishment of permanent peace".

28. The Arab States have persistently refused to take a single step towards the restoration of peaceful conditions. On the contrary, soon after the conclusion of the Armistice Agreements, they initiated their campaign of piecemeal aggression. There lies the root cause of the turmoil which has so adversely affected the Middle East over the years.

29. The Arab representatives have found in paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's latest report [*ibid.*] support for their policies. The Secretary-General refers therein to "the continuing Arab-Israel conflict". What the Arab representatives choose to ignore is that it is Israel that has made repeated efforts to arrive at a peaceful solution of the conflict and it is the Arab States that have rebuffed these efforts. It is their policy to continue the conflict.

30. In justification of that policy, the Arab Governments claim that, in spite of the United Nations Charter and the General Armistice Agreements, they are in a state of war with Israel and are therefore free to conduct any act of belligerence of their choosing. No lengthy argument is required to refute that doctrine. The Security Council, in its resolution 95 (1951) of 1 September 1951, has ruled that "neither party can reasonably assert that it is actively a belligerent" under the armistice régime.

31. That resolution was validly adopted. Those who are urging for the full restoration of the Armistice Agreements must first insist that the States concerned forgo belligerence. On behalf of Israel, I can give this assurance. An armistice with built-in belligerence is no armistice.

32. The draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic [S/7919] seeks the endorsement of the Security Council for this policy. Its object is to promote the real aim of the Egyptian Government, which is not to return to the conditions of 1956, but, as President Nasser has stated himself, to go back to the situation prevailing in 1948—in other words and in clear language, to abolish Israel's independence. In his speech of 26 May, President Nasser

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 72, 302nd meeting*, pp. 41 and 43.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 77, 309th meeting, p. 2.

left no doubt; he said: "Our basic aim will be to destroy Israel".

33. How different were the hopes and expectations expressed by responsible leaders in 1956, when the late Secretary of State Mr. Dulles said at the 561st meeting of the General Assembly:

"All of us, I think, would hope that out of this tragedy there should come something better than merely a restoration of the conditions out of which this tragedy arose.

"There needs to be something better than the uneasy armistices which have existed now for these eight years between Israel and its Arab neighbours. There needs to be a greater sense of confidence and sense of security . . ."⁴

34. The question of belligerence is not an academic matter. The Arab Governments, since the inception of the armistice régime, have not only upheld the doctrine of belligerence, but, much worse, have been practising belligerence. They have practised it in the Suez Canal; they have practised it on land by countless armed incursions into the territory of Israel; by continuous threats against the territorial integrity of Israel, culminating in an act of war—the imposition of a blockade in the Strait of Tiran.

35. The representative of the United Arab Republic, and in his wake other Arab spokesmen, have raised two main arguments to justify the blockade of Tiran. The first is that Israel has no right to be at Eilat, or Umm Reshresh, as it once was called. I can dispose of that very briefly. The Arab contention that Israel has no right to be in Eilat at all is a mystification. Eilat was included in the Jewish State by the General Assembly's resolution of 29 November 1947 [181 (II)]. In May 1949, Egypt complained to the Mixed Armistice Commission about the Israel presence at Umm Reshresh. On 8 February 1950, after very careful consideration, the Mixed Armistice Commission rejected—I repeat, rejected—the Egyptian complaint that the occupation of Umm Reshresh was a violation of the Armistice Agreement. But what determines the issue is the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement, by which Umm Reshresh—Eilat—is placed on the Israel side of the border. I invite the attention of the members of the Security Council to the map attached to that Agreement, which can be found in the Security Council's official records.⁵

36. Another argument is based on the doctrine of belligerency which, as I have already said, is outlawed under the armistice régime, and under the Charter.

37. The third argument is that the Strait of Tiran is not an international waterway. The question of the international character of the waterway, which, in the opinion of my Government, has always been clear, was authoritatively answered at the eleventh regular session of the General Assembly and at the 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law

of the Sea. Both the International Law Commission and the Geneva Conference stated quite clearly that there must be no suspension of the right of innocent passage through international straits. Article 16, paragraph 4, of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone of 1958 embodies the generally accepted rule of international law governing straits.

38. The representative of the United Arab Republic has said [1344th meeting] that the International Law Commission stated that its draft articles on the law of the sea regulate the law of the sea in time of peace only. He omitted to mention that this view was not adopted by the Geneva Conference. In any case, this whole argument is irrelevant, because the Egyptian claim of belligerency is inadmissible.

39. The Egyptian Government itself has recognized the international character of the Strait of Tiran and its obligations under the recognized principles of the law of nations. In its aide-mémoire to the United States Government of 28 January 1950, it undertook "that this passage, the only practicable one, will remain free, as in the past, in conformity with international practice and recognized principles of the law of nations".

40. On 20 February 1957, President Eisenhower declared:

"Now, with reference to the passage into and through the Gulf of Aqaba, we expressed the conviction that the gulf constitutes international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf. We announced that the United States was prepared to exercise this right itself and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right."

41. On 1 March 1957, the representative of France declared in the General Assembly:

"The French Government considers that the Gulf of Aqaba, by reason partly of its breadth and partly of the fact that its shores belong to four different States, constitutes international waters. Consequently it believes that, in conformity with international law, freedom of navigation should be ensured in the gulf through the straits which give access to it."⁶

42. On 4 March 1957, Prime Minister Lester Pearson, the then Chairman of the Canadian delegation, declared in the General Assembly:

"Concerning the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran, I suggested then that there should be no interference with innocent passage through those waters, nor the assertion of any claim to belligerent rights there."⁷

43. The representative of Denmark declared on 4 March 1957, at the same meeting of the General Assembly:

"In the view of the Danish Government, the Strait of Tiran must be regarded as an international waterway

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, First Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 561st meeting, paras. 154 and 155.

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1*, annex I.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. II, 666th meeting, para. 58.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 667th meeting, para. 148.

through which vessels of all nations have a right of passage.”⁸

44. I would take up too much of the Council's time if I were to quote all the authoritative statements affirming the international character of the Strait of Tiran. In recent days more statements to that effect have been issued by many Governments.

45. The Foreign Minister of Iraq, in support of his arguments in favour of the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, has stated that not a single resolution was adopted by the United Nations on the problem of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba. Since when does the United Nations have to adopt a resolution on freedom of navigation through international straits? Are rights of free navigation in the Skagerrak or any other international strait impaired by the fact that the United Nations has not adopted a resolution?

46. But, again, we are arguing not an academic legal point, but a matter which the Secretary-General accurately described as being most vital to Israel's interest. While in Cairo, he called to the attention of the Government of the United Arab Republic the dangerous consequences which could ensue from restricting innocent passage of ships in the Strait of Tiran.

47. Eilat, a thriving port and industrial centre, is Israel's outlet to the Red Sea. It links our country with Africa and Asia. Considerable trade passes through this essential maritime route. Eilat is one of the main ports for the export of chemicals and fertilizers so urgently needed to keep up the world's food supplies. It is the terminal of an oil pipeline connecting it with Haifa. The maritime trade passing through Eilat is the basis of the city's economic life and the life of the hinterland of that city. Severing the artery is an act as grave as an attempt to truncate part of our territory. It is a curious thing that those who are responsible for proclaiming the blockade and creating the current crisis come here and belittle the significance of their action for Israel. But if that is so, why do they go to such lengths and create a situation so fraught with dangers?

48. They are following the same line as was used by the Nazis in 1939 when they took over Danzig. They broke down resistance by belittling the significance of their act and by diverting attention from their ultimate objectives. The world has paid a terrible price for that appeasement. The Nazis launched the theme—Why fight for Danzig?—and that is what we have heard here: Why fight for Eilat? Mr. Shukairy has given us the answer in that broadcast to which I referred earlier: first the Gulf of Aqaba and then the Bay of Acre. Israel is determined to make its stand on the Gulf of Aqaba. Nothing less than complete non-interference with free and innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba is acceptable to the Government of Israel.

49. Arab representatives have attached themselves with ardour to paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's first report of 19 March 1967 [S/7896]. On reading that report and that paragraph we were puzzled and asked ourselves to what statements the Secretary-General was referring. We

were unable to find the answer in our own files. Various Arab spokesmen have now enlightened us by attributing to responsible leaders of Israel statements to the effect that Israel was ready to march on Damascus and to overthrow the Syrian Government. I am grateful to the Arab representatives for giving us this clarification. However, I am sorry that I cannot oblige them and confirm their allegations. I can state quite categorically that no such statements have been made. In a previous intervention, I assured the Council and the representative of Syria that Israel has no interest in the nature of the régime in Syria or in its activities, so long as they are confined to Syria.

50. Having said that, I should like to point out that for the twenty years of its existence Israel has been subjected to a constant barrage of vituperation and threats of exceptional vehemence. Every conceivable medium of mass communication has been mobilized for this campaign.

51. The Arab Governments have given as a pretext for their present mobilization and military activity alleged Israel troop movements and concentrations, which the Secretary-General has reported never took place, and statements of Israel leaders, which have never been made. The archives of the Israel Government are bulging with the unending torrent of abuse and threats from Arab leaders against the very existence of Israel. If we were to follow the Arab logic, every one of those statements would be a sufficient reason to take up arms. But it is not the statements alone which are causing the present crisis. This time these verbal threats are linked to military preparations on an unprecedented scale. These statements are no longer hurled into the air. They are now falling on inflammable ground where two armies are standing face to face.

52. The situation with which the Council is confronted today has deteriorated since the Council first met on this question. In my statement on 29 May [1343rd meeting], I urged that five immediate steps be taken. None of them has been taken. On the contrary, the Arab Governments have intensified their preparations for war. It is not a breathing spell which will avert the present danger. What is required is action, concrete steps to forgo all belligerence and to withdraw the armies back to their previous positions.

53. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Since this is the first time that our deliberations have been presided over by a member representing one of the countries which have recently acceded to our ranks, I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating him. I hope, Mr. President, that you will preside over the Security Council many, many times.

54. At the last meeting of the Security Council, on 31 May, the representative of Jordan drew attention [1345th meeting] to the fact that, ever since the question of Palestine first came up in the United Nations, it has always been listed on the agenda as "The Palestine question". The same title has been used in all the reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly, in the reports by the Secretary-General and in other United Nations documents. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria feels that there is no reason to depart from this well-tried practice at the present juncture, and that it would be more

⁸ *Ibid.*, 667th meeting, para. 234.

in keeping with established practice to introduce the three items on the agenda with the general heading "The Palestine question". This would be fully justified on grounds of substance and procedure.

55. It is heartening to note that, in a tense and sometimes artificially overstrung atmosphere, the Security Council has managed, by patient and sustained endeavour, to conduct its deliberations on the agenda item before it amid relative calm and has been able to ensure moderation in its discussions. The nervous tension created by certain delegations, as manifested in attempts to impose immediate decisions, even before the Secretary-General's return from his visit to Cairo, has subsided thanks to the efforts of the other delegations, in particular those of the African-Asian group.

56. Together with many other important factors which must also be taken into consideration the restrained and reserved attitude adopted by the Security Council has undoubtedly exerted a beneficial and calming influence on certain overheated and over-excited elements, despite the Israel Foreign Minister's assertion that "the United Nations does not emerge from the events of the past two weeks with brilliance or credit"—an assertion reported in *The New York Times* and presented as being the "most massive understatement of this century".

57. The calm and resolute attitude of the Security Council members has so far played a moderating role in the crisis which is at present convulsing the Middle East. The breathing spell the need for which was referred to by the Secretary-General in his report of 26 May [S/7906]—a suggestion which, although supported by many delegations, apparently fails to meet with the approval of some of the speakers, as was made clear a moment ago—began, in fact, from the instant the Council refused to submit to the pressure of certain Governments and their delegations.

58. The moderation and reserve with which the Security Council has acted until now cannot, of course, serve as a substitute for the moderation which the parties concerned and all countries should exercise in this matter.

59. The actual root causes of the tense situation in the Middle East lie in the policy of interference and intervention conducted by certain imperialist circles for the purpose of appropriating and exploiting its vast natural wealth and re-establishing their control over a region of particular strategic importance where their domination has been shaken by the struggle of the Arab peoples to free themselves from colonial rule and regain their national independence.

60. The preparations made and the measures taken by the Government of Israel and the attacks carried out against Syria and Jordan were nothing but manifestations of that policy, designed to augment the threat of war and stir up this hotbed of war which has been created by the intrigues and machinations of the imperialist Powers.

61. You will remember that on the very next day following Israel's act of aggression against Syria, on 14 July 1966, the Israel Chief of Staff, Mr. Itzhak Rabin, said: "We

are still ready to play the game. We shall apply the rules that we find most suitable."

62. Subsequent developments in the Middle East proved such statements to be more than verbal threats. According to the latest issue of *Newsweek* magazine of 5 June, the same Chief of Staff:

"... publicly observed that the time might have come to seize Damascus and topple the Syrian Government.

"And Prime Minister Levi Eshkol warned that if the terrorism continued, Israel would"—and these are the exact words of Mr. Eshkol—"choose the time, the place, and the means to counter the aggressor.""⁹

63. That is where the source of the danger and of the tension in the Middle East lies. It was this imminent and very real danger which forced the Governments of the United Arab Republic, Syria and the other Arab countries to take certain precautionary measures. Confronted by these preparations and provocations, the content, scope and sequence of which were revealed by President Nasser in his speech of 22 May, the Arab countries were obliged to take the necessary steps to ensure their defence.

64. The withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force has unreasonably annoyed those same imperialist circles which are responsible for the tense situation in the Middle East and their representatives, who have the habit of regarding any United Nations peace-keeping operation as a military expedition designed to protect their special interests, and in this case, to prevent the United Arab Republic from exercising full sovereignty over its territory. They even went so far as to censure the withdrawal of the Force, to which the Secretary-General consented without asking their specific permission, as contributing to the present crisis in the Middle East.

65. The attempts by certain circles to create confusion and obstruct the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, which are referred to in the Secretary-General's report [S/7906], are an indication of their plans to interfere in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State. The fact that the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force in the territory of a host country, the United Arab Republic, was in this case conceived as an extraordinary and hence temporary measure, and the fact that it was the consent of the Government of the United Arab Republic which constituted the legal basis for that presence, do not seem to bother those circles.

66. It is strange to note that certain NATO countries, and above all the United States of America, deny the United Arab Republic's right to move its armed forces over its own national territory, when at the very same time armed forces of the United States are engaged in a war of aggression on Viet-Nameese soil and have assumed the role of international policemen in an area remote from their national frontiers where they may provoke incidents liable to trigger off another world war.

⁹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

67. Even stranger is the Israel representative's manifest displeasure at that legitimate action of the Government of the United Arab Republic, considering the refusal on the part of Israel to accept the presence of the Emergency Force on its territory as well as to apply the General Armistice Agreements or to abide by the obligations set forth therein, thus blocking the machinery of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

68. In the light of all these developments, the steps taken by the Government of the United Arab Republic are no more than measures of self-defence against a very real danger of aggression.

69. Considering all these facts and the announcements by Israel statesmen, such as that said to have been made by Mr. Eshkol at a meeting of Mapai party leaders: "Bearing in mind the incidents of the last few months, we must take measures that are as rigorous as those taken on 7 April", no one has the right to be surprised that the Arab countries decided to take serious action to cope with whatever might happen.

70. Nevertheless, while taking these precautions, the Government of the United Arab Republic, through President Nasser and the Foreign Minister Mr. Riad, gave a formal assurance to the Secretary-General "that the United Arab Republic would not initiate offensive action against Israel". We should like to hear a similar statement, even at this rather late hour, from the Israel Government.

71. My country, concerned as it is about the maintenance of peace and security in the region and throughout the world, would indeed have liked to have an assurance that during this crisis—and afterwards—Israel, for its part, would not initiate any offensive action against any Arab State. Such a formal pledge by Israel, before the Security Council and the bar of world public opinion, would contribute immediately to the reduction of tension in the region.

72. Apart from an urgent appeal for moderation, the Secretary-General, in his two reports to the Security Council, felt that it would be particularly helpful "in the present situation if the Government of Israel were to reconsider its position and resume its participation in the Egyptian-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission" [see S/7906, para. 15]. He suggested to the Council that it consider that possible approach during its search for ways out of the present crisis.

73. The Secretary-General's idea, which incidentally has been gestating for a long time, has been taken up and supported in the draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic [S/7919] and supported in the Council by the delegation of India. The usefulness and necessity of such an instrument in the present situation are undeniable. The role that could be played by the Mixed Armistice Commission in preparing the ground for a settlement of the important questions pending is more than obvious.

74. It is only natural, of course, to ask that the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel be strictly complied with. Without the implementation of that Agreement, which has been illegally and

unilaterally denounced by Israel, it is hard to see how any contribution can be made to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

75. The Security Council should ask the parties to the Armistice Agreements between Israel and the Arab States to abide by those Agreements and to fulfil all their obligations as regards the effective functioning of the machinery provided for in the Agreements. This is a preliminary step which the Council should decide on. Any violation of the Agreements would inevitably lead to an aggravation of the crisis. In this connexion, an appeal to the Israel Government to reconsider its unilateral denunciation of the Armistice Agreement with the United Arab Republic—which is still valid and binding on the parties—and to apply the Agreement, together with an appeal on the same lines by the United States, which is on the best of terms with Israel, would undoubtedly have a salutary effect. Instead of that, however, *The New York Times* of 31 May informs us, in a report from the Sea of Crete, that [the speaker continued in English] the entire long range striking force of the Sixth Fleet, the carriers *America* and *Saratoga*, the cruisers *Little Rock* and *Galveston* and their ten accompanying destroyers standing by in the Sea of Crete are ready to intervene in the Middle East if Washington so decides.

[The speaker resumed in French]

76. This news item needs no comment. We know only too well that neither the United States Sixth Fleet nor the United States military bases encircling that region are there for peace-keeping purposes. On the contrary, the sole effect of their presence is to heighten the tension throughout the region, to create new hotbeds of war and to encourage and pit one side—in this case Israel—against the other—the Arab peoples, who are struggling for final liberation from the imperialist and colonial yoke. All this is currently confirmed by reports which, as you can see, come from United States sources.

77. This development of the situation in the Middle East has aroused justifiable concern in our country. I quote an official statement put out by the Bulgarian Press Agency in that connexion:

"The people and Government of Bulgaria, which have close links of friendship with the Arab countries and have the greatest sympathy with them, support their struggle against imperialism and colonialism and for freedom and national independence. The Bulgarian people, like all peace-loving peoples, is deeply concerned about the maintenance of peace in the Middle East and cannot remain indifferent to the course of events in a region which lies so close to the People's Republic of Bulgaria."

78. In face of the crisis which has been provoked by the activities of imperialist circles in the Middle East, it is the duty of all Members of the United Nations, and especially the Security Council, which bears the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to call for the utmost moderation and to make efforts to induce Israel to observe the General Armistice Agreements and participate in the bodies set up to ensure their application, so that those bodies can function properly.

79. Only thus will the Security Council and all Members of the United Nations be able to play their part in tackling the underlying causes of the crisis that is shaking the Middle East, and to seek just and effective solutions.

80. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

81. Mr. DAOUDY (Syria): Mr. President, as we assemble today for the first time under your able Presidency, we feel confident that you will preside over our deliberations with the required objectivity, consonant with the great responsibilities attached to your high office.

82. At the same time, I should like to refer to what you said in the meeting of the Council on 30 May, in your capacity as the representative of Denmark: "Let us never forget that the problem confronting mankind today is, in the words of a Danish poet, 'coexistence or no existence, that's the question.'" [1344th meeting, para. 107.] Let me remind you respectfully that your honourable people in Denmark, who have a great love for liberty and a deep-rooted attachment to independence, did not accept this advice when it came to coexistence with the Nazi occupation, and rightly so.

83. Mr. President, I should now like to reply to the speech delivered on 30 May by Mr. Goldberg [1344th meeting], when he attempted, in his answer to my colleague, Mr. Tomeh, to convey the impression of the non-alignment of United States policy in the Arab-Israel conflict. He referred to the United States attitude during the Suez crisis in 1956, and to his Government's statement and vote during the debate by this Council on the Israel aggression against As Samu in Jordan in November 1966.

84. In doing so, I am not trying to score points in a mental exercise, but I am acting out of necessity, especially after the developments that have taken place since 30 May. The United States delegation has submitted a draft resolution [S/7916/Rev.1]. And the United States Government's antagonistic stand against the Arabs becomes more threatening. In the atmosphere there looms the shadow of a new Suez-like operation.

85. It is a fact that the United States Government disapproved of the Suez aggression and joined hands to go along with the sincere, firm and constructive efforts made by the Soviet Union and the African-Asian countries. That attitude of the United States received the appreciation of the Arab people and of peoples the world over. The Suez crisis, as is well known, could easily have led to a third world war, only eleven years after the end of the Second World War.

86. Today again, after another eleven years of these tragic events, Israel is leading the world to the brink of catastrophe. One has the impression that Israel is following a cycle which makes it gamble with the fate of our area and the peace of our planet every eleven years. However, Israel could not and would not do what it is doing if it were not assured of strong backing by its powerful protectors and benefactors.

87. Thus we remember this United States attitude, but we also remember what the United States Government did at the end of the Suez crisis. It came out with what was at that time called the Eisenhower Doctrine, aimed at filling the so-called vacuum left in the area. Egypt, the victim of aggression, categorically refused this vacuum theory, and the Arab people everywhere, to safeguard their dignity, rejected the doctrine. This was followed by the stoppage of food supplies and medicines badly needed by Egypt. At the same time help of all kinds—money, food and grants—was rushed to Israel. The end result was that the goodwill acquired by the United States for its commendable attitude was transformed into bitter resentment which swept through the Arab homeland.

88. Mr. Goldberg expressed pride in the United States attitude during the debate on the As Samu aggression. Frankly, we all know that this aggression was nothing less than a war crime, and no Council member could very well have adopted a different stand without jeopardizing his moral integrity. It was difficult even for the United States to refrain from condemning this Israel act of mass assassination. It is interesting now to recall the many expressions of implicit wonder that Israel had directed its American-made instruments of death against Jordan, and not against Syria—whose régime is not liked by Tel Aviv and Washington—which not only actively supports the rights of the Palestine people to regain its homeland, but which also is most outspoken in backing every liberation movement in the world.

89. At the same time, we wish to remind the United States delegation of the Israel aggression against Syria on 14 July 1966, when the Israel Air Force attacked Syrian territory, killed a number of civilians and destroyed a development project. The United States defeated in the Council the resolution condemning the wanton Israel aggression and massacre of innocent Syrians. The same happened in November 1964, when a large number of Israel military planes also destroyed a development site in Syria, killing civilians and damaging properties. The United States adopted the same hostile stand against us, to mention only a few instances.

90. A more recent reminder was what happened on 7 April 1967. My colleague Mr. Tomeh gave you the other day [1344th meeting] a full account of this treacherous aggression against my country. It was substantiated by a report issued by the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, with irrefutable proof of the criminal assault on Syria by Israel. Why, we ask, should Washington officials, echoed as usual by their followers in London and elsewhere, make such an uproar when Syria announced its decision to defend itself and protect its people? Why the outcry when the United Arab Republic responded, in the face of Israel's declaration of intentions for aggression, by implementing the Mutual Defence Pact between the two countries and re-establishing its sovereign rights over its territorial waters?

91. Why did the United States Government keep quiet when Israel leaders, only a few weeks ago, came out with their insolent threat to invade Syria, occupy Damascus and topple its revolutionary Government? Not a single voice

was then heard from Washington about the threat to peace and security in the Middle East. Consequently, that mobile instrument of United States diplomacy in our area, the Sixth Fleet, continued its leisurely routine course.

92. All this is nothing but a manifestation of the official United States policy vis-à-vis Syria and the Arab people—a policy of inherent active enmity, while catering to Zionist ambitions in our area. The United States attitude was confirmed once again by a statement of Mr. Eshkol, in which he revealed that he had received assurances from Mr. McNamara of his Government's readiness to put the Sixth Fleet at the disposal of Israel.

93. The traveller who comes to New York from the Middle East these days—and that is my case—must be struck by the atmosphere of hysteria prevailing in most of the mass communications media of this city in favour of Israel.

94. The slanderous campaign conducted against the Arab countries in general, and Syria in particular, is systematically distorting the facts and misleading American public opinion. Unfortunately, it is fed by statements made by some of the politicians in this country who, for well-known and obvious reasons, portray Israel as a little, harmless and innocent State surrounded by powerful fanatical elements bent upon exterminating it. The result, in their opinion, is that Israel is in dire need of aid and protection from the United States of America. As most of the people of this country are known to be kind-hearted, those who have embarked on the campaign of distortion are using this characteristic to lead the public astray in order to promote their personal, selfish interests, and not the national interest. But let us ask: is Israel really that harmless, weak and innocent creature, or is it precisely the opposite?

95. As an illustration of this misleading and provocative campaign by the news media, allow me to give an example of the irrational course followed by the friends of Israel in this country. In an editorial appearing in *The New York Times* on 31 May under the title "Middle East and/or Viet-Nam", it was stated:

"In terms of American interests—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from South-East Asia.

"...

"The Persian Gulf area produces 27 percent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 percent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than \$2.5 billion. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the South-East Asian peninsula.

"...

"If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to de-escalate the war in Viet-Nam."

96. The stand taken by the influential *New York Times* reflects the war-like mentality which characterizes the Zionist endeavour to poison American-Arab relations.

97. Surely American interests, real or imagined, cannot be safeguarded by sheer brute power or fleet diplomacy, as has been shown in the war against the people of Viet-Nam.

98. In this brief review I have attempted to show the erroneous and aggressive nature of United States official policy towards the Arab countries and have cited a few examples of the slanderous campaign conducted by the Zionists and their friends and supporters in this country.

99. In the face of such provocations, which vary from the supply of arms to the support given Israel in the Security Council, from the so-called declaration on the freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba to the threat to use American force against us, what are the Arab countries expected to do? The answer has been given by many Arab official statements, either in the area or before the Security Council. Our attitude is purely defensive in nature and legitimate in its motives. If, despite what has been said and reiterated, Israel alone, or together with overt United States participation, carries out an aggression in the Gulf of Aqaba or elsewhere, the Arab Governments are determined to react strongly and unitedly to defend their people by all means at their disposal.

100. Here we would like to make our views quite clear and plain. Whatever Israel does, it will certainly be with the full backing of the United States Government.

101. In this respect, it may be of interest to the Security Council to know about the feelings and attitude of our people. Ten days ago, when the Israel threats against Syria reached their dangerous point, the Central Council of the International Union of Arab Workers decided to hold an emergency meeting in Damascus.

102. On 22 May, delegations of trade unions representing the various countries of the Arab homeland hurried to Damascus to show their full support of Syria and of the United Arab Republic. At the end of their meetings, the Arab trade unions passed, on 24 May, a number of resolutions expressing the determination of the Arab masses to defeat any aggression against the Arab countries. Allow me to read out from some of those resolutions:

"At the spark of any Israel aggression, the Arab workers throughout the Arab world are called upon to:

"1. Destroy the oil sources, pipe-lines and installations from which the enemy could benefit.

"2. Close all Arab airports to planes belonging to colonialist and imperialist countries.

"3. Boycott all ships belonging to the enemies of the Arab Nation and prevent them from entering Arab ports.

"4. Cripple all institutions and establishments belonging to the colonialist and imperialist countries.

"5. Destroy all foreign military bases still on the land of some of the Arab countries."

103. Let me emphasize once more, especially in view of the obduracy of Zionism and colonialism in denying the

Arab people of Palestine their distinct identity, that this identity does exist. It is specifically in this aspect of the problem that the United States Government has totally given in to the Zionist conspiracy against the Arab people of Palestine. This we feel it our duty to make unequivocally clear.

104. While the Security Council is now endeavouring to overcome the present crisis, let us not lose sight of the fact that, as has been recognized by many speakers, there are deeper causes. No peace can ever be lasting until and unless the full rights of the Arab people of Palestine to their homeland are recognized and fully implemented.

105. With permission, I will say a few words about the speech which has just been delivered by the representative of the Tel Aviv authorities. The representative of the Tel Aviv authorities gave a lengthy statement a few minutes ago and tried, as usual, to distort the facts.

106. He pretended that the present crisis in the Middle East erupted on 16 May 1967. Contrary to what he said, the crisis in the Middle East started, as a matter of fact, on 29 November 1947, when the former President of the United States, Truman, used all the influence and might of the United States to impose the partition of Palestine and was instrumental in the uprooting of the Palestine people.

107. As for the latest development in which the Middle East is embroiled at present, it did actually start on 7 April 1967, when the Israelis sent their military planes over Damascus, killed civilians and destroyed non-military targets and threatened to invade Syria. Time and again the Israel representatives repeat the allegation that the Arab States attacked Israel in 1948. To answer this, I would like to state that from the very inception of the Zionist movement its aim was to throw the Arab people of Palestine out of their country by terror and slaughter. The Council is familiar now with the Zionist underground movement in the Middle East. The following quotations [see also S/7845 of 9 April 1967] prove beyond any doubt what I have just stated:

“On 23 January 1943, the American Minister in Egypt, Mr. Kirk, cabled the Secretary of State in Washington as follows:

“On the Jewish side I have found Zionist officials of the Jewish Agency uncompromisingly outspoken in their determination that Palestine at the end of this war shall become not merely a national home for the Jews, but a Jewish state despite any opposition from the 1,000,000 Arabs living there. In various ways the main result of many of their efforts seems to be to goad Palestinian Arabs into breaking informal truce that has existed since war began. This enormously increased assurance on part of Jews in Palestine stems from two main sources: (a) their feeling that they have the increasing support of public opinion in Great Britain and the United States; (b) their confidence in their increased numbers and in their supply of arms that makes them feel they can more than hold their own in actual fighting with Arabs of Palestine.

“It is no secret that the Haganah, their secret Jewish military organization, has plans fully made and is well

equipped not only with small arms, but also with tommy-guns and machine guns . . . smuggled into Palestine during the past two years.¹⁰

“On 5 May 1943, Brigadier General Patrick J. Hurley, Personal Representative of President Roosevelt, also cabled to the President:

“For its part, the Zionist organization in Palestine has indicated its commitment to an enlarged program for (1) a sovereign Jewish State which would embrace Palestine and probably Transjordan, (2) an eventual transfer of the Arab population from Palestine to Iraq, and (3) Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control.¹¹”

108. On aggressive statements, the following one by the Prime Minister of Israel was delivered on 2 April 1967 and is very revealing. Mr. Eshkol said, according to *The Jerusalem Post*:

“Israel has not been approached so far on a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Indeed, there was no difference how men die—whether from nuclear or conventional arms.”

109. The Israel representative had the courage to speak about international morality. He forgot the perpetration of the tragedy of the Arab people of Palestine. What about the eighteen resolutions adopted by the General Assembly affirming the rights of the refugees to their homeland? He forgot also the massacres perpetrated in cold blood by the Zionist underground against the Arabs. To refresh his memory, let me remind him of the following massacres.

110. The Haganah, Irgun and Stern gangs committed the following massacres in Palestine: the King David Hotel massacre, 22 July 1946; the massacre of Deir Yassin, 10 April 1948; the massacre of Naserudine, 14 April 1948; the massacre of Carmel, 20 April 1948; the massacre of Al-Qabu, May 1948; the massacre of Beit Diras, 3 May 1948, the massacre of Beit Khoury, 5 May 1948; the massacre of Az-Zaytoun, 6 May 1948; the massacre of Wadi Araba, 13 May 1950; the massacre of Sharafat, 7 February 1951; the massacre of Falameh, 2 April 1951; the massacre of Qibya, 14 October 1953; the massacre of Nahalin, 28 March 1954; the massacre of Gaza, 28 February 1955; the massacre of Khan Yunis, 31 May 1955; the massacre of Khan Yunis, 31 August 1955; the massacre of Tiberias, 11 December 1955; the massacre of As-Sabha, 2 November 1955; the massacre of Gaza, 5 April 1956; the massacre of Rafah, 16 August 1956; the massacre of Ar-Rahwa, 12 September 1956; the massacre of Gharandal, 13 September 1956; the massacre of Houssan, 25 September 1956; the massacre of Qalquiliyah, 10 October 1956; the massacre of Kafr Kassem, 29 October 1956. To go further would take too much of the Council's time.

111. In concluding, I should like to say also a few words about the letter dated 2 June [S/7924] that was circulated

¹⁰ *Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers, 1943* (Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1964), vol. IV, p. 748.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 777.

this morning by the delegation of Israel on the so-called responsibility of Syria concerning a clash which took place yesterday within the Israel-occupied territory in Palestine.

112. Naturally, Israel does not waste any time in attempting to attribute the responsibility to Syria, and in its usual pattern is trying to divert attention from the real facts of the problem: that the Palestine Arab people are not ready to give up their homeland and are ready to die for it. Everything that is happening now is a confirmation of this simple reality, and neither Syria nor any other country can claim to talk on behalf of the Arab people of Palestine or to direct their activities.

113. On the other points raised today by the Israel representative I wish to reserve my delegation's right to answer later.

114. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you on behalf of my delegation for the opportunity you have given us to state the point of view of the Moroccan Government on the present developments in the Middle East situation. However, before I proceed to express our viewpoint, there are various comments I should like to offer on the quotations and references by the Israel representative in his statement a few minutes ago.

115. Mr. Rafael—at a loss, perhaps, for a suitable foreword to his statement—had recourse to a quotation from one of the African continent's most eminent heads of State, like those authors who, in order to conceal the mediocrity of their work, have it prefaced by a distinguished literary figure. I should like—as behoves the representative of an African country—to replace the quotation outside the context in which the Israel representative tried to set it. You will undoubtedly recall that this denunciation of the impotence of the League of Nations in the face of the tragedy being enacted in Ethiopia was in fact an expression of the Emperor's feelings when he agreed to leave his country and go into exile with many of his fellow countrymen, in the face of the fascist aims of occupying Ethiopia and the implantation of a mass of fascist ex-servicemen who had immigrated into the country in order to usurp the place and the rights of the Ethiopian people.

116. I think that this clarification will help Security Council members to realize that these quotations were only a screen used to conceal well calculated designs. It should also be borne in mind that when it comes to referring to the fate of the Emperor of Ethiopia and to the odyssey which had such remarkable symbolic value for the liberation of the African continent, the Israel representative should be the last to invoke them to support Israel's aggression against the Arab world. It brings to mind those street vendors who, although not Christians themselves, make money by selling crucifixes outside churches.

117. In his second reference, Mr. Rafael mentioned the case of Danzig. I appreciate that his German origins make it easier for him to refer to German history, but the Danzig case involved a Nazi claim for passage through the territory of others. His mention of it reminds me that Eilat is in exactly the same situation. If the German occupation of

Danzig was attributable to the weakness of certain great Powers at the time, some of those Powers showed similar weakness in 1947 and 1948 despite the promises they had made to the Arab States which had supported them in the struggle against the Axis and despite the legal and moral obligations of one of those Powers which had the mandate over Palestine and which should have returned the whole of that territory to its people. It was that same weakness which left Czechoslovakia and Poland helpless and enabled Germany to take Danzig by force.

118. The United Arab Republic's claims to Eilat are made in the same spirit and are of the same nature. The Israel representative—who seems to be losing his touch—made a poor choice of historical examples to buttress his argument. After this aside, I shall now proceed to set forth the Moroccan Government's viewpoint, and should like first of all to express our profound satisfaction at the measures which the Secretary-General immediately took to prevent events from taking an even graver turn.

119. Firstly, we unreservedly approve the Secretary-General's response to the request by the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from its territory. The conditions and legal framework within which the United Arab Republic and the United Nations Secretary-General had defined the arrangements regarding the stationing of the Force allow of no challenge from any quarter in respect of the Secretary-General's response and the measures which he took to make that withdrawal effective. Not only did he scrupulously respect the spirit and the letter of an agreement between the United Nations and a Member State, but we are furthermore firmly convinced that that decision, by its very promptness, safeguarded loyal co-operation between the United Nations and a Member State and prevented the situation from being distorted and the course of the crisis from being diverted along quite different lines by manoeuvres or pressures.

120. Simultaneously with that decision which enhanced the esteem and trust in which he is held, at a time when the very role of the United Nations is being seriously put to the test, the Secretary-General went to the scene of the crisis in order to gather information at first hand and learn from the competent authorities the facts of the situation. He has presented us with a report in which he forthrightly expresses his concern, but he has also notified us of the assurance he received that the United Arab Republic would not initiate any offensive action or violence against Israel. That frank exchange which an Arab State was ready to conduct with the Secretary-General in his capacity as responsible head of this Organization should be noted with satisfaction in the circumstances in which the United Nations at present finds itself, for many States in even graver situations refuse to engage in such exchanges. We still recall the Secretary-General's vain efforts to arrange for visits to Katanga, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and the steadfast refusal of certain colonial Powers to agree even to the dispatch of United Nations fact-finding missions.

121. Having regard both to the Middle Eastern crisis and to the moral authority of the United Nations, therefore, we

should like to express our warm thanks to the Secretary-General for his initiative.

122. I shall refrain from commenting on the statements made in some of the great capitals by certain senators and public representatives who saw fit to interpret the measures taken by the Secretary-General as precipitate actions detrimental to the interests of peace. It was considerations of electoral arithmetic in those capitals, rather than concern for peace, which inspired those ill-considered statements.

123. Many speakers have apprised the Council of their Governments' views on what constitute the root causes of the permanent crisis in the Middle East, of which the present situation is merely one of the periodic manifestations.

124. It would be wrong to regard the legitimate exercise by a Member State of certain aspects of its sovereignty as the starting-point of the present events in the Middle East. For twenty years now, the United Nations has had occasion several times a year to examine the tragic situation in the Arab world since the creation of Israel—at the General Assembly, in special committees and in the Security Council. And the reason why the Middle East has consistently been one of the major concerns of the United Nations is that the process which took place from the time of the Balfour Declaration up to 1948 and the consequences of the situation created by the dismemberment of Palestine for the benefit of an artificially constituted State introduced into the region elements alien to what might have been its course of natural evolution.

125. Twice in twenty years, the Middle East has experienced war, and both times on account of Zionist aggression, prepared and supported from outside. On the second occasion, in 1956, certain great Powers were direct accomplices, combining with Israel in aggression against the Arab world. True, in 1948 as in 1956, the United Nations intervened to restore peace, but without restoring justice. The Arabs accepted that peace but are still suffering the consequences of the injustice.

126. If we examine, even briefly, the reasons which have led the Security Council, over the past twenty years, to devote attention to the situation in the Middle East, it will readily be seen that it always did so following acts of aggression or violations by Israel of the Armistice Agreements and of General Assembly or Security Council resolutions.

127. The circumstances attending the creation of the State of Israel and the open backing which it has constantly been given by certain great Powers could not but generate a logic which encourages it to seek constantly to extend its territory, impose its presence further and provide daily confirmation of the threat it constitutes within the Arab world. The representatives of the United Arab Republic, Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq have reminded the Council of the long series of violations of agreements and Security Council resolutions by Israel. Twenty-three per cent of the present territory of Israel was conquered after the Armistice Agreements of 1948 and the aggression of 1956. Half of its present population is the result of immigration organized

by international Zionism, thus making it daily more imperative for Israel to sustain its expansionist appetite. One-and-a-half million Arabs have been living for twenty years as stateless persons and as witnesses of the occupation of their towns and farmlands by international Zionism's mercenaries. The waters of the Jordan have been diverted without regard for the legitimate rights of the riparian owners. But when the Arabs decide on a legitimate and reasonable scheme for exploiting their water resources, Israel threatens and bombs the areas where the work has begun.

128. It would be pointless and frivolous for us to make further statements here on the gravity of the present situation. The United Arab Republic, acting within its sovereign rights and wishing to create conditions enabling it to assume the obligations which bind it to the other Arab States, requested, under the terms of an unequivocal agreement, the withdrawal of the United Nations forces. Their maintenance in an area of key importance for the security of the United Arab Republic and free communication with the other Arab States could no longer be regarded as a measure preventing confrontation between Israel and the Arab States, but had become, politically and militarily, a protective screen from behind which Israel could with impunity pick out any Arab State for attack.

129. The most recent acts of aggression against Jordan and Syria have amply demonstrated the soundness of the reasoning which led the United Arab Republic to request the withdrawal of those troops, as it was entitled to do.

130. Unable to challenge that right and taken by surprise, perhaps, by the Secretary-General's legally justified and wise decision, the Powers which sought to dramatize the situation arising from that measure have now shifted the focus of their diplomatic action to the situation created in the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba. The port of Eilat is Israeli only as a result of an act of aggression and occupation committed subsequent to the Armistice Agreement with Egypt and the pertinent Security Council resolution. Even the state of truce could not give either of the parties any military or political advantage. When the Arabs denounced this Israel act of aggression to the great Powers which had decided to guarantee the *status quo* in the Middle East and lodged a complaint with the Security Council, they failed, here or elsewhere, to get those Powers to respect the *status quo* created by the Armistice; and the case of Eilat, since then, is simply—and cannot be other than—one of illegal occupation of a piece of Arab land which, despite all ensuing military operations and arrangements, remains an integral part of Arab territory. The fact that this port has become vital for the consolidation of Israel and for its strategy cannot erase the Arabs' right to regard it as their territory. It would be difficult for the great Powers to win acceptance here for considerations flowing from a *fait accompli* contrary to international law, whose champions they claim to be.

131. The thesis advanced by the representative of the United Arab Republic in support of his country's decision is irrefutable, and Morocco unreservedly supports it. Quite apart from political arguments, there is no legal authority—whether in London, Paris or Washington—who could

dispute the soundness of that thesis without impugning the full weight and integrity of the supreme principles of international law.

132. Once again we hear talk of a conference of maritime Powers. My country can hardly challenge the right of any group of States to meet and agree on common interests; but the decisions of a conference which would look more like a board of directors of a group of shipping companies cannot acquire the status of international law in opposition to a given country's legitimate rights.

133. When geography favours any country with a position having a vital bearing on its security or prosperity, international law and friendly relations can provide a framework permitting some form of arrangement whereby the international community can share the advantages of that position. But such arrangements can be contemplated only on the basis of strict respect for the rights and wishes of the country concerned.

134. The London Conference held in 1956 to impose freedom of passage through the Suez Canal was one of the most serious breaches of international maritime law as taught by the most eminent Western authorities. We thought, perhaps naively, that the failure of that Conference and of the tripartite aggression would lead certain great Powers, after ten years of new experiences in international relations, to reconsider their methods of approaching and seeking solutions to conflicts involving a clash between law and policy. We welcome the fact that the French Government, in Paris, has taken a position which marks a break with the views underlying the Suez expedition. We would undoubtedly have welcomed a like evolution in the thinking of some of the highly placed persons who were responsible for French policy at that time; but after an interval of ten years, those same leading figures, instead of remaining silent, which might have been more dignified but which would have indicated a disavowal of earlier decisions, persist in coming out again with the old arguments. To those of us who like to turn to their elders to seek the benefit of their experience, that attitude inclines us to think that in the case of politicians, age does not always bring better judgement.

135. Similarly we noted in a statement in the Council by the United Kingdom representative [1343rd meeting] an encouraging appreciation of certain aspects of the thesis advanced by the representative of the United Arab Republic. When Lord Caradon described the tone of Mr. El Kony's second statement to the Council as moderate, we were led to think that the Government of Mr. Wilson was perhaps more clear-sighted than Mr. Eden's team had been in October and November 1956. However, the latest statements by the United Kingdom Prime Minister, and in particular his desire to hold a conference of maritime Powers, the outcome of which it is easy to foresee, is a grave disappointment to us. I should like to say, with all the respect which we have for the United Kingdom Government, that Africa and the entire world would have been tremendously impressed had Mr. Wilson adopted an equally energetic approach in dealing with the Government of Mr. Smith, which in Southern Rhodesia has so flagrantly violated not only international law but also United King-

dom law, reducing Mr. Wilson to impotence in respect of his own constitutional law. I purposely mention the case of Southern Rhodesia at a time when the Council is considering the Palestine question for the good reason that the process which the Southern Rhodesian white minority has been applying for several years in many ways resembles that initiated by Mr. Balfour and allowed to culminate tragically in the partition of Palestine and the expulsion of one-and-a-half million of its inhabitants.

136. I am not being a prophet of woe when I tell the African members of the Security Council, with heartfelt emotion, that the upheavals which have been convulsing the Arab world for the past twenty years lead me to fear that South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are ominous warnings for the future of the African continent.

137. The problem which the Security Council is considering today is not an isolated event. It is one aspect of a much vaster problem, which the fact of having become chronic does not render any less serious or painful. It cannot be solved by finding a way of making Saudi Arabia, Jordan and the United Arab Republic allow free passage to Israel shipping or to the vessels of other countries whose cargoes help to strengthen Israel's aggressive potential. The real solution would be to display political and moral courage and make a thorough re-examination of all the relations between Israel and the Arab States. We are told that the Security Council is powerless to find an effective solution to this crisis. The Council is not an occult force, and its members' sense of responsibility is such as to allow of the possibility of progressively working out the elements of an over-all solution. It can, in any case—there is nothing to prevent it—decide that its previous resolutions on the Palestine problem as a whole remain valid and invite the parties concerned to comply with them. The great Powers, which are permanent members of the Council, not only voted in favour of these resolutions, but undertook to ensure respect in the Middle East for the *status quo* which Israel, with the protection of some of those Powers, has repeatedly changed.

138. As things stand at present, the Secretary-General has received an assurance from the Arab States in Cairo and in the Council itself, that they will not initiate any act of violence or war. We would certainly appreciate it if the great Powers which in this Council are defending several aspects of Israel's thesis would obtain a similar assurance from the latter and give us proof, either in the Council or outside it, that the moral advantage, deriving from their preponderance in international affairs is finding active expression in their determination, from now on, to impose peace on the aggressor and not on the victim.

139. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and make a statement.

140. Mr. AL-RACHACH (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to thank you and members of the Council for inviting me to address the Security Council. Upon instructions from my Government, I come to state its views on this most vital problem which may engulf the countries of the Middle East, and possibly the world, in the start of a third world war.

141. The present ominous situation precipitated by the reckless authorities in Tel Aviv, which threatens an outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, is in its essence a legacy of the Zionist adventure in Palestine. Therefore, it behoves the Security Council to delve into the Palestine question in its totality and try to deal with the "underlying causes" that have plagued the Middle East with turmoil and upheaval, threatening international peace and security in the area.

142. The present crisis is not an isolated incident, nor is it the first or the last. This crisis is not of Arab making, nor is the perennial upheaval and turmoil in the Middle East of our creation. All this has been foisted upon the Arab world just as much as the transplanted militant Zionist Jews have been foisted upon Palestine and its people. Whatever measures the Arab people have taken, they have been defensive and in self-defence to preserve the integrity and sovereignty of the Arab homeland.

143. The Government of Saudi Arabia maintains that the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran have always been under Arab control from time immemorial and are Arab territorial waters. Speaking in an interview on British television, His Majesty King Faisal declared: "We consider the Gulf of Aqaba to be an Arab Gulf." His Majesty labelled the viewpoint advanced by some great Powers that the gulf is an international waterway as "incompatible with all the legal principles".

144. During the last ten years and as a result of Zionist aggression in 1956, the Israel authorities were enabled to use the Strait of Tiran behind the shield of the United Nations Emergency Force. Such usage by the Israel authorities was never undertaken with the tacit acquiescence of the Arab littoral countries, nor was there any intention by them to forgo their sovereign rights in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran.

145. The legal arguments and the principles of international law applicable to the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran were ably presented by other Arab speakers. It is needless to add that the Saudi Arabian Government considers the Zionist enclave in Palestine an illegal occupation that has no legitimate rights to navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran.

146. For nineteen years the United Nations and its organs have shirked their responsibilities whenever certain facets of the Palestine question were debated either in the General Assembly or in its committees or in the Security Council. It has been the hope of certain big Powers to liquidate the Palestine question and every vestige of it by the passage of time. Little did such big Powers know the deep Arab attachment to the homeland.

147. The position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on Palestine has always been made crystal clear on every occasion. On 20 October 1966, Mr. Baroody, while addressing the Security Council, quoted, *inter alia*, from a speech delivered by His Majesty King Faisal on 9 October 1966, at Riyadh. His Majesty stated:

"We reject United Nations resolutions concerning the partition of Palestine"—I repeat: "We reject United

Nations resolutions concerning the partition of Palestine"—"The Saudi people, including myself, my brothers and my sons, if need be, will be in the vanguard in order to retrieve Palestine and see that it goes back to its people." [1309th meeting, para. 53.]

I wish to reiterate, here and now, that this remains the policy and objective of the Saudi Arabian Government.

148. May I add at this juncture that the Secretary-General, in his report [S/7906], referred to the "underlying causes" that precipitated this crisis. Accordingly, it is incumbent upon the Council to study immediately these "underlying causes" in its search for peace in the Middle East, guided by the history of events in the area during the last nineteen years.

149. It is our belief that the Secretary-General had in mind, when referring to the "underlying causes", the whole Palestine question. Any attempt to interpret the intention of the Secretary-General differently is tantamount to an abdication by the Security Council of its responsibilities under the Charter to maintain international peace and security and to put an end to the long suffering of the indigenous Arab people of Palestine, who were forced by Zionist terrorism and massacre out of their homeland in Palestine, to live in the squalor of the refugee camps at seven cents a day, while alien transplanted Zionists enjoy the produce of Arab lands and live in Arab homes. For nineteen years the indigenous Arab people of Palestine have suffered deprivation and the agony of living away from home and country, while transplanted Zionists ingathered from all corners of the world have reaped the income from Arab properties in Zionist-occupied Palestine.

150. Does this make any sense? And will such conditions ever lead to peace? As long as the militant Zionists remain in occupied Palestine, the threat to international peace and security will continue unabated.

151. The last nineteen years have vindicated the warning which Arab spokesmen had given during the second regular session of the General Assembly in 1947 that the Arabs were unalterably opposed to the partition of Palestine and the imposition of alien Zionist transplanted Jews into the heart of the Arab homeland.

152. What the supporters of the so-called Jewish State fail to conceive is that the Arabs are indigenous to the area, while the transplanted alien Zionist Jews will continue to be isolated and unwanted in our midst; I repeat, will continue to be isolated and unwanted in our midst.

153. If war breaks out in the Middle East, due to either miscalculation or to the challenge of Israel authorities of Arab sovereign rights in the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, the Arab world will meet this challenge with courage and fortitude and will resolve once and for all Zionist aggression in Palestine; I repeat, once and for all Zionist aggression in Palestine.

154. The Security Council had occasion to hear the views of a number of speakers from Arab countries in Asia and Africa. This is ample evidence of the unwavering determi-

nation of the Arab people, who occupy an area extending from the Atlantic in the West to the Indian Ocean in the East, with a population of about 100 million, to liberate the occupied part of their fatherland.

155. If hostilities should break out because of the pugnacity of the Zionist usurpers of the Arab homeland in Palestine, it will be total and unremitting. Supporting the Arab people in their national struggle are many friends who have been indignant and deeply appalled by the injustice committed against the indigenous Arab people of Palestine. The Arab people have considered every contingency likely to arise and are accordingly ready to meet such challenges with all their resources and with all the might at their command, in blood, treasure or both, irrespective of sacrifice.

156. Let those who harbour any idea of hostile action against us not misinterpret our zeal and our determination to treat them as our foes and enemies. I repeat, let those who harbour any idea of hostile action against us not misinterpret our zeal and determination to treat them as our foes and enemies.

157. Any resolution that falls short of dealing with the restoration of a united Palestine to its indigenous people and the repatriation of the transplanted alien Zionist Jews to their countries of origin, or to countries of their choice, will be considered an evasion by the Council of its own responsibilities. This is the only course; there is no other. The alternative will lead ultimately to disaster that will engulf mankind. Such action calls for men of vision and courage. And of those there is a great want.

158. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): As my delegation has had occasion to observe before, the United States representative has repeatedly and at length discoursed in the Security Council on the theme of international navigation, the principles of international law, legal rules and standards in this regard, etc. In doing so he apparently has felt no compunction in painting a glowing picture of the United States as a champion of free international navigation and a guardian of law and justice who watches over these matters everywhere on earth.

159. We have already pointed out to the Council that these hypocritical declarations are not merely divorced from reality, they are very obviously at flagrant variance with the deeds, the criminal practices, of the United States of America.

160. Members of the Council will no doubt remember that I asked the United States representative how Washington justifies the illegal actions of the United States against Cuba. Members will also remember that we received no answer from the representative of the United States. There was no answer because these actions cannot be justified, because the United States of America brazenly flouts the most elementary principles of international law, including those relating to free international navigation.

161. As we know very well, not a day passes without the United States committing some fresh arbitrary act and

defying international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Yesterday was no exception in this sequence of criminal actions. This time, on 2 June, 11 a.m. Moscow time, United States aircraft bombed the Soviet vessel *Turkestan* anchored in the port of Campha, fifty miles north of Haiphong. Two United States warplanes dropped a bomb and strafed the ship with explosive bullets from large-calibre machine-guns. Two members of the Soviet vessel's crew were severely wounded, and one of them, an electrician, died a few hours later. The vessel was damaged. I must add that there were no other ships in the harbour except for the Cypriot vessel *Asma*.

162. This attack by the United States Air Force on a Soviet merchant vessel constitutes one more flagrant violation of the principle of free navigation and an act of piracy that is fraught with the most serious consequences. The USSR Government has lodged a strong protest with the Government of the United States, which bears full responsibility for these acts of provocation and banditry by the United States armed forces.

163. All this patently shows that the ruling circles in Washington, while endlessly preaching Pharisaic sermons about peace, legality and international law, indulge in lawlessness and the reckless use of brute force, and brazenly arrogate to themselves the right to dictate to other States, in violation of their sovereignty and national independence.

164. I should like in this connexion to call attention to the statement of 2 June 1967 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic which has been circulated as a Security Council document. The statement reads, in part:

"The United Arab Republic in its present struggle against colonialism and foreign domination is facing a new phase of pressure and threats exercised by some States who claim to speak on behalf of the maritime Powers. These States are attempting to follow the policies of the nineteenth century of warship diplomacy. Such an action is in no way meant to serve the cause of international trade or international navigation; it is meant merely to serve the purposes of the Israel aggression."
[S/7925.]

165. In view of this criminal line of action, Washington has no moral right to assume, here in the Security Council, the role of guardian of free international navigation. Indeed, the United States deserves the sternest condemnation for its policies and actions, including its complicity with the extremist circles in Israel which are perpetrating aggression against neighbouring Arab States.

166. An end must be put once and for all to the high-handed actions of this international gendarme.

167. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, as this is the first time that I have taken the floor under your presidency, I should like to offer you sincere congratulations on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Mali. I do so with all the more warmth and pleasure because you are presiding over the Council in this month of June, following a month during which, in its own

interests and for the benefit of our Organization, the office of President should, in my Government's view, have been held by the great People's Republic of China, whose capital is Peking and which is temporarily deprived of its rights here—to the great detriment of the United Nations itself. Mr. President, I am convinced that, under your wise guidance, the Council can expect to achieve fruitful results in its consideration of the problem before us.

168. On 24 May 1967 the Security Council was suddenly convened, to be confronted with a three-paragraph draft resolution [S/7905], submitted that same day by Canada and Denmark, dealing with the current situation in the Middle East. On that day we had two exceptionally "colourful" meetings, in view of the gravity and urgency which the agenda implied.

169. What, in fact, was at stake?

170. On 18 May the United Arab Republic, a sovereign country and a fully-fledged Member of the United Nations, called for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from its territory. The Secretary-General of our Organization, acting within his prerogatives and competence, acceded to the request of the United Arab Republic on the same day and on 22 May he flew to Cairo to meet the President and leaders of the United Arab Republic.

171. On 20 May the United Arab Republic decided to prohibit the use of the port of Aqaba to any ship flying the Israel flag or carrying strategic materials destined for Israel.

172. My delegation applauds the dispatch with which the Secretary-General took the necessary decisions and acted as he did, prompted only by a desire to respect the rights of a sovereign State and by the interests of peace.

173. We could not, and we still cannot, understand why, while the Secretary-General was holding talks with the leaders of the United Arab Republic at Cairo, some people here considered it essential, urgent and imperative to convene the Council and to take a decision on the very subject of the talks that were going on in Cairo. We could not, and still cannot, understand why we were asked to give the Secretary-General the support of this Council, which, by the very fact of electing him to his office, accorded him all the support and confidence he needed for the effective discharge of the heavy task entrusted to him.

174. Finally, the Secretary-General, with commendable swiftness, fulfilled his mission at Cairo with the minimum delay, as the situation required, and, better still, with even greater swiftness he began work immediately on his return to Headquarters in order to submit his report [S/7906] to us at noon on 27 May. Once again the delegation of Mali is grateful to him for all his efforts to help us to work better and, this time, to have at least a basis on which to work, namely his report. I have been greatly interested to observe the skill with which outstanding speakers before me have made use of the Secretary-General's report. I would therefore beg your indulgence in allowing me to imitate them.

175. My delegation feels that we must recognize straight away that the problem before us today is one of long standing. It is the problem of Palestine. At this point, my delegation would like to state that, for the sake of accuracy and proper procedure, the current debate should be inscribed in its only true context and under its true title, "The Palestine question", which is still a serious and distressing problem. It is, in fact, a problem created with the blessing of our Organization itself. It is the problem of Israel which, for the Arabs, is a State created by Western racism and imperialism, a malignant tumour, forcibly implanted in the heart of their country against their will. If it was not through racism, why were the Jewish people driven from every corner of Europe to be settled outside Europe on another continent? What have we seen in recent days? A far-reaching and tendentious campaign to give credence to the view that the United Arab Republic's decision to request the withdrawal of UNEF from its national territory, or its decision with regard to the blockade which it has just imposed in the Gulf of Aqaba, are manifestations of anti-Jewish sentiments. That is going too far.

176. Why, in their miserable work of brainwashing, have they not the courage and moral honesty to rake over the ashes? Which are the peoples which have on their conscience the heavy responsibility for having decimated almost 6 million Jews—human beings, men, their brothers—only a quarter of a century ago in the crematoria ovens and in the concentration camps? Is it the Arabs? Who are mainly responsible for the forced exodus of the Jews? Is it the Arabs?

177. Why, therefore, is it felt to be reasonable and necessary to ascribe to the Arabs the guilty responsibility which belongs to all those who are today pretending to play the role of Pontius Pilate? Why are they trying to transform a question of national sovereignty into a question of racism?

178. Do they think that, by acting in this way, they can align part of the world against the Arabs? That is neither just nor honourable nor constructive, for the result might on the contrary, be merely to awaken and heighten in the Arabs a feeling with which they are credited in advance. Is that the result which it is hoped to achieve?

179. Should we not recognize this inversion of the truth which is manifest in this campaign of which we are all aware, for what it really is, namely clever stage-management by those whose souls are, alas, stained with Jewish blood? It is they who are the true enemies of the Jews. It is they who are the vampires who drenched and sated themselves with the blood of the Jews. It is they who, having exploited the Jews and even continuing to do so, give theatrical support to Israel, which they are setting against the Arab

180. Let no one be mistaken, however. This dangerous game of opposing and dividing in which they are engaged designed solely to protect and safeguard their own interest. It is not love of the Jews as human beings or as the neighbours which governs their actions. That is impossible. The wholesale slaughter of 6 million Jews is enough to convince us of that.

181. It is something quite different. It is their interests, for the sake of which they do not hesitate to set any region of the earth ablaze. They are so skilled at doing this, even from a distance, that it sometimes seems difficult to find the trace of their barbarous hands in the fires which they light.

182. Like leeches, they exploit the Jews to strengthen their economies. They exploit the Jews in their so-called nuclear research and all the other research whose sole object is to prepare the world for an apocalyptic awakening.

183. That is the truth, Mr. President; the question is not one of Arab racism. As we have already stated in this very forum, we harbour no racist sentiments, either against the Jews or against anyone. For us, a Jew is merely a man like any other man, white, yellow, red or black. Nor do we think that the Arabs see the question in an entirely different light. As a distinguished Arab ambassador said here, the Arabs and the Jews are cousins, if not brothers. We therefore do not think that, in the circumstances, it is right to accuse the Arabs of anti-Jewish prejudice. It is, however, understandable that the Arabs cannot fail to feel the great frustration to which they have been subjected. That would be too much to ask of them, for they, too, are only men.

184. Deprived of their goods and their land, they were expelled, in hundreds, in thousands, in millions, from the land of their ancestors and reduced to a miserable existence as outcasts in exile. The United Nations bears its share of responsibility for this tragedy, in the face of which hesitation and postponement can only give rise to vain hopes. It is lamentable that, for twenty years, those truly responsible for this situation have contrived to use the United Nations to promote merely stopgap solutions. It is, alas, necessary to repeat once again that the problem can be settled only by the return of the Palestinians to the land of their ancestors.

185. The stagnation which handicaps the United Nations is due to the persistence of the problems which arise in that area and to which, from time to time, mere semi-solutions are applied. Until an appropriate solution has been found to the Palestine problem, it will gnaw at the Organization itself like an ulcer.

186. At a time when the United Nations is justly proud of a certain degree of progress accomplished in decolonization, thanks to which Member States have seen their number constantly increase through a process which we should like to see accelerated still further, it is well to reflect a little on the question of pockets of minorities which receive the utmost assistance from the Western Powers. Thus we see that Israel, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are alike industrialized regions set up in the midst of under-developed countries.

187. For our countries, these minority pockets are bastions consciously and deliberately set up by imperialism for neo-colonialist purposes. The support which is given to them by the West is a blatant demonstration of the latter's insatiable desire to dominate young, newly independent

States, using new and cunning methods. It seems to us that they are seeking to regain with the left hand what they have been forced to yield with the right.

188. We have a vivid recollection of the unforgettable and historic attitude taken recently, during the discussion of the burning problem of South West Africa, by the Powers which were in the best position to take positive action. Unhappily, economic interests meant more to them than the fate of millions of human beings.

189. At this stage, we should like to stress that the Government of Mali hails any struggle undertaken by a people to free itself from a colonial yoke or to recover the inalienable rights that our Charter recognizes for all peoples. For this very reason, we fear that an unfortunate interpretation may be placed upon the second sentence of paragraph 13 of the Secretary-General's report.

190. We have tried, with the utmost impartiality, to identify the real problems facing this distinguished Council, because anything that may be said which has no bearing on the problems of Palestine is irrelevant in the present circumstances. The United Nations, which must, alas, bear its share of the responsibility for the dispute which we are considering, must act with honesty and sincerity, for if it were to continue in the passive role of an instrument—which certain people are endeavouring by every means to foist upon it—it would be in danger of error or, rather, it would be perpetuating an error dangerously prejudicial to itself.

191. After these general comments, let us turn our thoughts to the present situation.

192. Before Israel was created, this people possessed no territory and no port. The Western countries, supported by the United Nations, gave it a territory after driving out the legitimate owners.

193. For the United Nations, a new financial item called the Agency for Palestine Refugees was added to the list of expenses. This, moreover, is not a happy item, for it must be admitted in all objectivity, that the sacrifices that are made are swallowed up like a drop of water in the ocean, so completely inadequate are they to dress the wounds for which they are intended.

194. However, for reasons we shall describe as purely humanitarian, the United Arab Republic allowed these people, uprooted from Israel, the use of its territory as a haven, despite the permanent state of war inherent in the presence of the Jewish people on Arab soil.

195. It would be useful at this point to consider certain terminological factors.

196. Everyone here is aware—as we indicated briefly on 24 May 1967 at the 1341st meeting—that the United Arab Republic, as a sovereign Government, replied favourably to a United Nations request that it would allow the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force on the national territory of the United Arab Republic for peaceful purposes.

197. We feel that our Organization, whether it says so or not, owes a debt of gratitude to the Government of the United Arab Republic for its understanding and co-operation. This was an agreement between the Government of the United Arab Republic and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, reached over ten years ago.

198. On 18 May 1967, the United Arab Republic, for reasons of its own, asked the Secretary-General to withdraw the UNEF forces from its soil. That was an action fully within the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic. We think that it was because he recognized, firstly, the effective co-operation which the United Arab Republic had given and, secondly, the legitimacy of that country's request, that the Secretary-General, fully aware of the situation, met the Egyptian request. Had the Secretary-General acted otherwise, the United Arab Republic would have been justified in considering that its co-operation efforts and the legal basis underlying its position as a sovereign State had been disregarded.

199. Moreover, the report of the Secretary-General of 26 May 1967 [S/7906], in paragraph 2, states as follows:

"It has been alleged in some quarters that the prompt compliance with the request for the withdrawal of the Force is a primary cause of the present crisis in the Near East. This ignores the fact that the underlying basis for this and other crisis situations in the Near East is the continuing Arab-Israel conflict which has been present all along . . ."

In paragraph 3 of the same report, the Secretary-General points out that:

"The United Nations Emergency Force was introduced into the territory of the United Arab Republic on the basis of an agreement between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of Egypt. The consent of the host country, in this as in other peace-keeping operations, was the basis for its presence on the territory of the United Arab Republic. When that consent was withdrawn, the essential part of the basis of the Force's presence ceased to exist."

And in paragraph 5 that:

"My decision in this matter was based upon both legal and practical considerations."

Further on, in paragraph 6 of the report, the Secretary-General states:

"It may be relevant to note here that the Force functioned exclusively on the United Arab Republic side of the line in a zone from which the armed forces of the United Arab Republic had voluntarily stayed away for over ten years. It was this arrangement which allowed the Force to function as a buffer and as a restraint on infiltration. When this arrangement lapsed, United Arab Republic troops moved up to the line as they had every right to do."

In paragraph 7 of his report, the Secretary-General observes:

"If the Force had been deployed on both sides of the line as originally envisaged in pursuance of the General Assembly resolution, its buffer function would not necessarily have ended. However, its presence on the Israel side of the line has never been permitted. The fact that the Force was not stationed on the Israel side of the line was a recognition of the unquestioned sovereign right of Israel to withhold its consent for the stationing of the Force. The acquiescence in the request of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the Force after ten and a half years on United Arab Republic soil was likewise a recognition of the sovereign authority of the United Arab Republic. In no official document relating to the Force has there been any suggestion of a limitation of this sovereign authority."

200. Thus the legitimacy of the request for the withdrawal of UNEF from the soil of the United Arab Republic needs no proof.

201. Before we deal with the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, let us recall that there is no frontier between Israel and the United Arab Republic, but a so-called demarcation line. Moreover, ever since the creation of Israel, as is evident from the Secretary-General's report, there has been a real state of war, a continuing conflict, between Israel and the Arabs; and it was because of this idea of a continuing conflict that the stage of an armistice was reached.

202. Now, in the *Dictionnaire de la terminologie du droit international*, published by the International Academic Union in Paris in 1960, we find the following definition of armistice on page 57: "An agreed and provisional suspension of military operations that allows the state of war to continue"; and article 36 of the rules annexed to Hague Convention IV of 18 October 1907 notes that an armistice does not become a state of peace by reason of the fact that it does not specify a date for its expiration.

203. At this point, I should like to quote an eminent jurist, Raymond Geouffre de la Pradelle:

"The Armistice Agreement of 24 February 1949 between Israel and Egypt states that the armistice demarcation line 'is not to be construed in any sense as a political or territorial boundary'. It was not a peace treaty but a suspension of hostilities, and after the events of 1956 no new document was signed."

De la Pradelle also writes:

"The decision which President Nasser has just taken is in keeping with a position of principle that has been constantly affirmed by the United Arab Republic. From a legal standpoint, there is nothing new in it.

"This case involves an unusual gulf which is bordered by several States, but whose greatest width does not exceed the territorial waters of the riparian States. The United Arab Republic holds that its territorial waters extend for twelve miles, and in international law the

extension of territorial waters is a matter to be determined by the individual States. An exception is made, however, in the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone of 29 April 1958. Article 12 of this Convention states that "where the coasts of two States are opposite or adjacent to each other, neither of the two States is entitled, failing agreement between them to the contrary, to extend its territorial sea beyond the median line . . .".

"The waters of the gulf close to the Red Sea are therefore territorial waters either of the United Arab Republic or of Saudi Arabia. Access to the gulf, however, is well within Egyptian territorial waters, since the Strait of Tiran is the only channel accessible to ships of large tonnage."

204. It would seem, moreover, that article 16, paragraph 4, of the 1958 Convention on territorial waters is not applicable in the case of the Gulf of Aqaba, since the provisions of the Convention apply to peaceful relations and not to states of war. We all recognize that it is this latter situation which still prevails between the Arab States and Israel.

205. Turning once again to the Secretary-General's report, we read: "Free passage through the Strait is one of the questions which the Government of Israel considers most vital to her interests." [S/7906, para. 10.] We must acknowledge, however, that the United Arab Republic is justified in not considering any ship flying the flag of a country with which it deems itself at war, or any ship carrying strategic materials to a country which it considers its enemy, to be inoffensive.

206. In the light of the foregoing, and in view of the essentially peaceful mission of our Organization, my delegation thinks that it would be wise to take action to reduce tension in the area. The Republic of Mali attaches the utmost importance to peace among men, for we believe that it is the major, the most precious and the most indispensable element for life and survival. We want neither violence nor bloodshed, and we are totally committed to the peaceful settlement of disputes.

207. My delegation is therefore ready to lend its wholehearted support to any objective measures designed to bring peace to the Middle East. As we have already stated, however, we are not yet convinced that resolutions drawn up ably but in haste, as we know so well how to do here, can solve the problems facing us, as by the wave of a magic wand. This, we repeat, is a question dating back twenty years and it is time that we tackled the substance of this matter objectively and dispassionately, if we are really seeking to reach the same goal: peace in the Middle East.

208. Before concluding, I wish it to be clearly understood that in the opinion of my Government the present crisis in the Middle East calls for a just settlement of the question of the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic over its national territory.

209. As the representative of a newly independent country, I wish to stress our concern over the mere idea of a

manoeuvre designed to create an unfortunate precedent which we are not prepared to accept.

210. We condemn in advance any arrangement by any "club" whatever which might prejudice the logical and historical restoration that took place in the United Arab Republic on 20 May 1967, to the benefit of the people of that country. We regard that restoration, in fact, as the legitimate recovery by the United Arab Republic of a part of its national patrimony based on respect for the sovereignty of a country and not on racist feelings against anyone.

211. We do not support—particularly in this Hall—the principle that young nations should wait to be gobbled up indiscriminately at the mere desire or whim of some other nation. We cannot understand, as an anecdote from our country illustrates, how anyone can keep saying to the hare: "Hare, the devil is all yours", while whenever the devil appears the hare has to run and hide.

212. On the basis of the above, my delegation is prepared to examine carefully any idea or suggestion that will advance the work of the Council. We therefore feel that it would be wise to explore new avenues that would enable us to consider the problem in its entirety, for only thus will the Council be able to accomplish the task which the world rightfully expects of it.

213. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, in speaking for the first time since you have assumed the Presidency of the Security Council, I am pleased to express to you the special friendship which the French delegation feels for you personally and for your country, which you represent with such distinction and courteous authority.

214. In deciding to intervene only at this point in our debate, my delegation remains true to the rule it has followed since the beginning of the present serious crisis in the Near East. The friendly relations my country enjoys with all States in that region, the understanding shown there to our policy, our interests and our history, all these compel us to be particularly objective and at the same time make it our duty to contribute to the maintenance of peace in that part of the world.

215. France's age-old ties with the Arab world enable us to understand the great care with which the latter means to preserve its dignity and independence.

216. In the same spirit of friendship, France wishes to express its desire to see the existence of the State of Israel assured and to see a people who have suffered so much for so long allowed to live unimpeded.

217. Our silence until now in a debate in which numerous speakers have already taken part must obviously not be construed as a sign of indifference. Like the other members of the Council, we have listened intently to the interventions of those who have preceded us. In the past few days there has been much discussion of the report which the Secretary-General submitted on 29 May to the Security Council. At times there has seemed to be a tendency to

single out certain passages considered more important than others.

218. My delegation, too, might be tempted to draw attention to one or another paragraph to support its judgement on the events which have led the Council to meet. I do not think it would be desirable, nor do I think it was the Secretary-General's intention, for us to use this report as a collection of quotations, at the risk of giving the impression that we wish to stress certain aspects of the situation instead of considering it in its entirety. In the light of the urgent necessity to reduce tension, my delegation views the Secretary-General's report [S/7906] as a balanced description of the problems with which we are grappling. With the outlines thus drawn, we should devote our attention to specific points, selected in such a way that the parties concerned will from the very outset be convinced that their claims will be considered objectively and in a spirit of fairness.

219. We are aware, of course, that it has not yet been possible to follow this course of action. The views expressed before the Council appear to be so radically opposed one to another that one might be tempted to succumb to pessimism. At the present stage in the crisis and in view of the antagonism between the members of the Council, we must first decide what useful steps can be taken in the present circumstances to safeguard the essential, i.e. peace, and consequently, to pave the way for a subsequent discussion of the problems which cannot be ignored.

220. But we feel that the immediate aim of the Council should be to obtain a breathing spell, in order to prevent the crisis becoming worse. We think that this pause should serve to bring about a psychological, and perhaps even a military *détente*.

221. We should like to impress upon the parties concerned how grave a responsibility the one which first decided to resort to military action would bear. With this in mind we feel that the Security Council's most urgent task today is to reach agreement on the terms of an appeal to the parties to refrain from using force of any kind to back up their claims during this breathing spell. Only by making such an appeal will the Council live up to the responsibilities which fall to it and which it has assumed on behalf of the United Nations.

222. In making this proposal, the French delegation wishes to make clear to the parties whose representatives have spoken before the Council that for the moment it is not a question of approving or disapproving their respective positions, but simply of seeking the ways and means which might lead to peaceful procedures for settlement, in other words, to negotiation.

223. Furthermore, we should be taking an incomplete view of the situation were we to ignore the special responsibility weighing on the great Powers. My delegation therefore calls upon the other permanent members of the Council to join with it in endeavouring to direct the ominous crisis in the Near East along the only road which, in my Government's opinion, can lead to peace, and which, I repeat, is that of a *détente* followed by negotiation.

224. That is why the French delegation thinks that it would be useless, if not dangerous, to allow our debate to proceed from a discussion to a vote on draft resolutions on which it seems highly doubtful that a general consensus can be reached. Such an admission of impotence, deplorable in itself, might prompt the opposing parties to pursue a policy or undertake action likely to create a worse situation.

225. We therefore appeal to all to work together to seek a solution on which all could agree and which would lead to the breathing-spell that is indispensable if we wish to see this crisis guided towards a peaceful settlement.

226. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The hour is late and I do not wish to detain the Council unduly. Nevertheless, I am impelled to exercise my right of reply in light of several statements that have been made here today concerning United States policy.

227. The representative of the Soviet Union again persists in injecting the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 into this debate. I pointed out the other day that I saw no purpose in discussing irrelevant subjects not on the agenda. But Ambassador Fedorenko persists, and I shall now give him the reply he presses for.

228. I am surprised that any representative of the Soviet Union would wish to recall the sordid chapter of military adventurism on the part of his country. The passage of offensive missiles, carefully concealed and obscured by military and diplomatic deception in an effort to produce a nuclear confrontation threatening the peace of the entire world, could hardly be described as innocent. What we are debating today is the right of innocent passage. I would remind the Council, moreover, that at the height of the Cuban missile crisis, when the Secretary-General appealed to the parties to avoid a confrontation, the United States responded affirmatively and, as a result of the Secretary-General's appeal and President Kennedy's courageous and prudent stand, the crisis was resolved.

229. The Secretary-General, in this grave situation, has made an appeal for restraint to all concerned. The United States is supporting this appeal. We would hope that, instead of engaging in invective, the Soviet Union would show restraint, as Mr. Khrushchev prudently did in the Cuban crisis situation.

230. With respect to the protest of the Soviet Union about the incident in Viet-Nam referred to by Mr. Fedorenko, my Government is carefully and promptly investigating this allegation and will, in an appropriate diplomatic way, reply to the protest. I reaffirm, however, the willingness of my Government not only to talk about Viet-Nam—when it is a subject on the agenda—but also to vote on the problem of Viet-Nam any time the Soviet Union withdraws its objection to the effect that the United Nations has no competence to deal with this subject.

231. There is another matter to which I must refer. I would suppose that the primary function of the Council, if it is to harmonize the actions of nations, is to observe elementary diplomatic courtesy and usage. Several remarks have been made by participants in this debate about public

opinion in the United States on this subject. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter says, for a very good reason, that nothing in the Charter authorizes the United Nations "to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State". The public opinion of people in any country represented in this Council is a matter of its domestic jurisdiction. Our country is very proud of the fact that it is a free country and that all citizens, all newspapers, are free to express their opinions.

232. My Government cannot accept the implications by representatives of any country that such expressions of public opinion are in any way to be curtailed by my Government. My Government has no constitutional right to curtail the exercise by its citizens of the right of free speech and free Press, which is basic to our conception of a democracy. My Government, of course, like any democratic government, takes cognizance of the opinions of its citizens in formulating its foreign policy. It, however, as a Government, declares its foreign policy within its own constitutional processes, and statements on this subject have been made by our President and by me, representing our Government, to the Security Council. These statements, I frankly and readily agree, are an appropriate subject for debate in this Council. Every member of the Security Council is free to agree or disagree with our statements; indeed that is the prerogative of every Member of the United Nations.

233. But it does not serve the cause of harmonizing the actions of nations for representatives of any country to make reference to what any of our citizens, in the exercise of their constitutional rights, may say or legally do with respect to their views about the grave situation which we are considering. We all read the world Press. Citizens of all countries are expressing their views about this grave situation, which is indeed highly understandable and natural under the circumstances. But we do categorically reject the right of any representative in any way to express an attitude with respect to the exercise by our citizens of their convictions in the matter.

234. I should like to make another observation. It has been said here—it was said two or three times today—by representatives of certain countries that the United States attitude on this matter is one-sided. I have adverted to this before, but I should like to say a very brief word about it again. The implication has been that while at Suez our Government was "impartial"; since Suez that has not been the case, because our Government, if I understand the argument, recognizes Israel as a State—just as we recognize all other Members of the United Nations as States.

235. I should have thought that this argument could not be validly made under the Charter. The Charter is very explicit in Article 2; it says that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state . . .".

The statement made by the President of the United States, which I quoted here the other day, explicitly derives from this Charter statement. I repeat it:

"To the leaders of all 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 . . .". [1343rd meeting, para. 24.]

That is the Charter commitment, to which all countries of the United Nations are equally bound. Indeed, in addition to this broad statement of principle, it would show a very faulty memory for members of the Council and Member nations of the United Nations to forget what the United States has said when problems have arisen on complaints between Israel and the Arab States in the Council, including some very recent ones.

236. Does it sound very one-sided for the representative of the United States to have said in this Council on 29 July 1966—and this was on the complaint of the Government of Syria:

"My Government considers it deplorable that the Government of Israel chose to reply to these raids in a manner which not only caused further civilian injuries and deaths but also increased the danger of continued and more serious breaches of the cease-fire. The United States Government was not consulted and had no knowledge of this strike . . . We believe that reliance on the United Nations machinery was clearly called for in this instance." [1291st meeting, para. 13]

In a further intervention, on 3 August 1966, the representative of the United States in this Council said:

"Our conclusion is that both Syria and Israel bear responsibility for the violence along the borders with which the Council has dealt, and that a resolution which only points in one direction is not helpful." [1295th meeting, para. 86.]

237. On 14 October 1966, in an intervention in this Council, I, on behalf of my Government, said:

"Secondly, to discharge this responsibility, the Council must act, as it has generally acted in the past . . . impartially and even-handedly for peace. I believe the record of many years will show that my own Government has sought to act whenever the fragile state of peace in the area was endangered or broken from either side." [1307th meeting, para. 86.]

On 17 October 1966, I said again in this Council, referring to a statement made previously by the United States representative:

"The decision of the Government of Israel to 'respond' . . . to these incidents was a deplorable one, given the availability of United Nations machinery on the spot." [1308th meeting, para. 162.]

On 17 October I also said:

"We seek good relations with all countries. We seek to apply the provisions of the Charter and of United Nations resolutions which call for non-interference in the affairs of other countries." [Ibid., para. 168.]

238. I could repeat many other statements that have been made—in the Jordanian complaint, in the Syrian complaint, for example—and they have been very clear and expressive statements. And they were not only statements; they were supported by votes in this Council which demonstrated the even-handed nature of our position.

239. It would be helpful if other countries, particularly other great Powers, were to make similar statements. I am still waiting for statements from some of the other great Powers in this debate, statements which would contribute to the relief of tension in the area: statements to the effect that the Charter provisions, that the political independence and territorial integrity of all States are to be respected; that aggression and violence and force wherever they occur are to be deprecated; and that the rights long confirmed by this Council and established by international law—rights which have long been recognized—should be respected. I am still waiting for statements of that character which could help to restrain the situation. I have not heard them. The United States has expressed itself very clearly; and those expressions have been backed up by action, as I have said, throughout the year.

240. We have hoped to enjoy and tried to enjoy, as the President has said, good relations with all countries in the area. Our objective today is a very simple one. It is to support an appeal made by the impartial agency of the United Nations, the Secretary-General. Our draft resolution was cast in those plain terms. It did not seek to go beyond them. It did not seek to prejudice the claims of any party. It sought to help, in the Secretary-General's explicit words, to alleviate tension in the area. This is the objective of the United Nations, and this is what we are pursuing in the Council.

241. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Ethiopia had asked to make a few remarks, but, by error his name did not appear on my list. I therefore now give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia.

242. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Since this is the first time I have intervened in the Council since your elevation, Sir, to the high office of President of the Security Council, may I take the opportunity to associate myself with those representatives who have spoken before me in congratulating you, and to assure you of my delegation's full and sincere co-operation in the performance of your important duties. We are confident that you will bring to the office of the Presidency of this Council the objectivity, wisdom and cool common sense so characteristic of the Nordic region of which your country forms so vital a part.

243. Since reference was made earlier in our debate to the name of my august Sovereign and to an historic declaration which His Imperial Majesty made in 1936, in circumstances which had nothing to do with the present crisis in the Middle East, I should like to be allowed to remove any possible misunderstanding that could arise from this far-fetched and unrelated reference made by the representative of Israel, by reading for the record of the Council a message of appeal which His Imperial Majesty, my august Sovereign, made on 25 May 1967. In so doing, I wish to express my gratitude to the representative of Morocco for the kind and

generous words which he was good enough to express with regard to my august Sovereign. I should like also to thank him for the appropriate clarifications which he made in his brilliant statement before the Council this morning.

244. The meaningful appeal of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia was made in the course of his address on the occasion of Africa Day, and reads as follows:

“We are greatly disturbed at the dangerous turn of events in the Middle East. As we have stated on previous occasions, the preservation of world peace is the common concern of every people and nation. We would therefore avail ourselves of this opportunity to appeal to all concerned to exercise every restraint in the spirit of their solemn undertakings in the Charter of the United Nations, and to make every effort to maintain the peace in the Middle East.”

I respectfully submit that this appeal of Ethiopia's Head of State is fully in accord with our efforts in the Council at the present time and is expressive of Ethiopia's keen and genuine desire to contribute to the efforts of the Council to resolve this dangerous crisis.

245. Finally, with your permission, Mr. President, I should like to associate myself, in the spirit of the appeal which I have just read, with the remarks made by the representative of France: his call for restraint, his call for time, his call for the continuation of the intensive consultations that we are carrying out and which are well under way under your able leadership. It would be a great pity if these were not allowed to continue, with the objective of obtaining a draft resolution containing an appeal which would be acceptable to the members of the Security Council as a whole.

246. The PRESIDENT: Before we pursue our debate, I should like to say just one word. I would certainly hesitate to interfere with the right of any member of the Council to express himself on subjects which he considers to be directly or indirectly linked with the question under debate. On the other hand, I believe that it will speed up our deliberations and promote our efforts to achieve the results we all desire if all the members of the Council confine their statements, as strictly as possible, to the item under discussion.

247. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): May I state first of all that, as was to be expected, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, the representative of the United States, did not answer and is hardly likely to answer the direct question I put to him. As before, he tried to shift the discussion to a different plane and to a different subject, a device frequently resorted to in court proceedings and legal practice in certain countries. But eluding an answer does not cancel out the question, and I say again that Washington had no justification, no grounds and no rights to warrant its illegal and arbitrary actions against Cuba, a Member of the United Nations.

248. Secondly, the statement by the United States representative has again made it quite clear that Washington lays claim to the role of world judge and policeman. The United

States considers itself entitled to install its nuclear weapons in any part of the world, thus endangering peace and the lives of millions of people. Nuclear bombs of the United States, as we all know, have actually fallen on the territory of other States, whether by accident or not. What comes immediately to mind is Palomares, where United States nuclear bombs were "lost" in the Mediterranean.

249. Washington's ruling circles have gone so far as to install nuclear weapons in the immediate proximity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

250. Would it not be more reasonable for the United States representative, instead of lecturing others, to recommend to his Government that it stop this hazardous nuclear adventurism, which as we know is still the order of the day?

251. In 1962 the Soviet Union repelled the threat of direct United States aggression against Cuba. As we all remember, this action by the Soviet State was hailed throughout the world.

252. As to the adventurism about which the United States representative spoke, glaring instances of it are the infamous aggression against Cuba at Playa Girón supported by the United States in April 1961 and the quite recent aggression against the Dominican Republic.

253. Furthermore, the United States representative repeated for the nth time that the United States is willing to discuss the question of Viet-Nam in the Security Council, where this matter, for reasons of which everyone is fully aware, cannot and should not be considered. I take this opportunity to confirm once again the position expressed by my delegation both in the Security Council and elsewhere.

254. The United States representative is no doubt trying to convince us of the truth of his ingenuous tale in the hope that the discussion of the Viet-Nam question in the Security Council would be a sort of palliative affording a justification for the dangerous policy of the United States. Is there any need to say how deeply mistaken he is?

255. Can it matter whether the Viet-Nam question is discussed here or not? Can there be anyone who does not yet understand that the crux of the affair is Washington's unwillingness to stop the aggression against the Viet-Nameese people, its determination to go on escalating the war in Viet-Nam?

256. The United States representative referred to an appeal made by the Secretary-General, back in 1962; but would it not be better for those concerned in Washington to heed the Secretary-General's warning that the world is now on the threshold of a third world war, and is it not clear to everyone what the Secretary-General had in mind?

257. Does the United States representative not know that it is the criminal aggression of the United States in

Viet-Nam that is posing a direct threat to peace, and not only in South-East Asia?

258. Let me also say that in my earlier statement today I made another point, concerning Washington's hypocritical declarations about freedom of navigation. In that connexion I should like to draw attention to the fact that the Soviet vessel *Turkestan*, which was subjected to a piratical United States attack, was chartered to carry coal from the port of Campha to Japan. The United States representative sought to console us by saying that arrangements were being made in Washington for an investigation and that a reply would be given in the usual diplomatic way.

259. But can there be any doubt that a criminal attack was made on this Soviet merchant vessel by the United States Air Force? Can it possibly be denied that this United States act of provocation resulted in casualties? Are we to take it that the crime was not committed by the United States Air Force but by Martians or by sinister forces from some other planet? Or perhaps our United States colleague will tell us that special investigating commissions, including Congressional Commissions, have to be set up? But we all know something about investigation procedures and the voluminous reports they produce.

260. Members of the Security Council can have no illusions about the insincere preachings of Washington. The value of the hypocritical declarations by United States representatives about "peace", "justice" and "legality" has been known for a long time. We know what is happening in reality. While their spokesmen make long, tedious speeches inside and outside the United Nations, peaceful Viet-Nameese villages are mercilessly burnt down with United States napalm and untold numbers of bombs and artillery shells rain down day and night on the territory of the sovereign State of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. In the most monstrous fashion, the ravaging hordes make desperate attempts to crush the heroic people of Viet-Nam, who are waging a patriotic war. The United States interventionists are trying to drown the nation in blood. But no wild excesses of United States militarism, in the blind rage of aggression and adventurist frenzy, can arrest the inexorable movement of peoples which are proudly and unyieldingly defending their sacred rights to national and social freedom and to independent existence and development. There can be no doubt that their just cause will triumph, whatever the sacrifices exacted from them by the forces of international imperialism and aggression.

261. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): If we needed any proof that the Soviet Union's conception of helping to relieve tension in the present crisis is to engage in a cold-war exercise, we have just heard it. The United States conception is otherwise. We shall continue to exercise our influence in this situation to help keep the peace in the Near East.

262. The PRESIDENT: There are no more names on the list of speakers, but before adjourning the meeting, I wish to make a brief statement.

263. As the result of informal consultations among members of the Security Council, there appears to be a

general agreement to hold the next meeting on Monday, 5 June, at 3 p.m., on the understanding that members of the Council will hold themselves available for consultations also over the week-end and for an urgent meeting of the Council before Monday afternoon in case there are any new developments that may require the convening of the

Council. As I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 2.20 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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