

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

**1352<sup>nd</sup>** MEETING: 9 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY,

MAR 30 1971

UN/SA COLLECTION

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1352/Rev.1) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902); .....	} 1
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907); .....	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910) .....	

## NOTE

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

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

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

## THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 9 June 1967, at 12.30 p.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1352/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).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902);**

**Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907);**

**Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)**

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, Jordan, the Syrian Arab

Republic, Lebanon, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Tunisia and Libya to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: At one o'clock this morning I was informed by the Secretariat that the Secretary-General had just received the following cable from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic:

"In reply to your two telegrams of 6 and 7 June 1967, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic has decided to accept the two appeals for a cease-fire contained in the resolutions of the Security Council [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)], provided that the other party accepts the cease-fire."<sup>1</sup> [S/7958.]

3. At 5.30 this morning I received the following communication from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations:

"During the course of yesterday (8 June) afternoon and into the night (local time), sixteen Israel villages along the northern border from Ein Baruch in the north to Tel Qatsir in the south, were shelled by Syrian artillery. This shelling was resumed this morning when Syria again directed heavy artillery fire against these villages. Israel forces are presently engaged in the process of silencing the Syrian gun positions.

"I have brought this to your urgent attention in view of the fact that I was informed at 1 a.m. (New York time) this morning by the United Nations communication centre, acting upon instructions from Mr. Bunche, that the Foreign Minister of Syria had notified the Secretary-General of Syria's acceptance of the cease-fire. Heavy Syrian artillery fire continued to be directed against Israel villages for many hours after this message was received by the United Nations.

"I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated immediately as a Security Council document."

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

4. Then at 6 o'clock this morning I received a request from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. In accordance with the understanding upon which our meeting was adjourned yesterday afternoon, that members would remain available in the event of any emergency, I have therefore convened this meeting on short notice.

5. The Council will now continue its discussion of the three items inscribed on its agenda. I should like to remind members of the Council of the three draft resolutions presently pending before it: the Canadian draft resolution [S/7941], the USSR draft resolution [S/7951/Rev.1], and the United States draft resolution, which is now in the process of being reproduced in a newly revised text [S/7952/Rev.2].

6. Before giving the floor to the first speaker on my list, I would ask the Secretary-General to make a statement.

7. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: At thirty-six minutes past midnight New York time today, I received the message from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic which has just been read by you, Mr. President.

8. The Permanent Representative of Israel was informed of this message by telephone at five minutes past one o'clock this morning, New York time. The President of the Security Council was similarly informed, and the message was immediately relayed to the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, with instructions to inform the Israel authorities in Jerusalem.

9. At 7.14 a.m., New York time today, I was advised by the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission that he had received the following message from Syria:

"In spite of our observance of the cease-fire which was communicated to you at 4 a.m. this morning we are now being subjected to an Israel attack on the whole length of the armistice demarcation line and against our towns and villages which began this morning, and continues at this moment. Different arms are being employed, aircraft, tanks, artillery and infantry. We hold the Security Council and the international conscience responsible for this criminal aggression. We demand immediately the convocation of the Security Council, the immediate cessation of the aggression and the punishment of the aggressors. Please circulate this document to the members of the Security Council.

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

10. At 0900 hours GMT—that is, 5 a.m. New York time—the Chief of Staff of UNTSO received a message from the Israel authorities strongly advising against the intention of the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission to man observation posts on the Syrian side of the line as this would be a severe risk to the safety of the military observers, since there was severe shelling and shooting in the area.

11. General Bull was unable to contact the UNTSO Tiberias control centre and then contacted the Israel authorities, recalling to them that both sides had accepted a cease-fire and expressing his deep concern about the new developments.

12. At 7.45 a.m. New York time, I received reports from General Bull based on reports from the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission of artillery shelling and air bombing in the central demilitarized zone at between 0745 and 0755 hours GMT. Further bombardment and aerial activity were reported by the Tiberias control centre half an hour later. The Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission requested headquarters, UNTSO, to contact Israel authorities.

13. General Bull also reported at this time that he had been informed by the Israel authorities that there was heavy shelling going on in the north near Syria, including the town of Safad, and that in the early hours of the morning some sixteen villages and towns had come under heavy artillery fire.

14. At 8.21 a.m. New York time, I received through commercial channels the following message, similar to that transmitted by the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic:

"In spite of our acceptance of the two appeals in the resolutions of the Security Council for a cease-fire, which was communicated in our telegram of this morning and broadcast over Radio Damascus at the same time, Israel continues its aerial aggression over Syrian territory combined with a general attack by the Israel army and tanks. We have managed to stay calm so far. We ask immediate measures to prevent the war from breaking out afresh.

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

15. At 0930 hours New York time today, I received a message from the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission stating that the first confirmed bombing by Israel aircraft north and east of Lake Tiberias was at 0746 hours GMT on 9 June. The message went on to say that "Bombing, napalming and strafing have been continuous up to 1218 hours GMT. The bombing of the village of Sqoufiye now in progress. Heavy explosions also heard north of Lake Tiberias."

16. At 10.32 a.m. New York time today, I received the following message through the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission in Damascus from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic:

"Israel attack still going on inside our territory. All enemy air and ground arms assaulting our country. Israel lying. Did not for a moment respect Security Council resolutions. We request immediate convening of Security

Council and prompt compulsion for Israel to stop aggression immediately.

“Ibrahim MAKHOUS  
“Minister for Foreign Affairs  
“Syrian Arab Republic”

17. At 12.13 p.m. today—just about half an hour ago—I received the following report from General Bull:

“Following messages received from Chairman, Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission. Time of dispatch is indicated before text of each message:

“A. 1246 hours Z. ‘We confirm bombing in vicinity Damascus. Senior Syrian delegate has requested that Chief of Staff send a message to U Thant concerning current development.’

“B. 1248 hours Z. ‘Unobserved explosions and heavy artillery fire continues far north from Tiberias. Tiberias Control Centre confirms Israel jet aircraft in the area. Senior Syrian delegate alleged 200 Israel aircraft in the area. Considerable movement of troops and targets engaged as far east as Kuneitra.’

“C. 1401 hours Z. ‘Damascus having an air raid.’ ”

18. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker on my list is the representative of Syrian Arab Republic, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

19. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Mr. President, let me express my delegation's deepest appreciation to you and to the members of the Security Council for having favourably responded to the request which I communicated to you, upon instructions from my Government, for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. The situation is very grave indeed, and I shall be very brief.

20. My Government declared its acceptance of the cease-fire as stipulated in the Security Council resolutions of 6 and 7 June [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)]. That acceptance was officially cabled to the Secretary-General. Early this morning I personally checked with the competent authorities of the United Nations, and they confirmed that they actually received that acceptance today at 0036 hours New York time—that is, during the first hour of this morning.

21. The decision of the Syrian Government to accept the cease-fire was broadcast over Damascus Radio in an official *communiqué*, and all our forces strictly abided by it.

22. One hour later, the Israel military forces unleashed vast air and land operations, which are proceeding with increasing intensity at the present time, leaving no doubt that their aim is the total invasion of Syria. As I address the Council now, Israel military aircraft are indiscriminately bombarding military positions, towns, villages and civilians. Columns of heavy armour are destroying every trace of life and property in their advance inside Syrian territory. The ruthlessness of the aggressor is indescribable. My country and people are being subjected, while I speak here, to the most barbaric slaughter committed by the very forces whose representative only yesterday before this Council was advocating peace, co-operation, coexistence and what-not.

23. Two hours ago I received a copy of a cable addressed by my Government to the Secretary-General. I had intended to read the text out to the Security Council during this brief statement, but since the Secretary-General has already done so, I need not repeat it. It suffices to emphasize that the report of the Secretary-General, based on the reports of the Mixed Armistice Commission, confirms what I have stated so far.

24. I wish also to emphasize that as I proceeded here, I received the news that two air attacks by a large number of Israel planes had already taken place over my capital, Damascus. In fact, the first of them started at 1000 hours New York time, when the Security Council was scheduled to meet.

25. What is happening today is tragic confirmation of what we have been constantly saying to the Security Council: that Israel planned to invade Syria. My information as of 9.50 this morning was that this aggression was continuing with increasing intensity, and it is not decreasing in the least as I address you now.

26. The time has come for the Security Council to act promptly and decisively. I need not go further, for I wish to facilitate the Council's task in discharging its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. For the threat and the aggression are now present, grave and overwhelming.

27. No clearer case of aggression could exist than the one I am presenting to the Security Council. The Israel invasion of Syria, premeditated and well prepared, is a violation of the cease-fire and also of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter. This invasion is proceeding against a Member State, and I respectfully submit that the very existence of the United Nations will be in jeopardy as long as this aggression persists.

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

29. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): At 5.30 this morning I asked Mr. Chai<sup>2</sup> to transmit to you, Mr. President, a report which I had received that very hour from my Government in Jerusalem. I subsequently confirmed that report in writing and requested that my letter be circulated to the members of the Council. The text of that letter was read by you, Mr. President, to the members of the Council. Shortly after I had conveyed the information to Mr. Chai, I was contacted by a member of the Danish delegation, on behalf of the President, who confirmed the receipt of the information. He inquired whether I requested the President to take action. I replied that Israel had announced its acceptance of the cease-fire provided that the other Governments involved would do likewise.

30. The fact that Syria was continuing military operations was very disturbing, particularly because the Syrian attacks were directed against the civilian population of no less than

<sup>2</sup> Director of the Security Council and Political Committees Division, Department of Political and Security Council Affairs of the Secretariat.

sixteen villages along the whole length of the Israel-Syrian frontier. I expressed the hope that the President would take urgent steps to ensure that the Syrian Government and army would strictly abide by its acceptance of the cease-fire. I was given to understand that the President could not act on his own in this matter, but had to consult the Security Council.

31. At the same time as Syria announced its acceptance of a cease-fire, it opened an attack of unusual vehemence against Israel villages. It appears now that the Syrian announcement was nothing else than a camouflage for a premeditated and planned attack against Israel. The shelling, which was confirmed by the reports read by the Secretary-General, is still going on and has caused heavy damage to Israel villages. At this time I have only fragmentary reports on the events, and it must be assumed that the shelling has also caused a number of casualties.

32. Israel was the first to welcome the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council. For two long days the United Arab Republic withheld its reply. Syria informed the Secretary-General of its acceptance only in the early hours of this morning. Yet, at the same time, it increased its military action against Israel. Syria is proceeding on two different roads. At the United Nations it announces its acceptance of the cease-fire, and in the field it is stepping up its military aggression.

33. As in the past, Syria continues to carry out acts of aggression and violence while seeking shelter behind the United Nations. When the recent hostilities began, it was Syria which proclaimed all-out war against Israel. But long before that it had organized, planned and carried out a long series of hostile acts against Israel. It propagated false allegations of Israel troop concentrations along the Syrian border. All this was done to involve other States in a serious obsessive campaign against Israel. That aim it has achieved, with the well-known results. Although all its partners in this adventure have by now faced up to the reality, Syria, in spite of its professed acceptance of the cease-fire, is still blindly pursuing, without restraint, its aggressive military policy. All its radio broadcasts, emanating from Syrian stations, are still full of the usual bombast and threat.

34. This morning, at 2.30, Damascus Radio broadcast the following call: "Your hour of action has come. Strike, destroy, blast. Act now; do not hesitate". At 10.55 local time today, Damascus Radio announced that the war was continuing, that it would continue and that it would be long. Yesterday evening, at 7.45, Damascus Radio called on El-Assefa, the terrorist band organization to which the Syrian Deputy Foreign Minister referred a few days ago, to strike at Israel. There are more transcripts of broadcasts available, but this is an hour when we have to act swiftly and therefore I do not want to delay action by the Security Council.

35. I just want to add one piece of information. We have here a news item coming from Hans Benedict, Associated Press correspondent with Israel forces at the Syrian border. His dispatch says:

"The heavy artillery duel between Syrian and Israel batteries broke a shaky cease-fire Friday. Syrian mortars

opened fire on Israel hilltop positions on the Syrian border eighteen miles north of Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee. Israel artillery responded promptly."

36. I wish to reaffirm that my Government is prepared to observe a cease-fire on this front, as it is doing on the others, as soon as it is assured that the Syrian Government has issued the necessary orders to all its fighting forces for an immediate cease-fire, and that the Syrian firing has ceased. I have just spoken on the telephone with Jerusalem and have been told that Syria is still shelling villages and its artillery fire is directed at the villages of Haon, Tel Qatsir, Shamir, and Lahavot Habbashan.

37. May I ask you, Mr. President, to take the necessary steps to obtain assurances from the Syrian Government that it has given the necessary orders to implement the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council. My Government will act in strict compliance with its acceptance of the cease-fire resolutions.

38. The PRESIDENT: The Council has now heard the statements of the representatives of Syria and Israel. I have consulted all members of the Council, and it is my understanding that there is agreement that, before we proceed with our business, we ought, in the present situation, to adopt urgently a resolution demanding that hostilities cease forthwith.

39. Therefore, in my capacity as President of the Council, I have the honour to present a draft resolution [S/7960], the text of which reads as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June and 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967,*

*"Noting that the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire,*

*"Noting the statements made by the representatives of Syria and Israel,*

*"1. Confirms its previous resolutions about immediate cease-fire and cessation of military action;*

*"2. Demands that hostilities should cease forthwith;*

*"3. Requests the Secretary-General to make immediate contacts with the Governments of Israel and Syria to arrange immediate compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions, and to report to the Security Council not later than two hours from now."*

*A vote was taken by a show of hands.*

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>3</sup>*

40. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States voted for the draft resolution presented by

<sup>3</sup> See resolution 235 (1967).

the President of the Council because of the extreme urgency of the situation and because, ever since this grave conflict broke out, we have consistently favoured an immediate end to all fighting. Indeed, before the conflict broke out, we sought by every possible means to avert it. We were prepared to vote for such a cease-fire when we walked into the Council before 10 o'clock this morning. We only regret that over two hours were lost before the Council was able to come to this decision. This delay was no fault of yours, Mr. President. Throughout your handling of this grave affair, you have acted with extreme expedition and have made every effort to ensure that the Council would act urgently and energetically in the interest of stopping the fighting and bringing about more stable conditions in the area.

41. I would be less than candid if I did not also say that the delay was not due to the parties involved. Both parties involved were ready for us to proceed at 10 a.m. Now, what is the delay due to? It is, in my opinion, more than time to call a spade a spade. The delay is due to the fact that other members of the Council insist upon attempting to inject into our discussions matters which should be handled next. It is because some members of the Council do not adequately, in my view, understand the extreme urgency of bringing the fighting to an end and because they inject into our discussion matters, important matters, which should and will require the Council's consideration after we bring the fighting to an end.

42. It is only fair to recall that the same sort of unfortunate delay took place on Monday and Tuesday. If all of the members of the Council had been prepared, as we were, to demand a cease-fire the moment the fighting broke out, perhaps a great deal of bloodshed and many complications could have been avoided. Indeed, if all members of the Council had been prepared on 24 May to support the resolution [S/7905] that you, Mr. President, offered on behalf of your country, joined by the representative of Canada, perhaps no conflict would have taken place.

43. Now we have a grave conflict, and we must do everything within our power to bring the fighting to an end, to bring an end to the bloodshed and the hardship and the loss of life that have occurred in the area. We have joined other members of the Council, for the third time now, in saying that there must be a cease-fire. And there must be a cease-fire on the part of all in practice, and not only in words. The cease-fire must promptly be made fully effective and enduring in all sectors. That is our most urgent task. Every minute that the fighting continues in the present tense situation poses further dangers to peace. Further delay in the full implementation of the cease-fire resolutions of this Council is not acceptable—not acceptable, I think, to any member of the Council. All hostilities must stop promptly and the cease-fire must be scrupulously and continuously observed by all parties. Also, it must be accepted by the combatant States that have not yet done so.

44. My delegation is pleased that, to bring about this result and to ensure that the cease-fire, once achieved, is strictly adhered to, the Council has now acted to request the Secretary-General to make energetic efforts to implement

its decisions. Part of our problem here has been the fact that some members of this Council have not been willing to authorize the appropriate officials of the United Nations to take action in implementation of the Council's resolutions. It is not a high mark in the history of this Organization that a simple draft resolution offered a few days ago by the representative of Canada [S/7941] was not promptly acted upon but was thought to be something that required study and consideration. What kind of study, what kind of consideration, when what was called for was all the energies and resources of this Organization in the interest of bringing the fighting to an end so that the Council could then proceed to deal with the underlying causes of the conflict, to pacify the situation and to help bring about a durable peace.

45. Now we are finally using the Secretary-General. We should have done so before. We should have followed the suggestion made by the representative of Canada and utilized the resources of this Organization for the purpose of restoring peace to the area.

46. We are not doing credit to the United Nations by the manner in which we have been proceeding. I say this with the greatest regret, because I have great faith in this Organization. This Organization is no stronger than the will of its Members, and it has no magic wand unless its Members are prepared to give it the magic wand that will enable it to perform its duties.

47. If we go back, as we shall have to go back at the appropriate time, and consider what happened in this situation, we shall see that it has been a lack of ability to concert our actions here once conflict has broken out, to stop the fighting so that there can then be a sorting-out of the problems that develop whenever fighting takes place. This has been consistently our problem, and this morning we were once more witnesses to the difficulty of doing the minimum that is required for the purpose of containing a very dangerous situation.

48. Because of our delay, people have lost their lives. That is something for which we have to assume the responsibility before the conscience of the world.

49. I believe that this type of manoeuvring ought to stop in this Council. I say this very plainly and very categorically. My Government is willing to concert its actions with every member of the Council so that we can bring the fighting to an end, so that we can start consideration of all that we need to consider, so that we can make a major contribution towards the restoration of peace in the area. We are ready at any time to do this, we are ready under any circumstances. We feel very strongly that when we delay and when we engage in elaborate and unnecessary negotiations, quibbling about words, quibbling about ideas that are not relevant to the particular problem at hand, which is to stop the fighting, we do not do a service to the cause of peace.

50. We have now acted. Had we acted before, we could have had by now the report of the Secretary-General that would have enabled us to see what has happened, and hopefully his intervention would have brought about full implementation of the cease-fire resolution.

51. I hope and trust that as we proceed in the handling of this grave affair we shall all be conscious of our responsibilities to humanity, and that we shall proceed in such fashion that this Council can act with expedition, in the spirit of the Charter and with all its great force, to bring an end to the fighting. Once this is achieved, I pledge, on behalf of my Government, that we will do everything in our power to act together with members of the Council in dealing with all the other problems that will remain before us. It was in that spirit that we offered our draft resolution yesterday [S/7952/Rev.1]. But we must take care of first things first, and the very first thing, as is apparent from the conflicting reports we have received this morning, is that the fighting should stop—and stop now.

52. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council, convened at the request of Syria, has just taken, as an extraordinary, urgent and provisional measure, a decision concerning the continuing aggression of Israel, in this case against the Syrian Arab Republic. The decision is a further condemnation of Israel's aggression, which continues in defiance of the Security Council's already adopted decisions.

53. It is clear from the Secretary-General's communication, which we have just heard in the Council, that Israel's armed forces are carrying out extensive military operations against Syria, in which large numbers of aircraft are taking part. Damascus, the capital of Syria, has also been bombed.

54. Thus, the ruling circles of Tel-Aviv are continuing their provocationist and adventurist activities in pursuit of carefully laid plans for expansion at the expense of the Arab countries.

55. As in the past, efforts have continued to shield the aggressor, to put the aggressor and the victim of aggression on the same footing. The United States representative in his statement tried to justify and defend Israel, despite the irrefutable fact that it is precisely the Israel interventionists who have invaded Syrian territory. Such attempts by professional lawyers must be categorically rejected as fraudulent and completely devoid of substance.

56. We note that Washington continues to give the forces of Israel aggression every assistance in their criminal attempt to seize Arab lands by armed force.

57. Yesterday, as we all know, the Soviet Union delegation, on the instructions of its Government, requested an urgent discussion in the Security Council of the question of the cessation of Israel's military activities and the withdrawal of its troops from the territories of the United Arab Republic and Jordan, which had been seized as a result of aggression.

58. The Soviet Union delegation, as members of the Security Council will of course recall, presented a draft resolution on the subject [S/7951/Rev.1], to which we would again draw the Security Council's attention.

59. The events of the last few hours show beyond question how timely, important and urgent the initiative

taken by the Soviet Union was. Israel, the aggressor, has not stopped its intensive military operations; it continues cynically to flout the decisions of the Security Council and is acting in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter.

60. As can be seen from the document on the subject [S/7958] which is available to the members of the Security Council, and as has been repeated today, the Syrian Government has accepted the Security Council's decision concerning a cease-fire and the cessation of military operations. Earlier, the Governments of Jordan and the United Arab Republic had agreed to conform to the decisions of the Security Council. But what course has Tel-Aviv followed? The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Tomeh, has just informed the members of the Council that at this very hour, at this very minute, while the Security Council is meeting, the Israel forces are continuing their invasion of the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic. The aggressor is becoming constantly bolder, and now—as, indeed, before—no further proof is needed that Tel-Aviv's expansionist schemes know no limits.

61. Having seized a part of the territory of Jordan and the United Arab Republic, the aggressor, taking advantage of the fact that those two countries are complying with the decision of the Security Council, has decided to strike a blow at Syria, which has also accepted the Security Council's decision concerning a cease-fire. But the forces of aggression do not even bother to seek a pretext. They take their weapons of argument from the same garbage heap of history, from the arsenal of the most shameless criminals. They are following in the bloody footsteps of the Hitlerite executioners, who, in the same way, always charged their victims with aggression. But the facts are inescapable; it is the troops of Israel which are now developing their attack on Syrian territory.

62. In our statement to the Security Council we drew the attention of the members to the fact that the Israel representative, in his wordy statement, avoided answering the most important and urgent question, which all peoples in the world must inevitably be asking themselves, namely, when will the Israel Government cease its aggression against the Arab peoples? When will Israel withdraw its troops from the territories it has seized by its criminal attack on the territories of Jordan and the United Arab Republic and, now, of Syria?

63. We have had no answer to this question. Instead, we have been told that Israel, despite the unanimous decisions of the Security Council, continued to extend its aggressive action to the territory of another Arab country, Syria, which has long been the object of constant provocation by the extremist circles of Tel-Aviv.

64. Yesterday, my delegation drew attention to the fact [1351st meeting] that in Tel-Aviv demands and claims amounting to ultimatums are being put forward, and that statements are being made to the effect that Israel will keep part of the territory of the Arab countries seized as a result of aggression. None other than General Moshe Dayan, as was stated at yesterday's meeting of the Council, has bluntly said that Israel's forces will not withdraw from the part of Jerusalem which they have seized. The insatiable



appetite of the aggressors seems to be increasing in this bloodthirsty adventure; but, as is well known, not even an earthworm can swallow the whole earth.

65. It is clear that the forces of expansionism enjoy not only the blessing but the support of Washington, in particular. We are constantly receiving new reports to the effect that Israel intends to put forward political and territorial claims, taking advantage of the aggression it has committed. As we know, the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Eshkol, declared last night that the situation resulting from the conflict "has created a new political reality in the Near East."

66. Tel-Aviv has already abandoned its hypocritical references to principles, the United Nations Charter and international law. It does not need these any more. Its policy and its claims are now based on the "new reality" to which Mr. Eshkol referred. We also have information that Israel is also taking practical measures, by expelling the Palestinians from Jerusalem.

67. We have just seen the representative of the United States hasten to make a speech which, as always, abounded with professions of "love of peace", a desire to see the conflict "settled" and efforts to create the impression that it is Washington, more than anyone else, that wants to see peace restored in the Near East. It is highly significant, however, that the United States representative found not one word to say in condemnation of those who unleashed the criminal aggression in that part of the world and who are now ignoring the decisions of the Security Council concerning an immediate cessation of military action.

68. We ask, is this an accident? Is it an accident that the United States, instead of using its influence over Israel to put an end to that country's aggression, to ensure that its criminal actions cease in fact and not just in words, does not deem it possible to support here in the Security Council the just and legitimate demand that the aggressor should be condemned and that the forces of the aggressor should be immediately and unconditionally withdrawn from the territory seized from the neighbouring Arab States?

69. Is this not sufficient ground for considering that Washington's policy is merely to encourage its ally, Israel, to commit further acts of conquest?

70. It is also noteworthy that the United States representative has seen fit even now, while the bombings are still going on without interruption, to urge that this is not the time to deal with such matters as condemnation of the aggressor and the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist forces from the territories they have seized.

71. In his statement, he developed the thesis that we should now speak only of the cease-fire. But has the Security Council not taken a number of decisions calling for the immediate and unconditional cessation of firing and of all military operations? Why then is it that Washington, which has sufficient means at its disposal, has not lifted a finger to stop the unleashed forces of Israel aggression? Whom is the United States representative trying to hypnotize—the Security Council, perchance?

72. Is it not significant that the United States representative continues to speak in the Security Council of anything and everything except the fact that Israel has committed aggression and that Israel has seized Arab lands by force in violation of all the principles and standards of international law and of the provisions of the United Nations Charter?

73. Some speakers have shown a great desire to obscure matters and to create a smoke-screen, by trying to give the impression that the true circumstances of the aggression are not clear, that the situation has to be studied, investigated, clarified.

74. The circumstances are crystal-clear, and the attempts of the United States representative to divert the Security Council from the main problem must be unmasked here. The Security Council cannot remain inactive. Israel's aggression must be severely condemned, and we have no doubt that the aggressor will be punished.

75. My delegation insists that the Security Council should firmly demand that Israel cease its aggressive activities, in conformity with the decisions which the Security Council has already adopted. Israel must not only cease military operations against Syria and other Arab countries but must also immediately and unconditionally withdraw its troops from their territories.

76. In this Council chamber and outside it, many demagogic statements have been made, including those by the representatives of Israel and some of its allies. But we want a direct and unequivocal answer from them to our question: by what right is Israel not only not withdrawing its troops from the territories which it has seized from the United Arab Republic and Jordan but is even seizing new territory in Syria?

77. We ask the question: at what moment will Israel begin to withdraw its troops from the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, which have accepted the decision of the Security Council concerning the cease-fire and the cessation of military operations? Or has Israel decided all by itself to create new principles whereby, *inter alia*, it would resuscitate in international law the principle that foreign territory can be seized by armed force? We are waiting here now for an answer to this question, and we hope that you, Mr. President, will co-operate with the Council in this connexion.

78. In conclusion, my delegation considers it its duty to draw attention to the question which, by instruction of the Soviet Government, it has brought before the Security Council. The forces of aggression cannot be allowed to remain in the territories they have occupied. This matter will brook no delay, and my delegation wishes to express its conviction that the Security Council will perform its duty in conformity with the United Nations Charter.

79. The PRESIDENT: I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union that the President is willing to co-operate to reach any decision which it is the general wish of members of the Council to adopt.

80. Mr. COX (Canada): Canada welcomes the resolution which has just been adopted unanimously. Once a cease-fire call is made by this Council and accepted in official declarations by the parties concerned, that cease-fire must be fully and immediately respected. This is the first step that must be taken and, of course, other steps must follow.

81. An important part of this resolution is operative paragraph 3, because it is, in our view, essential that responsibility for steps to bring about immediate compliance with the Council's resolution be clearly established. We hope that subsequent resolutions which we may consider will, as appropriate, contain a clear provision or provisions for concrete practical action implementation of the Council's decisions.

82. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Before I turn to the most dangerous situation in the Middle East may I, with your permission, Mr. President, say a few words about the further killing by Israelis of Indian soldiers serving with the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF). The Secretary-General has informed the Council that another Indian soldier has been killed and seven others wounded. In addition, it is reported that twelve Indian soldiers are missing, bringing the total casualties to forty-one: nine killed, twenty wounded and twelve missing.

83. There can be no doubt that the strafing and shelling by Israelis of Indian soldiers serving with UNEF was unprovoked and deliberate. What other conclusion can we draw from the series of cowardly attacks on the defenceless Indian contingent except that they have a purpose known only to the attacker? The least that this Council can do is vigorously to support the Secretary-General's protest to the Government of Israel and censure Israel for these dastardly attacks on Indian soldiers serving the cause of peace.

84. I take this opportunity to offer my most sincere condolences to the Government of Ireland for the loss which it has sustained in the death of a valiant and dedicated member of its armed forces who was also serving the cause of peace in the area. Our condolences also go to the Government and the people of the United States, in connexion with the ship which yesterday was the target of an Israel attack, resulting in heavy casualties. We share the grief of the United States. While the Government of Israel has promptly apologized to the United States, my delegation still awaits a sincere and clear apology to the Government and the people of India.

85. Only a few days ago we had fervently hoped that peace in West Asia would be preserved. We raised our voice in support of the Secretary-General's efforts to gain a breathing spell during which the Council could work for a *détente* and seek ways and means of consolidating peace in West Asia. Instead of getting a breather, peace has been choked. Our hopes were rudely smashed by Israel's move to start massive military action in the air and on the land, action which is war, stark and naked. The Council has deplored this in all but a formal statement, and it is clear that the responsibility for the grave situation presently prevailing in the Middle East is that of Israel. The Council finds itself confronted with yet another *fait accompli* on the heights of Galilee, through a sudden and surprise attack

by Israel, even though the Foreign Minister of Israel twice in as many days declared before this Council his Government's acceptance of the cease-fire, and even though Syria ceased fire last night.

86. My delegation has closely and carefully followed the events of the last three weeks and has actively participated in informal consultations with members of the Council. Attempts were made by some members to pass a resolution supporting one party's claims of the passage of ships through the territorial waters of another State. The endeavour of my delegation, as of several others, was to work for a resolution that would have provided for a breather and which would have enabled a *modus vivendi* within the framework of the United Arab Republic's sovereignty.

87. We regret that a largely juridical dispute on shipping rights was allowed to spark off a tragic conflagration. Attempts were made here—and all of us know that those attempts continued right up to the day of the outbreak of hostilities—to pass a resolution in the Council that was meant mainly to support Israel's claims for passage of its ships through the Gulf of Aqaba. The main purpose of such a resolution was to deny, albeit in oblique terms, the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic over its territorial waters.

88. Some of us tried hard to bring a modicum of reality and fair play into the discussions, but our efforts were blocked by those who, for their own reasons of policy, were bent upon asserting claims which their most ardent supporters cannot claim to be sanctioned by international law, but only occasionally conceded in international practice. In a word, their effort was to acknowledge the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic, but to deny to it its exercise.

89. There are many disputes among nations. There are also disputes between Israel and its Arab neighbours which have existed for many years. It should not be impossible to settle them, given time. The point, however, is not the existence of disputes, but how they are settled—through the use of arms or through the means of peaceful negotiations. But today we witness a different situation. Unleashing offensive armed action, indeed a *blitzkrieg*, Israel has occupied vast territories in the United Arab Republic, Jordan, and now within Syria too. Can anyone in this Council claim that this action is in accordance with the principles of the Charter, of international law and practice, or even of international morality? The central issue before us today is this: can a country first invade and occupy the territory of other countries and then demand a new settlement on its own terms?

90. It is over sixty hours since we adopted resolution 233 (1967) asking for an immediate cease-fire in the Middle East. It is nearly forty hours since the second resolution, resolution 234 (1967), was passed by the Council and the time-limit imposed by the Council has expired. It is almost eighteen hours ago that we heard the Secretary-General make the welcome announcement that the Government of the United Arab Republic had accepted the cease-fire. Last night, Syria made a similar announcement. This morning

news has come of the massive invasion of Syria by Israel. As I have already mentioned, their objective obviously was the heights overlooking the Sea of Galilee and taking over the supporting terrain.

91. Why is it that despite assurances that the aggressor will stop his predatory moves and cease further action, the cease-fire has not become fully effective in the Middle East? Is it not perhaps because the original resolution adopted at 8 p.m. on Tuesday was unrealistic? There were delegations here which had said in the Chamber that a simple resolution calling for cease-fire could have been adopted on Monday morning and that the Council had been involved in an unnecessary waste of time—nearly thirty-six hours—before such a resolution was passed. There is an attempt to put the blame on those, including India, who would have preferred, and who indeed worked very hard for ensuring, that any resolution passed by the Council should contain a provision for withdrawal to positions prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

92. My delegation categorically refutes those insinuations. Indeed, the fact that the cease-fire has not so far become effective is due to the attempts, successful attempts, of those who wanted a favourable solution of the question of the Gulf of Aqaba through a resolution whose primary purpose was to bring the conflict to an end; I mean, of course, a solution favourable to themselves.

93. The course of events in the last three days, the statements made by the leaders of Israel, for which, it is evident, there is not only a great deal of sympathy but even overt support outside, amply prove that the aggressive action taken by Israel was motivated by a desire to occupy positions on the field which would enable it to impose a new *status quo* more favourable to its claims. Is that a fair and proper way of dealing with the urgent problem we face of stopping the war and restoring peace in the area? Would it not have been appropriate first to take steps to end the war and provide for the withdrawal of forces of both sides behind the armistice demarcation lines, and then discuss the other problems relating to the so-called underlying causes? This is a course of action my delegation has continued to urge consistently, both in the Council Chamber and in informal consultations.

94. The responsibility for the grave situation now prevailing in the Middle East must be placed squarely on Israel. The Prime Minister of India, speaking in the Indian Parliament on 6 June 1967, said:

“I do not wish to utter harsh words or strong language. But on the basis of information available there can be no doubt that Israel has escalated the situation into an armed conflict which has now acquired the proportions of a full-scale war.”

95. The nature of the war unleashed on the morning of 5 June, especially the air strikes made by Israel, confirm, if confirmation is necessary, that Israel's design was to launch a surprise attack and face this Council with a *fait accompli*.

96. Early in the morning of 5 June, when all of us were summoned here to deal with the situation created by the

outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East and when, according to the most eminent practice of the Council itself, the issue had to be one of simultaneous cease-fire and withdrawal, the Council found itself faced with a most obstinate refusal on the part of those very members to deal with the question of withdrawal. India, among others, would have preferred—and events have vindicated our stand since—to follow the established practice of the Security Council and ask for a cease-fire and withdrawal to positions occupied by the respective forces at the outbreak of hostilities, that is to positions held on 4 June 1967. That is the issue on which the informal consultations among the members of the Security Council came to be deadlocked for quite some time.

97. There was a piece of paper which some people called the Indian draft. That in fact enjoyed the support of many members of this Council. It contained a provision for a simultaneous withdrawal. Other members of the Council, however, felt, indeed insisted, that the Council must do no more than ask for a simple cease-fire. We were told that a provision for withdrawal in a cease-fire resolution would complicate matters and prevent the cease-fire from being implemented. We argued that in our judgement a call for cease-fire, without there being a simultaneous provision for withdrawal of armed forces, would make the acceptance of a cease-fire much more difficult, if not impracticable. Our judgement was based not only on the realities of the situation, but on the well-known and time-honoured principle that the aggressor must not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of aggression. The spectacle we are all watching now—and some of us had even expected that this would or might happen—is one of the aggressor quickly occupying positions of military vantage and then offering to negotiate with and talk to his victims.

98. You, Mr. President, and all my colleagues in the Council here, have read enough history to know what to expect next. The aggressor, having occupied all its military vantage positions, all its objectives—Sharm El Sheikh, Gaza, Jerusalem, the western bank of the Jordan River, and now the heights of Galilee—will, after a show of reasonableness in negotiations, offer to split these gains half and half, perhaps.

99. Indeed, there would be little meaning in Article 51 of the Charter if all the Council were expected to do in such circumstances was merely to ensure a cessation of hostilities even while the aggressor sat astride the territory of the victim of aggression. That really would be an acquiescence by the Council, and more particularly by the great Powers, in the continuance of aggression by allowing the aggressor to continue to enjoy the fruits of aggression.

100. What is happening today is that the Arab States, having received setbacks due to the surprise attacks and having lost territory to the Israelis, will naturally have to insist that there be the full backing of the Council to withdraw to positions occupied by various armed forces on 4 June 1967. No purpose would be served by putting the blame on those who have resisted and are resisting aggression despite the call for a cease-fire by the Council. The Council should ponder on whether the prescription which it has given is an adequate one.

101. On questions of war and peace India's attitude has been clear and is unwavering. Only recently I reiterated it in meetings of the Council. For this reason we have supported and will continue to support resolutions calling for a cease-fire; the flames of war must be put out. It is with this objective that we have supported resolution 235 (1967) that the Council has just adopted. However, it seems to us that even at this stage the Council should deal with the problem in a practical manner, that is, link the cease-fire with withdrawal to positions occupied by the respective armed forces prior to the outbreak of hostilities. Such an approach, we are confident, will lead to the desired result: the restoration of peace.

102. If I may briefly indicate the views of my delegation: First, the Council should reinforce its call for cease-fire and immediately order withdrawal of all armed forces to positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities. Second, it would be necessary to reactivate and strengthen the United Nations machinery in the area to enforce the cease-fire and secure withdrawal on the lines proposed by the Secretary-General in his report of 26 May [S/7906]. Third, the Council should consider whether the Secretary-General should not be requested to depute a personal representative to the area to help in reducing tension and restoring peaceful conditions. The special representative should also ensure the safety and security of the civilian Arab population in the areas overrun by Israel. Fourth, when withdrawals have been completed and the aggression has been vacated the Council should consider earnestly the steps to be taken to stabilize peace in the area. Solutions to be worked out would have to be within the framework of the sovereignty of the States concerned and the just and immemorial rights of the Arab people.

103. It is in the light of the views and the considerations I have just stated that my delegation will take its position on the three draft resolutions which are still before the Council.

104. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation was gratified by the mutual acceptance by the Governments of Israel, Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Syria of the Council's demand for a cease-fire contained in its resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967). Unhappily, despite this acceptance and the time that has since elapsed, events show that the Council's demand has not been complied with along the Israel-Syrian frontier.

105. My delegation voted for resolution 235 (1967) because of its concern, as the hours have slipped by, over the continuance of the hostilities between Israel and Syria and the resulting loss of life and property. We trust that the fighting will soon stop and that we shall be able to turn to the consideration of other equally urgent steps which will help us to create the atmosphere of calm and tranquillity necessary for the discussion of lasting solutions. We place all our faith in the good offices of the Secretary-General in bringing about arrangements for immediate compliance with the cease-fire on the part of Israel and Syria, as repeatedly requested by this Council.

106. Before concluding, my delegation would like once again to offer its condolences to the representative of India

for the casualties among the Indian contingents in UNEF. We wish also to extend our condolences to the delegations of the United States and of Ireland in connexion with the lamentable events which have occurred. My delegation firmly hopes, moreover, that these events will not be repeated.

107. Mr. de CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil): Since the adoption by the Security Council of the two resolutions demanding an immediate cease-fire in the Middle East, we have been informed by the Governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic of their respective acceptance of the cease-fire, provided that the other party also accepts the cease-fire. That is encouraging news, which my delegation whole-heartedly welcomes as being full of promise for the ultimate establishment of peace in the area. We have at the same time, however, been informed that, unfortunately, hostilities are still continuing between Syrian and Israel forces, in spite of their readiness to comply with the Council's requests.

108. It is clearly our responsibility to press for the urgent and effective implementation of the cease-fire by the Syrian and Israel Governments, taking advantage of the concrete opportunity opened to us by their expressions of consent to stop fighting. To bring military operations forthwith to a halt must indeed be our primary concern at this stage, lest the continuation of the hostilities bring to naught both the efforts of the Council and the disposition of the parties to abide by our recommendations.

109. It was in that spirit and with that purpose in mind that the delegation of Brazil voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted by the Council.

110. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, the Chairman of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria voted in favour of the resolution [S/7960] introduced by you, which confirms the previous Security Council resolutions about the cease-fire and demands the immediate cessation of Israel's hostilities against Syria.

111. My delegation would have preferred the Security Council to condemn the aggressor, who has again flagrantly violated the Council's resolutions as well as the elementary rules and morality of international law, and to call on Israel to cease all military action immediately, in accordance with previous Security Council resolutions. Nevertheless, as we are a small country in close proximity to the Middle East, the vote which we cast in support of the Security Council's action was intended to meet the more urgent needs of the situation.

112. In the absence, however, of an explicit condemnation of those who are the aggressors and who have launched military action and attacks against the Arab countries, I do not believe that we are giving a good example because in the very calm atmosphere which appears to prevail in the Security Council we consider that both sides are guilty whereas there is one aggressor. There have been some speakers here who could certainly congratulate themselves on being neutral as between the aggressor and the victim. My country and my delegation do not believe that we can

be neutral in the face of aggression. We are in favour of condemning aggression from whatever source, particularly when the aggressor is one who began his activities a long time ago and is continuing them with impunity—possibly because of friendships which he enjoys in certain countries and in certain imperialist circles.

113. The complaint by the Syrian representative which was brought to the attention of the Security Council this morning, is an alarming development in the present situation. After the two Security Council resolutions of 6 and 7 June [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)], after the solemn statements in this Council by the Foreign Minister of Israel and after the Syrian Government had accepted the cease-fire, we have learned, with indignation, that Israel troops have taken advantage of the cease-fire which Israel had accepted—stressing that it did so with great relief—to continue their military attacks against Syria and invade that country.

114. This is a blatant violation of all the tenets of morality and shows an arrogant contempt for the Security Council and its resolutions. The Security Council's appeal was clear; its request was categorical and without reservations or conditions.

115. It now appears that although the Government of Israel accepted the cease-fire, it is continuing its aggression; it is taking advantage of the acceptance of the cease-fire by the Arab countries to continue its advance and pursue its aggression. Thus, despite all its statements concerning the cease-fire, Israel's aggression and invasion is continuing. This attitude of the Government of Israel cannot be passed over in silence. The Security Council cannot henceforth refrain from condemning this aggression or remain indifferent to it.

116. In its statement yesterday [1351st meeting], my delegation recalled that the Government of Israel had shown a similar contempt for Security Council and General Assembly resolution in the past. Israel has not complied with the resolutions calling for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of the troops that have penetrated the territory of the Arab countries which also in 1956 were the victims of aggression.

117. This morning, we learned from the Secretary-General's report—not from press dispatches, as the representative of Israel tried by quoting from unknown sources to make us believe, but from the Secretary-General himself and his representatives on the spot—that Israel had launched a concerted attack against the Syrian positions. While I do not wish to quote all the information which the Secretary-General gave us, at the very moment when he was making his report, or shortly before, 200—and perhaps more—Israel aircraft, as well as troops and mortars, had gone into action to destroy villages, towns like Damascus and entire groups of people in Syria. What are we to take this to mean?

118. I do not wish to dwell on what the Syrian representative has reported to us, but the representative of Israel has told us—and this is interesting—that Israel was responding to attacks made against certain Israel villages. Thus far,

we have heard nothing of all this from the Mixed Armistice Commission; we have heard nothing from the observers on the spot. We have merely heard about it from the Israel representative. Yet, a concerted attack has been launched against this country. How can the victim of aggression be expected not to resist such attacks? How can it hold its fire when fired upon? How can the victim of aggression stop defending itself? Such a thing is impossible.

119. At the same time, we are truly astonished to note that the pretext of attacks allegedly made by certain parties, who are actually the victims of aggression, should have been advanced. Such pretexts have been used and abused in the past, and usually the action taken against the country in question is military action. This stratagem was invented a long time ago. It was used to launch the Second World War, which caused innumerable victims, a war in which millions of men and women perished. Yet, this practice, used by the Nazis to launch the Second World War, is now being employed as part of the design in the Middle East. It appears that some people, or at least their leaders, who were truly—and this must be emphasized—the victims of Nazism, are beginning to learn or are trying to learn the methods of Nazism. This development is certainly by no means consoling.

120. The representative of the Soviet Union has already reminded us of that, and since we are on the subject, I would like to dwell on another aspect of it. All information media are already reporting that the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Eshkol, appears to believe that the new *de facto* situation which has been created in the Middle East must serve as a basis for the settlement of affairs and for the settlement of the situations that will subsequently arise. What does this mean? It has nothing in common with the United Nations Charter, the rights of peoples or historical precedent but is an attempt to remould history on the basis of *de facto* situations brought about by acts of aggression.

121. Is this not that same *Realpolitik* to which one representative referred not so long ago in the General Assembly? Is it not the very stratagem used at the time of the Second World War by those who wanted to conquer the world? My delegation and my country are truly astounded by such designs on the part of a country wishing to profit from the present sufferings of more than 100 million Arabs.

122. As an example of the intention, to which I have just referred, of bringing about new *de facto* situations, I need only refer to what is happening now in the Middle East, and more particularly in Israel. On page 18 of today's edition of *The New York Times* we read:

“The first thing on everyone's mind at the moment is the future of Jerusalem, and the Israelis, in their present or any foreseeable mood, are not willing to bargain or compromise on the Holy City”.<sup>4</sup>

Further on we read that Mr. Dayan, the Minister of Defence, has said:

“We have returned to the holiest of our holy places, never to depart from it again.”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

That is a first example by way of illustration.

123. Another example, if we are to believe the reports we have received, is the statement that the Gaza Strip is never again to be evacuated. We are hearing it said: "We have no intention of repeating the errors of the past and leaving the Gaza Strip now that we have conquered it".

124. Then again, as I have previously said and as the representative of India has just said again in much greater detail, an attempt is being made to establish rights, and here too it is appropriate to speak of *Realpolitik*. What has happened at Jerusalem, where, as the representative of the Soviet Union pointed out, many Arabs have already been expelled, seems also to be in store for Jordan. Steps are apparently being taken to expel part of the population of that country in order to create new *de facto* situations there and also because the intention, indeed the design, is to destroy the State of Jordan.

125. Such, then, is the *de facto* situation which they would have us accept and which certain delegations would like the Council to recognize by means of the draft resolutions which they submit referring to consultations for the withdrawal of troops. I am thinking here more specifically of the United States proposal under which conversations would be held in the light of the results of the military aggression.

126. The representative of the United States, in the statement which we have just heard, referred not only to the Indian delegation but to our own as well, for we have opposed the adoption of certain resolutions at decisive moments so that there would not be any *fait accompli*, whether with regard to the problem at present before the Council or to other questions concerning the United Nations in general. Mr. Goldberg said that if it had not been for the opposition of certain delegations, we would have had a cease-fire a long time ago. That is true; we would have had a cease-fire by now. However, certain parties apparently wanted to obtain the fruits of aggression even before the aggression was committed, and it was that intention which emerged in the draft resolution. By way of a rebuttal, we shall perhaps be told: "Yes, but after the aggression you find you have exactly the same result". That may be so, but in that case why did the countries which knew the aggression was to take place do nothing to prevent it? Why did those who are friends of the aggressor, and must therefore have known something, take no action?

127. To talk merely of a cease-fire—as certain delegations, and especially that of the United States, would wish—is not sufficient. It has been possible for the cease-fire to be accepted, but the aggressor has not held his fire. The aggressor is trying to continue the hostilities under the cloak of hollow declarations about a cease-fire. In these circumstances it is not easy for the cease-fire to become effective. What is needed, as the Indian representative has said, is not only a cease-fire but also measures to ensure the withdrawal of the aggressor's forces and the restoration of the conditions indispensable for establishing a lasting peace in the Middle East.

128. My delegation does not accept certain proposals submitted here which were purportedly based on a desire to help create an atmosphere favourable to a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities. Thus, one draft resolution submitted to us would have given the President of the Council and the Secretary-General certain rights to take immediate action. We are opposed to this type of proposal because, like certain other representatives, and among them the representative of the United States, who have said that they want our Organization to be able to carry on its work, we too want the same thing. We too are very solicitous for our Organization, and we too set great store by it. This explains why we could have doubts about certain ideas for improvised action which have been developed here and which, in our opinion, would threaten not only the efficacy of the United Nations but even, in the long-term, its existence. We do not want our Organization to be used as a tool by those who would like to bring about a *fait accompli* by means of improvised action. We do not intend to let our Organization be used as an instrument to facilitate the future actions of certain imperialist circles. On the contrary, my delegation would like the United Nations to act according to the principles and provisions of the Charter. That is why we oppose the improvisation which I mentioned a moment ago and which would endanger the United Nations. We therefore wanted to have a little time because what was needed was not to introduce changes in our Organization but to adopt a genuinely satisfactory resolution.

129. We believe that, as long as the aggressor has not been condemned for his aggression, as long as the troops which have penetrated into foreign territory have not been withdrawn and as long as the Security Council has not taken steps to reinstate all the organs of the United Nations which, as the Secretary-General pointed out and as the representative of India has just said, must facilitate the implementation of all the provisions of the armistice—in a word, as long as conditions allowing peace to prevail in the Middle East have not been created—we shall not achieve that peace, the life of our international Organization will be threatened, and the world will continue to be troubled.

130. We accordingly urge the Security Council not to lose sight of these various factors in considering the proposals to be submitted to it.

131. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of the United States, but he has yielded to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to make an important statement. I now invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

132. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Thank you, Mr. President, and I wish also to express my thanks to the representative who was courteous enough to allow me to take the floor to make this very brief statement.

133. As soon as the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution S/7960, I called my Foreign Minister in Damascus and talked with him over the telephone; that was at 2.15 p.m. He instructed me to inform the Security Council of the acceptance by our Government of this resolution adopted today. The Foreign Minister of the

Syrian Arab Republic also gave me the following information, and asked me to place it before the Security Council.

134. First, the attack by Israel forces is increasing in intensity and gravity by the minute. Secondly, Israel paratroopers have been dropped over Kuneitra, which is 30 kilometres inside Syrian territory beyond the armistice demarcation line. Kuneitra, which was mentioned in the cables read to the Security Council by the Secretary-General, is 65 kilometres from Damascus. Thirdly, besides the paratroopers that have been dropped over Kuneitra, Israel armed columns in large numbers are on their way to Kuneitra. Fourthly, the Israel air force is still continuing air raids and bombing our capital, Damascus. The number of civilian victims is increasing, as this attack increases.

135. Immediately after I spoke to my Foreign Minister, which was at 2.15 p.m., I called the office of the Secretary-General and informed him officially, on behalf of my Government, of our acceptance of the Security Council resolution.

136. The timing here is quite important. This resolution was voted upon at 1.5 p.m. Both I and the Israel representative were immediately called by the Secretary-General and requested to convey to our respective Governments the text of this resolution. This I did, and I presume that the Israel representative did so also. It is now 2.35 p.m., that is, one-and-a-half hours have elapsed of the two hours mentioned in operative paragraph 3 of the resolution. As I said in the four points which I mentioned—after having talked directly with Damascus—the attack by Israel regular armed forces on Syrian territory is now proceeding inside Syrian territory, and this is happening while the Council is meeting.

137. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the United States representative, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

138. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The innuendo of the Soviet representative that the United States did not use its influence with Israel and the adjacent Arab States to exercise restraint and avoid recourse to force is totally unfounded. The Council is aware of the public record of our efforts, and the Soviet Government, perhaps more than any other Government, knows of our private diplomatic efforts to this end. I only wish that our efforts had been matched by others with influence upon the parties at a time when such efforts perhaps could have prevented the grave consequences. I assure you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council that the United States is using its influence and will continue to do so in the interest of an immediate end to the military conflict and a stable peace in the Near East.

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

140. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The representative of the Soviet Union has deemed it fit, in the course of the last few days while this debate has been going on, to hurl insult after insult and vituperation at my Government and its

representatives with an ever-increasing vehemence which is matched in the annals of the United Nations only by certain Arab spokesmen. Mr. Fedorenko reached the heights of his crescendo today, when he compared Israel's fight for its existence to Hitler's aggression. This is unheard of. It appears that Mr. Fedorenko believes that, representing a powerful country, he has the right to trample on the honour of a small State and a people which suffered more from Hitlerite aggression than any other nation, a people one third of which was exterminated by Hitler. I believe that the Soviet representative, in his rage, indeed has overstepped the limits of the permissible.

141. Neither Israel nor the Jewish people concluded a pact with Hitler's Germany, a pact which encouraged Nazi Germany to unleash its aggression against the world. It was not Israel which proclaimed that the victims of this Nazi aggression were imperialist aggressors. The people of Israel volunteered from the first minute of that war to take up arms against the enemy of mankind while others stood by watching the developments. We are dismayed but not astonished that the Soviet representative should also confuse the issue in the present conflict and present the victim of aggression as the aggressor.

142. In advancing his allegations, he finds himself in singular isolation. Statements are pouring in from all over the world which hail Israel's deliverance from the avowed threat and the actual attempt to strangle and extinguish it. Personalities and organizations which usually show great sympathy, support and comprehension for the Soviet Union and its policies, the so-called progressive circles, have enthusiastically expressed their support of Israel in its hour of anguish and rescue. They have clearly agreed—and with them the great majority of nations—that Israel had been subjected for many long years to Arab aggression, which in the last few weeks culminated in direct attempts on Israel's security.

143. Did Israel first concentrate forces along the Egyptian border? Did Israel impose a blockade, a warlike act, against any of the Arab States? Did Israel proclaim that it intended to destroy the Arab States? Did Israel prepare and organize a liberation war against the Arab States?

144. Where was the voice of the Soviet Union then? Did we ever hear the representative of the Soviet Union take the slightest exception to those threats and war preparations? On the contrary. The representative of the Soviet Union spoke of a war psychosis. Who inflamed that war psychosis in the Arab countries? Who excited the Arab passions? Who supplied them with the arms to wage war against Israel? The record speaks for itself.

145. The Soviet representative has stated that the Council has proclaimed Israel to be an aggressor. That is as false as his other statements. There has not been a single resolution adopted by the United Nations which has labelled Israel as an aggressor. The first and only time the Council applied Chapter VII was in 1948, when it referred to the Arab aggression against the new State of Israel.

146. The representative of the Soviet Union has done nothing in the past to allay passions and to reduce tensions.

From his statement today and from his statements made on previous days, it is clear that he does not intend to do so in the future either.

147. The representative of Syria has announced his Government's acceptance of the cease-fire resolution which was adopted by the Council a short time ago. I am in communication with my Government and hope to have a reply in due time. But I can repeat here what I said this morning: that Israel immediately announced its acceptance when the first two cease-fire resolutions were passed. We stand by our undertaking, and it will become effective as soon as Syria has completely, unreservedly and sincerely implemented its undertaking to cease fire.

148. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In my statement at this meeting of the Council I asked a direct question, which I shall repeat. We should like to have a direct and unequivocal answer from Israel to this question: Why is the Tel-Aviv Government not withdrawing its troops from the territory which it has occupied in the United Arab Republic and Jordan; and, furthermore, why is it seizing new territory in Syria? We put this question: When will Israel begin to withdraw its forces from the territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, which have accepted the Security Council's decisions?

149. We have just heard the statement of the United States representative, who hastened to take the floor in order to be the first to answer our question, which was addressed to Israel, to the Israel representative who is present here. Instead, we again heard the voice of America. This, needless to say, is not mere irony. This can only lead us to the conclusion that it is precisely Washington which at all times and in all cases knows best how to answer the question when and if the armed forces of the Israel aggressor will be withdrawn from the lands that have been seized.

150. It would appear that United States diplomacy has gained some experience from the recent dramatic situation which arose in connexion with the statement by the Israel Ambassador to London, who, it will be recalled—we are referring to a reliable United States communication—acknowledged that it was none other than Tel-Aviv that launched the aggression against the Arab countries.

151. We then heard the statement of the representative of Israel. And what did he speak about here, after taking his cue from the appropriate stage manager? Instead of replying to the direct question which we have just repeated, he embarked upon a discussion of an entirely different subject. He tried to justify Israel's aggression. Once again, completely ignoring the question put to him, he tried to divert the Security Council's attention from the issue. He even complained to us about the comparison with the demagogic arguments formerly used in Hitler's propaganda to justify what had been done. He unabashedly depicted himself as virtually the victor in the fight against Hitler's invasion.

152. But surely we know who it was that, covered with blood, saved not only their own country and people but the

whole world from the Hitlerite plague? Has Mr. Rafael forgotten these historic facts? Can he have forgotten at what price and with what sacrifices the world, and with it the people of Israel, were saved, primarily by the country and people represented here by the delegation of the Soviet Union? It would be well to advise the Israel representative, who is using every shift and dodge in an effort to justify Israel's aggression against its Arab neighbours, that such trifling with the facts of history and reality is inadmissible.

153. My delegation, in its statement here, has vehemently protested against Israel's perfidious action against Syria. Despite the officially proclaimed agreement of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to respect the Security Council's decision concerning a cease-fire, the Israel hordes, in a frenzy of depredation and banditry, are treacherously taking advantage of this position which Syria has adopted to engage in offensive military action against that country, thereby imparting an even more brazen quality to Israel's systematic violation of the Security Council's decisions and demonstrating the aggressive nature of its policy.

154. We categorically condemn these acts of Israel. The Soviet Union denounces them with anger and indignation and calls for the immediate adoption by the Security Council of decisive measures to secure Israel's compliance with its decisions. Israel's military operations against Syria must cease immediately.

155. We have just heard a very important statement by the representative of Syria, in which he informed us that Israel is continuing its military operations, its aggression, despite the decision adopted today by the Security Council. He also informed the Council that the Syrian Government accepts the decision which the Council has just adopted.

156. We do not consider it possible to adjourn the Security Council's meeting until we have heard from the Israel representative that his Government respects the decision which we have just adopted and that it is ceasing its military operations against Syria.

157. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

158. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): We have heard and we welcome the declaration by the representative of Syria accepting the cease-fire resolution adopted by the Council this morning. The Council has the right to expect, within the time allowed, a similar affirmative response by Israel. I note that the Israel representative is in touch with his Government. The Council awaits his reply.

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

160. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to address the Council once again. I would not have done so had it not been for the necessity to reply to some of the distortions directly concerning Syria and the other Arab States that were contained in the invective statements made by the representative of Israel. However, I



deeply regret to note that at this very hour when a Member State of the United Nations is being invaded, when civilians are being killed and property is being damaged, the representative of Israel finds time for theatricals. This is proved by the fact it seems he is not addressing the Security Council alone, because from the applause coming from the audience it is quite certain that he is also addressing the public outside the Security Council. However, I shall not indulge in such trivialities.

161. In his rather lengthy reply, the representative of Israel posed many questions about the crisis, about the turmoil that is taking place in the Arab world, in the Middle East, now—turmoil which continues to constitute a threat to the peace and security not only of the area but of the world. I have followed very closely the statements made by the representative of Israel today, as well as the statements that were previously made by his Foreign Minister and other speakers from Israel. Never once have they mentioned the aggression committed by the Arabs against Israel in this crisis. What words did the representative of Israel use today? “Attempts” at aggression and “threats”. But who committed the aggression? The party that committed the aggression, the party that is definitely the aggressor in this whole crisis is Israel and Israel alone. Israel started the attack on Egypt. Israel on 7 April attacked Syria with large forces, with its Air Force, and destroyed property and killed civilians. I quoted in this Council the reports of the Mixed Armistice Commission which prove our point of view. I challenge the representative of Israel to deny those facts.

162. Strangely enough, the representative of Israel said, if I heard him correctly, that the Security Council and the United Nations had never condemned Israel. I wish to reply to that statement by saying that no other State Member of the United Nations has ever been condemned or censured by the Security Council and the General Assembly so often as Israel has been condemned and censured. Suffice it to mention the last condemnation of Israel by the Security Council during the last part of November 1966 for its treacherous, dastardly, criminal and wanton attack on As Samu in Jordan. It certainly does seem to me, after hearing the statement of the representative of Israel, that he is suffering from a lapse of memory.

163. The representative of Israel communicated the resolution of the Security Council to his authorities before I did, and yet I received an answer before he did. It is certainly noteworthy that when the Israelis want to communicate something quickly to the Security Council, they do so, and when they do not want to, then communications fail.

164. It is certainly a tragic occurrence that Syria—from which Palestine was severed and from the territory of which Israel was created—which had given refuge to the Jews when the world, and Europe in particular, was persecuting them, should be rewarded by its cousin Semites as it is being rewarded now. When the world persecuted the Jews, they found a homeland in my country, Syria—they established their State.

165. In addition to the information that I have already given to the Security Council, the latest information that I

have now received is that the Israel army is at the doors and the entrance to Damascus, the capital of Syria, the oldest inhabited city in the world. Syria, which has seen many hordes and conquerors, Tamerlane and Ghengis Khan, is now witnessing the conquest by the Zionist hordes. But they will be repelled.

166. In his closing statement, the representative of Israel challenged the Syrian Government to answer concerning its acceptance of the Security Council resolution which was adopted a short while ago. I stated before the Council, after speaking with my Foreign Minister in Damascus, that we accept the resolution of the Security Council.

167. Furthermore, I have addressed a letter to the Secretary-General conveying to him the acceptance of the Syrian Government. With the President's permission, I shall read out the text of that very brief letter addressed to the Secretary-General:

“Concerning the information which I transmitted to your office at 2.15 this afternoon, I have the honour to inform you, on instructions from my Government, after a telephone conversation with my Foreign Minister in Damascus, Mr. Ibrahim Makhous, that he has instructed me to convey to you officially and to the Security Council the acceptance of the Syrian Government of Security Council resolution S/7960.”

168. It is over two hours now since the Security Council resolution was adopted. I challenge the representative of Israel to read out to the Security Council a similar statement stating acceptance of the Security Council resolution and showing respect for the highest Council of the United Nations, as I have done.

169. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

170. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I assume that at this stage the Council is more interested in our reply with respect to the resolution that was adopted a short while ago than in continuing this sterile debate of answering false accusations made by various representatives. I shall have the opportunity to refer to those false accusations at a later stage.

171. At this time, I shall announce that Israel accepts the cease-fire resolution which was adopted this afternoon, providing that Syria accepts that cease-fire resolution and that Syria implements the cease-fire. That is our reply to the resolution which has been communicated to the Government of Israel.

172. I wish at this time to inform the Council that when I received these instructions from my Government, I also received a report that Syrian armed forces have extended the front of their attacks and that they are continuing to shell our border villages on a larger and more extended front line than before. We assume that the acceptance by Syria of the cease-fire will be sincerely and unreservedly implemented. If that is so, the implementation of Israel's undertaking is fully assured.

173. The PRESIDENT: Under resolution 235 (1967), the Council requested:

“... the Secretary-General to make immediate contacts with the Governments of Israel and Syria to arrange immediate compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions, and to report to the Security Council not later than two hours from now.”

174. I now invite the Secretary-General to report to the Council.

175. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The cables to the two Governments of Israel and Syria, conveying the Security Council resolution of today [235 (1967)], were dispatched immediately after the adoption of that resolution. Ambassador Daoudy of Syria informed me orally at 2.15 p.m. today that he had just spoken to Damascus and relayed the latest Security Council resolution. According to Ambassador Daoudy, Syria accepts the terms of the resolution and is ready to stop immediately military operations on Syrian territory.

176. Just a few moments ago, I received this communication in writing from the Permanent Representative of the Syria to the United Nations:

“Concerning the information which I transmitted to your office at 2.15 p.m. this afternoon, I have the honour to inform you on instructions from my Government, after a telephone conversation with my Foreign Minister Mr. Ibrahim Makhous, that he has instructed me to convey to you officially the acceptance of the Syrian Government to Security Council resolution S/7960.

“(Signed) George J. TOMEH  
“Permanent Representative”

177. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the response of Israel was that given by the Permanent Representative of Israel in his statement to the Council a moment ago.

178. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

179. Members of the Council have now heard the statement of the Secretary-General to the effect that the Governments of Syria and Israel have both accepted to comply with the resolution adopted by the Council today, resolution 235 (1967), calling for a cessation forthwith of hostilities.

180. I am sure that I express the feelings of all members when I say that this is indeed encouraging news. Hopefully it means that the fighting in the Middle East can now finally be brought to an end and peace restored to the area.

181. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): My delegation would like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the communications which we have just heard from the representatives of Syria and Israel.

182. It is to be observed that in Syria's response to an appeal of the Security Council regarding the immediate application of the above-mentioned resolutions we heard a clear and definite answer unaccompanied by any conditions. And we also note that it is precisely the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic which immediately responded to the Security Council's appeal in connexion with the resolution, and was the first to do so.

183. We have also heard the representative of Israel, who, unfortunately, did not make such a clear statement concerning the willingness of the Israel Government to abide by the Security Council's decision as set forth in resolution 235 (1967). Instead of a direct and unequivocal answer, he put forward a whole series of conditions subject to which Tel-Aviv might accept the Security Council's decision.

184. We are compelled to draw the Security Council's attention to the position adopted by Israel, which once again provides evidence of the criminal role of the Israel aggressors.

185. The PRESIDENT: We have now received the reply from Israel, in writing. I would ask the Secretary-General to read it out to us.

186. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, I have just received a communication from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations. The text of the communication reads as follows:

“9 June 1967  
“1505 hours

“I have the honour to confirm what I said in the Security Council on 9 June, that I have been instructed by telephone to announce that Israel accepts the cease-fire resolution adopted by the Security Council [235 (1967)], provided that Syria accepts it and will implement the cease-fire.

“(Signed) Gideon RAFAEL  
“Permanent Representative”

187. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has drawn the attention of the Council to the fact that Syria in its reply has accepted the resolution, while Israel has accepted the resolution provided that Syria accepts it and will implement the cease-fire.

188. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, I am very grateful to you for giving due attention to our statement. Nevertheless, we consider it essential once again to point out that the position reflected in the Israel reply is not clear.

189. As we have just heard, the Syrian Government was the first to answer, accepting the Security Council's decision without attaching any conditions; and it made a statement here in the Security Council, through its representative, and also through the corresponding communication from the Secretary-General.

190. Yet, seeing and hearing the statement by Syria, the Israel representative is nevertheless laying down conditions in his statement. What is the logic of this? What basis is there for making Israel's position conditional upon something?

191. We deem it necessary once again to draw the Security Council's attention to what can only be regarded as either casuistry or mockery.

192. The PRESIDENT: I wish to draw the attention of the representative of the Soviet Union to the fact that the representative of Israel conveyed the information upon instruction from his Government. I am not aware whether his Government was aware of the statement made in this Council when it instructed the Israel representative. But the Israel representative has asked to make a statement, which may perhaps clarify the situation.

193. The representative of Bulgaria had asked for the floor, but has yielded to Israel. However, the representative of the Soviet Union has asked for the floor, and I now call on him.

194. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, we have asked to speak only to say that we are, of course, grateful for your interpretation of the position of the Israel Government. As President, you are naturally observing impartiality and objectivity, but you will doubtless agree that an explanation of the position of the Israel Government can best be made by the official representative of the Israel Government.

195. The PRESIDENT: May I say that I did not try to interpret. I merely drew attention to the statement made by the representative of Israel.

196. I now invite the representative of Israel to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

197. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I confess that in recent days I have had some difficulties of communication with the representative of the Soviet Union. But I will certainly try again to make our position clear. I am sure it is clear to him. I fail to understand the purpose of his repeated interventions. My reply to the Security Council resolution was given orally here in my statement and in writing, in a letter which I just presented to the Secretary-General and which was read out by him.

198. The meaning of this letter is crystal clear for all people who want to understand that meaning and who do not want to obscure the situation. The Security Council resolution speaks about "their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire". I think that is natural. There cannot be a cease-fire by one side alone. But I wish to draw the attention of the representative of the Soviet Union and of the other members of the Council to the fact that it was Israel which was the first to announce its acceptance of the Security Council resolutions on a cease-fire. Many hours passed, until the early hours of this morning, when a telegram was sent by the Foreign Minister of Syria to the Secretary-General announcing the accept-

ance by Syria of the cease-fire resolution. While that telegram was sent, Syria was engaged in heavy fighting and artillery shelling of civilian populations in villages along the Israel border.

199. I am glad to hear that the representative of Syria has now repeated that Syria is accepting the cease-fire. I have said clearly that Israel is accepting the cease-fire in accordance with the resolution adopted this morning. It is natural that this cease-fire can become effective only when it is implemented by orders of commanders in the field to cease fire. The Government of Israel, by its acceptance, has of course undertaken to issue such orders and it expects that similar orders have been given by the Syrian military authorities.

200. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I apologize for speaking again at this late hour, but the events which are taking place are really of capital importance. I yielded my turn to the representative of Israel in the hope that I would not have to speak, but I find that the situation compels me to do so.

201. Let me say first, before explaining why I am speaking in the debate at this late hour, that the representative of Israel who addressed us just a moment ago seems not only to have had some difficulties of communication with the representative of the Soviet Union but also to have considerable difficulty in communicating with his own Government, particularly when the matter is urgent and the Security Council has requested him to do so. Communications facilities in Israel are apparently too occupied with the transmission of military orders for contact to be established with the representative of Israel at the United Nations.

202. The representative of Israel also said here that the resolution calls for an immediate but mutual, cessation of hostilities. In the resolution, however, there is no reference to any kind of "mutual" action. The resolution is specific, and there is no question of "mutuality". The first requirement is that hostilities should cease, and of course it is primarily the aggressor who must stop; it is not the victim of the aggression who must stop resisting.

203. The representative of the Soviet Union raised the question of the objections and conditions which have been advanced here. I have already had conversations with my colleagues here who felt that there were too many conditions. The Soviet representative has already referred to two. The Government of Israel was ready to accept a cease-fire if the Syrian Government also agreed to do so. The representative of Israel was present, however, when the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic informed the Security Council, without any reservations, that his Government accepted the cease-fire and accepted the resolution.

204. A second condition was laid down: "provided that Syria . . . implements the cease-fire". In other words, "if you do not cease fire"—and members know how many interpretations could be given to this—"we will not cease fire". Thus speaks the representative of Israel, although Israel is the aggressor.

205. However, what is still more important—what amazes us and, I believe, causes the members of the Council great anxiety—is the fact that the representative of Israel, in his statement, informed us that his Government accepted the cease-fire on the conditions which had already been set out and, in particular, on condition that it was implemented, but he went on to say that Syria was not implementing the cease-fire and that, instead of ceasing fire, the Syrians had begun to attack the Israelis along a broad front so that in actual fact there was no cease-fire.

206. The facts are quite the opposite; we are being told that there is a Syrian attack so that the aggression can continue.

207. Is the Security Council going to continue to tolerate such a situation? Are we not going to take steps to ensure that military action on this front really ceases and are we going to continue to tolerate this aggression which merely seeks pretexts so that it may perpetuate itself? This is a matter that the Security Council will have to consider, one on which it must take a decision or about which it must at least do something.

208. The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could briefly summarize the situation before we proceed with our debate.

209. We have heard the official replies from the representative of Syria and Israel, according to which Syria accepts the resolution contained in document S/7960 and Israel accepts the resolution provided that Syria accepts it and will implement the cease-fire. We have heard additional explanations from the representative of Israel.

210. A question has been raised by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the implementation by Israel of the terms of the resolution; he has stated to the Council that the resolution called for an unconditional cessation of hostilities. This is the question we are considering, whether the two replies we have received are to be regarded as indicating compliance with the decision contained in document S/7960, in which the Council demanded that hostilities cease forthwith.

211. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I would merely wish to say that what matters now is not what happens here but what happens on the borders of Syria and Israel. We can do no more here for the moment than we have already done. We trust that the wishes of the Council will not be flouted and that our efforts will now be finally successful. But at the same time we very sincerely hope that both the guns and we will soon be silent.

212. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): The remarks of my friend, the representative of the United Kingdom, have almost silenced me. I hope it will be as effective in relation to the guns in the Middle East. I agree with him that the exchanges here as to the state of the cease-fire are less important than the two factors which have been brought out by, I think, most of the members. The first one is scrupulous respect for the cease-fire by those who have now accepted it. The second—and here I refer to one of the ideas that were mentioned by the representative of India—is the need to strengthen and reactivate the United Nations

presence in the area. I have in mind particularly functions of UNTSO in reporting to the Security Council on the observance by the parties of the cease-fire, in accordance with the resolution we adopted today.

213. I would conclude by saying that we hope to hear from our distinguished Secretary-General in due course what measures can be taken in this direction, that is, in both reactivating and strengthening UNTSO's activities, so that the observance of the cease-fire may be duly and promptly reported.

214. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We have listened attentively to the explanation given by the Israel representative, but it fails to satisfy us. The Council has not obtained as clear-cut and direct an answer as that given by the Syrian Government.

215. We share the view that what is important is not what is said here—and this includes what is said by the Israel representative—but what is being done by the Israel armed forces on Syrian territory.

216. We consider that to be the voice of reason as uttered by our colleague, the United Kingdom representative; but, Lord Caradon, we will be silent here only when the guns of the Israel aggressor fall silent.

217. My delegation therefore deems it necessary to present for consideration the following observation.

218. We adopted today resolution 235 (1967) regarding the attainment of an agreement on immediate compliance with the decisions mentioned in the resolution, and we attached a condition, namely, that the report to the Security Council should be presented within two hours. We believe that the decision that has been adopted must be carried out on the understanding that the Security Council should lay down a certain time-limit—for example, one hour—for compliance with the resolution after the receipt of replies from the parties. We base ourselves in particular on the unanimous decision adopted by the Security Council in relation to another situation in which a specific time-limit was laid down for compliance with our decision.

219. In this connexion, Mr. President, we would request you to consult the members of the Security Council now to see whether they have any objection to such an understanding and we should then of course request the Secretary-General to inform the parties of this decision and to report to the Council, taking the time-limit decided on into account.

220. The PRESIDENT: In view of the importance of the statement which has just been made by the Soviet representative, I should like to have the consecutive interpretation of his statement.

*The consecutive interpretation into French and English of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union was given.*

221. The PRESIDENT: If I understood the representative of the Soviet Union correctly, after having listened to his statement three times, he suggested that we prolong by one hour the time-limit provided for in the resolution contained in document S/7960; that we should have the replies within that hour; and that meanwhile I should consult the members of the Council to see whether they agree with this understanding.

222. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): I agree with my noble friend, the representative of the United Kingdom, that what matters is what happens on the spot, but, at the same time, my delegation feels that the message that will go out from this hall should be in as clear terms as we can possibly make it. I think that the debate which has taken place has created, and could not but help to create, some confusion in the minds of those who are looking on at these proceedings, because the impression may be given that we are in fact departing from the decision that we have made. But I believe that that actually is not the case, because to me the situation appears very clear.

223. We have demanded a cessation of hostilities, and both the parties concerned, Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, have accepted this demand for the cessation of hostilities. The difficulty and the debates that have followed are due to the fact that in the communication of the Government of Israel a sentence appears which gives the appearance of laying down conditions for the acceptance of the cessation of hostilities.

224. You, Mr. President, in an attempt to be helpful have tried to point to the possibility that the Israel message may have been relayed to the representative of Israel at a time when the reply of Syria was not known. If that is the case, the word "if" is correct and proper because there is mutuality involved in this resolution that we have agreed upon.

225. But since Syria now has accepted the cessation of hostilities, it seems to me that the simplest thing to do is for the Government of Israel to change the word "if" to "therefore", in the sense of saying that since Syria has accepted, therefore Israel also accepts. I think that the matter is as simple as that, and I appeal to my friend, the representative of Israel, to spare us the trouble of having to hold consultations on a point which is already past, when we have so much work awaiting us. I would ask him to come to the Council table and make this clarification, which is a clarification we expect of him and which I am sure he is in a position to make.

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

227. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I have hesitantly come to the conclusion that the representative of the Soviet Union does not seem to be too happy with Israel's acceptance of the cease-fire resolution. He accused us of casuistry. I leave it to those who will scrutinize the records to determine who is practising casuistry. My statement is clear; it is on record and there is nothing unusual in it.

228. The representative of the Soviet Union spoke about conditions, and that was repeated by the representative of Bulgaria. May I draw the attention of the representatives to documents S/7953 and S/7958. The former is a letter dated 8 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the Secretary-General. It states:

"I have the honour to inform you, upon instructions of my Government, that it has decided to accept the cease-fire call, as it has been prescribed by the resolutions of the Council on 6 and 7 June 1967 [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)], on the condition that the other party ceases the fire." [S/7953.]

229. The second document is a telegram dated 9 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic. It states:

"In reply to your two telegrams of 6 and 7 June 1967"—and may I draw your attention to the fact that the Secretary-General had to send two telegrams before he received a reply—"the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic has decided to accept the two appeals for a cease-fire contained in the resolutions of the Security Council [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)], provided that the other party accepts the cease-fire." [S/7958.]

230. I really fail to understand what this discussion is all about. Do we want a cease-fire or do we not want a cease-fire? I have the definite impression that the members of the Council want to see a cease-fire implemented as soon as possible.

231. My Government has tried to be as helpful as possible. In my first intervention this morning I repeated our position that not only was Israel the first Government to welcome the cease-fire, but also that it had accepted the cease-fire—and I have repeated that position. Now the representative of the Soviet Union apparently, while the shelling of our villages is still going on at this minute, wishes to issue an ultimatum to this Council or to Israel—I do not know to whom. There is no need whatsoever for that because the Council has taken note of the statements made by the representatives of Syria and the representatives of Israel. Both have announced, upon instructions from their Governments, that they have accepted the cease-fire resolution.

232. Since the representative of the Soviet Union is so interested in acceptance of the cease-fire resolutions, may I inquire of the Secretary-General whether he has received a reply from the Government of Iraq to his notification letter to that Government, asking it to give its reply on the cease-fire resolutions. It would be helpful to have that reply on record also.

233. In addition to that, I should like to state that we had one reply from the Government of Kuwait which stated bluntly that it would not accept the cease-fire resolution. I have not heard one word of blame from the representative of the Soviet Union in regard to that defiance by the Government of Kuwait.

234. In conclusion, I should like to repeat that my Government has accepted the cease-fire resolutions and that, of course, they can become effective only if the other side also will issue the necessary order for a cease-fire. I really cannot contribute more to the clarification of this situation—not now, not in an hour, not in five hour's time.

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

236. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I ask the forgiveness of the President and the members of the Council for asking to speak again, but you are aware that I am a party that is directly concerned.

237. Right at this very moment, as I have informed the Council, the situation is graver than words can convey. At this time when we are discussing very critical points, innocent civilians are being killed by the Israelis and blood is being shed in my own country, in our villages, on our land, in our cities. Our thinking should be very clear and we should be very aware of everything that is taking place here.

238. The Israel representative said in his last sentence that he could not give clarification beyond what he had already stated—not in one hour, not in five, not in five days. He really made it very clear that Israel's only intention is to continue the aggression against Syria. This is proved by the following. The whole argument of the Israel representative is based on the condition stated in the second preambular paragraph of the resolution as follows: "Noting that the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance . . ." [S/7960]. He picked out the word "mutual" and he said that unless Syria signifies its acceptance, the condition of mutuality is not fulfilled.

239. But here again this whole discussion has been taking place within the Council. To refresh the memory of the representative of Israel, I signified my acceptance first, orally to the Council and in a very clearly written answer to the Secretary-General. In my answer, no conditions whatsoever were contained; merely the acceptance in full and *in toto* of Security Council resolution S/7960. Therefore, since I, before the representative of Israel, have signified the acceptance of my Government of the resolution of the Security Council, the condition of mutuality stipulated in paragraph 2 of the preamble has already been fulfilled. To put conditions can mean only one thing: that the party putting the conditions, when those conditions have already been fulfilled, has something in mind, and that something is the design to continue aggression against Syria. When we say "cease-fire accepted", it means that it is accepted.

240. The Israel representative, in his previous reply, went on to say that the Syrians were continuing to shell, and so on and so on. But we are in a legitimate state of self-defence. The Israel armies, as I stated, are on the land of Syria.

241. As pointed out by the representative of Bulgaria, operative paragraph 2 "Demands that hostilities should cease forthwith". What about "forthwith"? Which is more important, the condition of mutuality, that has already

been fulfilled, or the demand by the Security Council that "hostilities should cease forthwith"?

242. In the circumstances, I, as a party to the dispute, wish to emphasize to the Security Council that in view of the development that has been taking place since we began this debate—and it is now four hours, not two—the Israelis have one objective in mind, and that is to continue their aggression against Syria. And I think that it is the imperative duty of the Security Council to be aware of these tactics and to call things by their names, namely, that what the Israel representative has been indulging in is an exercise in casuistry. If the word "casuistry" is not enough, the word "sophistry" could be used.

243. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I think it should be obvious that what is now required above all things is practical action on both sides to issue immediately the necessary orders to commanders in the field for a cease-fire, to which both now have committed themselves. I suggest that we can best contribute to this process by adjournment. If the fighting does not stop immediately, we shall have to meet again urgently to ensure that it does, and I suggest that we keep ourselves available today at the call of the President for that purpose.

244. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I have no objection to the suggestion made a moment ago by the representative of the United States. I likewise had no objection to the well-chosen remarks made earlier by Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom, for it is true that the situation cannot be altered by any amount of fire-power that is brought to bear in the Security Council. What must concern us above all is that the guns stop firing on the battlefield. Of course, both we and they must stop.

245. I should like, however, to go back to a suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union, because it is a very important one. As I understood it, the Soviet representative's suggestion was not what the representative of Israel has said; he did not suggest an extension of the time-limit, as some might wish, for the implementation of the cease-fire. In actual fact, there never was any extension of a time-limit. There were not two different times; the time for compliance was indicated in the resolution, which contains the word "forthwith". The representative of Israel has tried to interpret the word "forthwith" as meaning "as soon as possible". That, however, is erroneous. The text clearly states what is meant; it says "forthwith", not "as soon as possible". I shall not, however, dwell on linguistic discussions of this kind; they are of no immediate importance. What is needed is that the Council, having taken the decision to order an immediate cease-fire, should have time to verify whether the cease-fire is being complied with.

246. Consequently, while agreeing that the meeting should be adjourned, I believe that a minimum period of time must be fixed or that the President must be given the possibility of reconvening the Council when he has information enabling him to inform us that the cease-fire has been complied with or, on the other hand, that it has not been complied with and that the Council should take other measures, under other chapters of the Charter if necessary.

247. I am not at the moment making a proposal; I am making a suggestion. The President might perhaps wish to accept it and to enable us to remain in readiness, even though we would adjourn the meeting of the Security Council for the time being.

248. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): There is a point of great importance in what we have been discussing. I propose that we ask Israel and Syria to confirm within two hours that the necessary orders have been issued to their forces to cease fire. If there is no such confirmation, the Council should meet after the two-hour period ends.

249. Mr. IYALLA (Nigeria): When I last intervened in this debate on the situation in the Middle East I prefaced my remarks by pointing out that we in Nigeria have had a fairly long history of friendly relations with all the States in the area, and I trust that the few remarks which I shall make now will be taken by all parties in the same spirit.

250. As a result of the developments of the last few days, my delegation joined with others in considering the urgent necessity to stop and to contain the rapidly spreading hostilities in the Middle East. Consequently, all other considerations and all other matters ancillary to the consideration, were set aside for the moment, and we subscribed to a resolution designed first and foremost and as a first step to stop the fighting.

251. It is very sad that thrice in three days the Security Council passed formal resolutions calling for a cease-fire and the fighting is still continuing. I agree with the representative of the United Kingdom that perhaps the Security Council could not at this time and in this situation be reasonably called upon to pass any more resolutions immediately without hearing further developments. It would be a sad situation in the world if the Security Council continued to pass resolutions which would continue to be ignored, without any result.

252. I said that we regard all the States in the area and the peoples of that area as our friends. I hope, therefore, that they will not mind my merely saying, in the name of the people of Nigeria, that, in this very difficult and delicate moment, we appeal to them, especially to those who have themselves been involved collectively, and in some cases personally, in the awesome drama of history. We hope that they will appreciate far more than we ourselves can that sometimes success and advantage of circumstances demand the terrible burdens of statesmanship and perhaps the courage of magnanimity. The calls of the Security Council, according to my delegation's understanding, have been unconditional, and we, as their friends, expect all the parties to accept those calls unconditionally.

253. Finally, may I add my own appeal to those that have already been made in the course of these debates with respect to the necessity for treating the civilian and other population of the areas involved in this conflict with humanity.

254. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): After what has been said by my colleagues, and particularly by my neighbour on the left, I have very little to add. But

the news which is reaching us at this very moment is becoming more and more disturbing, and it seems to me that the first thing to be done, as has already been stated, is to find out whether the Secretary-General, with the machinery at his disposal for observation, could within as short a time as possible—a period of two hours has been mentioned—give us the reply that we want. If it would not be inconvenient for the Secretary-General to give the Council some information on that point now, we would be grateful if he could tell us the time which would be needed, taking into account the technical factors, for him to give us this reply. That would help us to fix the time for our next meeting.

255. The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding, I would ask the Secretary-General to reply to the question just raised by the representative of France.

256. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The information desired by the representatives of India and France can be made available, to the best of my knowledge, in two hours.

257. The PRESIDENT: I have no further speakers on my list. Members of the Council have now heard suggestions made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, Bulgaria and India. With the permission of members, I should like to make the following suggestion—that we adjourn now, and that the time and date of the next meeting will be decided after consultations with members, it being understood that members will hold themselves available for an urgent meeting at any time should we be faced with an emergency situation, and also on the understanding that if we have not within two hours had confirmation that the necessary orders have been issued for the cessation of hostilities, we shall meet again within two hours. Is that suggestion acceptable?

258. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I am in full agreement with what the President has just suggested, provided, of course, that we are not going to wait two hours merely to find out whether the orders have been issued, for we have just heard the representatives of Israel and Syria tell us that orders have been issued. If, therefore, we are to meet again, the reason would not be to receive information on that point but to learn what the situation is and whether the cease-fire has become a fact. That is what we want to find out. Otherwise, I have no difficulty in accepting the President's suggestion.

259. The PRESIDENT: Would members of the Council agree to my suggestion with the addition of the following phrase "and that fighting has actually stopped"? I shall read out the suggestion with the change—that the Council will now adjourn, and that the time and date of the next meeting will be decided after consultations with members, it being understood that members will hold themselves available for an urgent meeting at any time should we be faced with an emergency situation, and on the understanding that if we have not had confirmation within two hours that the necessary orders have been issued for the cessation of hostilities and that fighting has actually been stopped, the Council will then meet within two hours.

260. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In expressing our opinion

regarding the establishment of a time-limit for compliance with the Security Council's decision, we had in mind effective compliance, or, in other words, a cease-fire.

261. It is regrettable that the Israel representative has again provided some rather confused explanations, and is only aggravating the situation. Such a position on the part of the Israel representative can only be regarded as deliberate procrastination, since the most recent information shows that events are taking a very serious course. Damascus, the capital of Syria, is being subjected to air attacks, with serious damage and casualties.

262. How can we reconcile ourselves with the position presented by the Israel representative, who continues to repeat the same conditions? This is no longer merely casuistry but mockery. The war is going on, people are losing their lives, but the Israel representative cannot tell us clearly whether Israel does or does not accept the Council's decision. Although many members of the Security Council have suggested that he state this clearly, as we see, he evades answering. Hence, we are bound to heed the voice of the representative of Syria, who has drawn the Security Council's attention to the fact that this is being done deliberately, consciously, and intentionally.

263. We share the view expressed by the representatives of India and France, but it is not entirely clear to us from your statement, Mr. President, as it was phrased in somewhat imprecise terms, who is to gather information on the situation on the spot and who is to inform us, the members of the Council, within the next two hours. We should like to have a clearer explanation of this.

264. The PRESIDENT: In reply to the question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to make the clarification that if we have not received confirmation within two hours that orders have been issued for the cessation of hostilities and the fighting has actually stopped—information which should be collected by the Secretary-General—I shall then convene the Council within two hours. Is that acceptable?

265. I see that the representative of Bulgaria is asking for the floor, but if we are to proceed with this procedural debate, I shall have to call all the speakers in the order in which they have been inscribed in the list. I suppose that

the other speakers want to speak on my proposal. I call on the representative of France.

266. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): The President has given us an extremely useful clarification. I merely felt, for the sake of convenience and if only to ensure that representatives could be brought together very quickly, that it would be preferable, whatever the reply that is received, if, in any event and taking into account the reply given to us just now by the Secretary-General, we were to meet here again in two hours, at about 6.20 p.m., providing that this proposal is agreeable to the President.

267. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): My purpose in asking to speak is not to prolong the debate but simply to shorten the procedure.

268. I believe the statement made here by the representative of Israel that the Israelis have issued a cease-fire order. Since I believe that statement, I do not ask for confirmation that that order has in fact been issued. I also believe the Syrian representative's statement that the Syrian Government has issued a cease-fire order.

269. What I would rather know is whether the orders have already been carried out, not whether they have been issued, because if we are to meet again in order to find out whether the orders have been issued, we are extending the time that we are allowing for this to be done.

270. I agree with the President's suggestion, but what we must find out is whether the orders have already been carried out. I would therefore ask, in these circumstances, that another meeting should be convened in two hours' time.

271. The PRESIDENT: I made my suggestion in order to save the time of the members of the Council in case it was not necessary to meet again. However, the representative of France has suggested that in any event we should meet again in two hours. Would it be agreeable to the members of the Council that we meet again at 6.30 p.m.?

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.*