



UN LIBRARY

MAR 30 1971

UN/SA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1357th

MEETING: 11/12 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1357)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)	1
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907)	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)	
Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967)	

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-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 11 June 1967, at 10.30 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/1357)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902).
3. Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907).
4. Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910).
5. Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

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

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

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

Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan to take places at the Council table, and the representatives of Lebanon, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Tunisia and Libya to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber, in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: In response to the request of the representative of Syria contained in document S/7973, and in accordance with the Council's understanding that all members would hold themselves available should developments necessitate an urgent meeting, I consulted the members of the Council and convened this meeting on short notice.

3. The Security Council will now continue its discussion of the four items inscribed on its agenda. But before I call upon the first speaker on my list, I wish to call attention to the fact that supplemental information received by the Secretary-General since our last meeting is contained in document S/7930/Add.3 dated 11 June, which has been circulated to the Council.

4. Before calling on the first speaker on my list, I would ask the Secretary-General to make a statement, since he has received additional information.

5. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have received three messages from General Bull this evening which are not to be found in the supplemental information paper which is before the Council and which you have just mentioned, Mr. President, namely, document S/7930/Add.3. All three of them relate to the question of the Israel tank column moving out of Rafid. I had sent to General Bull and to the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission at Damascus three cables seeking urgent information on this matter.

6. The three messages from General Bull are as follows. The first message, received from General Bull at 1906 hours New York time today, reads:

“We are waiting for a report from Damascus and will inform you immediately upon receipt.”

7. The second message, received from General Bull at 2032 hours New York time today, reads:

“Hereby report just received from Damascus:

“1. Approximately 0950 hours GMT today, 11 June, United Nations military observer teams UN-203, UN-150, UN-77, UN-147, UN-85 and UN-142 were proceeding from Sheikh Meskine—the maps have been distributed to the members of the Council, and the name of this village is given on the map—‘and Naqoua towards Rafid’—those names are also given on the map—‘with a view to establishing mobile observation posts in the Kuneitra area. At Rafid the road was blocked by the Israel Defence Force. The United Nations military observers of all these teams reported that the Israel forces included numerous tanks.’

“2. At 1539 hours GMT, United Nations military observer teams 203 and 150 reported that they could observe two or three tanks in front of Joukada village.—This village is also shown on the map, where it is spelled ‘Joukhadar’; it is in a south-westerly direction from Rafid. The message continues:—‘They also reported that on a ridge in front of this village a column of tanks was heading in an easterly direction and afterwards turning in a southerly direction.’”

8. The third message, received from General Bull at 2036 hours New York time, is as follows:

“By telephone on 11 June, 2330 hours GMT, Mr. Sasson”—of the Israel Foreign Office—“informed me that he had received a message from New York containing a complaint of Syrian sources concerning troop movements around Rafid. This allegation he said had been checked with all forces and with the front commander. The front was quiet. He said that there was no advance anywhere on the front. This allegation was completely baseless.”

9. I have no other information on this matter at this time, but it should be kept in mind that the United Nations observers were not in that area on 10 June, and could not proceed there until the morning of 11 June. Their report,

therefore, is unavoidably limited to their observation on 11 June, that is, today.

10. The key point in connexion with the observance of the cease-fire is the question of whether the Israel troops were in Rafid and environs before 1630 hours GMT on 10 June, or whether they have advanced to that sector after the time fixed for the cease-fire to go into effect. That is the end of my report.

11. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the representative of Syria, I call on the representative of Mali on a point of order.

12. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): After first apologizing to the representative of Syria, I should like to refer to chapter VIII, rule 41 of the provisional rules of procedure and to express my surprise at the fact that the Secretary-General’s report, on which we are entitled to base ourselves when we participate in the Council’s debates, has not yet been circulated in French. My delegation insists, in conformity with chapter VIII, rule 41, of the provisional rules of procedure, that the Secretary-General’s report should be circulated in French as soon as possible; I should be grateful to the Secretariat if that could be done.

13. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): While I fully appreciate the Secretariat’s difficulties in the present circumstances, I associate myself, for obvious reasons, with the request of the representative of Mali. I would take the liberty of adding that a translation into French, or into language intelligible to an ordinary diplomat who has missed some hours of sleep, is all the more necessary because the Secretary-General’s paper (S/7930/Add.3, English text) contains a certain number of expressions which require some explanation, or even perhaps translation. I need not labour the point; you will find them. For example, on the first page there are terms such as “sitreps”, “TCC”, “IDF”, “lmg”, “smg”, and so forth.

14. On this occasion I should like to have my remarks interpreted.

15. The PRESIDENT: A point of order has been raised by the representative of Mali and supported by the representative of France with reference to rule 41.

16. I would also refer the representative to rule 46, which reads as follows:

“All resolutions and other important documents shall forthwith be made available in the official languages.”

17. Furthermore, in accordance with rule 26: “The Secretary-General shall be responsible for the preparation of documents required by the Security Council . . .” I should like to ask the Secretary-General when it will be possible to have the documents in question in the official languages.

18. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: In the absence of any indication of a possible Security Council meeting this afternoon, I had prepared this report, in the form of

supplemental information, some time this afternoon. It was sent to the appropriate department for processing, translation and distribution. Early this afternoon, I was under the impression that both the English and the French texts of this document would be available some time in the course of this evening. As soon as I heard that the Security Council was to meet at 10.30 I checked with the translation department and was informed that the French translation would be ready at about midnight. So I am still under the impression that the French version of my report will be available within the next hour or so.

19. The PRESIDENT: With the agreement of the representatives of Mali and France, we shall proceed with our discussion.

20. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, on whom I now call.

21. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for having responded to our appeal to hold this urgent emergency meeting of the Security Council. I must say that in view of the fact that today is Sunday, which is a day of rest, the inconvenience that this meeting is causing to the members of the Council and to you is undoubtedly great. But perhaps an excuse can be found in the fact that the situation we are facing is becoming graver and graver every day, and is deteriorating to an extent which I am sure will not be accepted by the Security Council.

22. Mr. President, I have been in contact with you and with the Under-Secretary during the day, following upon information which I received directly from Damascus. The fact of the matter, as I stated in my letter to you of 11 June, is the following; I shall read paragraphs 1 and 2 of that letter:

"At 3 o'clock p.m. today, we received a telephone call from our Minister for Foreign Affairs in Damascus, informing us that a column of Israel armoured cars and tanks supported by military helicopters and other forces has moved, at 18 hours local time, eastward and southward from Rafid, which was occupied yesterday three hours and seventeen minutes after the cease-fire, and occupied new sites and localities where fighting did not take place previously.

"The United Nations observers were immediately informed of this new violation and an investigation was requested. Accordingly they attempted to reach the areas where these violations took place, but the Israel forces of occupation prevented them from discharging their duties and even from approaching the areas involved."
[S/7973.]

23. The report submitted by the Secretary-General confirms that one Syrian liaison officer who was accompanying one of the United Nations military observer teams from Damascus was taken prisoner, and that after their intervention with the Israel authorities, that officer was released.

24. From the map distributed by the Secretary-General, the places where Israel forces have been seen are Naqoua,

Sheikh Meskine and Joukada to the South. Thus, we are witnessing another step in the systematic Israel invasion in order to occupy more land in Syria.

25. I do not want to take much of the Council's time in reviewing what we have witnessed so far, but allow me to remind the members of the Council that when we asked for emergency meetings—this is the third such emergency meeting—we submitted facts to the Council about the systematic invasion of Syria, the occupation of Kuneitra and the bombing of Damascus. All those facts were denied time and again by the Israel representative and then all of them were confirmed by reports which were received from the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and from the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission. I would not be at all surprised if the Israel representative were to say today "I deny categorically the allegations of the Syrian representative". In case that is done, the answer is already before the Security Council. Israel forces, in violation of the cease-fire which has been called for in three resolutions so far adopted by the Security Council, have advanced from Rafid, which was also occupied after the cease-fire, to the south and east, as reproduced on the map which is before members.

26. The choice of today, Sunday, for this further step in the Israel conquest is quite significant. Since this afternoon I have been trying to contact members of the United Nations Secretariat who are in charge of this aspect of the problem and also you, Mr. President, and we have been faced with the fact that communication with General Odd Bull in Jerusalem was difficult due to the fact that it has to go through Geneva, and the Geneva communication office is closed on Sunday.

27. It appears from the report of the Secretary-General that there is still difficulty—at least that is what I gather from reading the report of the Secretary-General, which we received as we were on our way here (it of course could not have been issued before). Communication with General Bull is difficult because, secondly, the Israel authorities are not providing all facilities for the observers to perform their tasks and their duties.

28. I also wish to note in this connexion that this new advance is important in this respect: If one looks at the map, one sees that this drive is aimed at the Yarmuk River and the headwaters of the Yarmuk. On previous occasions during meetings of this Council, I have explained the problem of the waters and how the Israelis have systematically tried to occupy all the parts where the headwaters of the Jordan are. The Yarmuk is one of the largest, if not the largest, tributary of the Jordan River.

29. As I said, the situation is graver than seems to have been realized so far. What we described as an invasion is being proved each day to be a systematic invasion in accordance with plans that have been fully drawn up.

30. In view of those developments which I have placed before the Council and in view especially of the contempt of the Israel authorities for the United Nations, the Security Council and its resolutions, particularly the last three resolutions concerning a cease-fire—which have been

violated—I think that it is time, and high time, for the Security Council to take some action.

31. The Israel authorities are treating the Security Council with contempt, and I believe that this situation should not be accepted or tolerated. Therefore, action is demanded. The action should first aim at stopping this invasion from proceeding further than it already has, especially in view of Security Council resolution 235 (1967) calling for the cessation of all military activities. Secondly, it is time for the Council to condemn violations of the cease-fire. If those violations have been proved, to be silent about them and to condone them can only be interpreted as an acceptance of them. This is a situation that challenges the Security Council as the organ charged with the task of safeguarding peace and security whenever peace and security are threatened. Therefore, if a violation is proved beyond any doubt—and I think I have presented to the Council so far a sufficient number of violations to warrant the condemnation of the Israel authorities—I think the Council should proceed without any further delay to prevent a further aggravation of the situation by condemning those who are violating the cease-fire. Thirdly, if these violations are established, and they are established, the violator should be called back to his place. To put it more clearly, the violator should undo his violation by withdrawing to the points from which his conquest started.

32. I believe that at this time we should avoid discussion that is not directly related to the points that I have raised with regard to the action demanded by the Council, and should face up to the grave situation in order to prevent further deterioration.

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

34. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I am glad to oblige the representative of Syria and to supply the information which is available to me on the matters raised by him and in the report submitted by the Secretary-General [S/7930/Add.3].

35. With respect to military movements in the Rafid area, I can state now that there was a movement of some military vehicles, but that movement took place within the truce lines. There was no advance beyond the truce lines established by the cease-fire yesterday, 10 June, at 1630 hours GMT. My Government is in constant touch with General Bull and has suggested to him, even at this hour again, to send observers to the spot, in case they are not there, and to verify that our forces are respecting the line which was established yesterday at the hour when the cease-fire went into effect.

36. Furthermore, I want to point out that there is no firing and no fighting whatsoever anywhere along the front line, and that the cease-fire is being scrupulously observed.

37. Moreover, I wish to draw the attention of the Council to some other matters connected with the situation with which we are dealing. The Kuneitra control centre was reopened with the co-operation of Israel authorities. United Nations observers are in Kuneitra and the Centre is

operating. I think this is confirmed also by General Bull in his dispatches.

38. A number of Syrian liaison officers were apprehended yesterday and today, and I am glad to confirm that they have been released. Indication of that is also to be found in General Bull's report.

39. My Government has given full facilities to the United Nations observers to reach the truce line, and the requested number of United Nations observer teams is stationed along the line and is deployed in accordance with instructions from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO.

40. Those are the facts available to me and they point out that the cease-fire is fully respected, that it is in force and that, on the side of Israel, everything is done to keep the cease-fire in good working order and to facilitate the work of the United Nations observers and the Chief of Staff in ensuring that the cease-fire is fully observed and respected.

41. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, today the Security Council is again holding an emergency meeting, at the request of the representative of Syria, in connexion with a further flagrant violation by Tel-Aviv of the Security Council's resolutions and the agreement on the cessation of military activities.

42. Ambassador Tomeh, the representative of Syria, has provided us with additional information on the aggressor's preparations for penetrating deep into Syrian territory. He has drawn attention to the fact that Israel tanks are advancing in the area of the Syrian town of Joukada.

43. The Soviet delegation is obliged once again to make a most vigorous protest against Israel's treacherous aggressive acts against the Syrian Arab Republic. Tel-Aviv's criminal acts are evidence not of an accidental violation of the Security Council's decisions but of a systematic and premeditated violation. The Israel interventionists are acting more and more arrogantly, and are revealing more and more frankly the aggressive nature of Tel-Aviv's policies.

44. Thus, as we have already emphasized, ruling circles in Israel are making a scandalous mockery of the United Nations and of the Security Council and its decisions. The Council cannot remain inactive, and it has no right to do so. It must call the high-handed aggressor to order and force him to cease his military activities forthwith.

45. The Secretary-General's report [S/7930/Add.3] contains irrefutable evidence that Israel has made every effort to prevent the United Nations observers on the spot from discharging their functions and thereby providing the Security Council with information on what is actually happening. This in itself—and particularly the Israel authorities' refusal to grant the United Nations observers freedom of movement—shows that Israel is continuing its aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic.

46. From what the Secretary-General has just told us it is clear that the United Nations observers have witnessed movements by tank columns in the area in question. But, as

was to be expected, Tel-Aviv—replying this time without a moment's delay—denied the fact that there had been any further violation of the Security Council's decision by Israel's occupation forces. This means that the Tel-Aviv adventurers are continuing deliberately to misinform and deceive this important body.

47. Can this cynical defiance, this outrageous lie, be tolerated? How long will this arrant perfidy and this violation of the Security Council's decisions continue? How long will the representatives of those who are protecting the international adventurers in Tel-Aviv continue their efforts here to sabotage and paralyse the work of the Security Council, which is not in a position to take the proper decision? Is not this situation alarming for the members of the Council and for you, Sir, as you preside over the Council at the present time?

48. As members of the Council will recall, yesterday the Council was discussing the question of the bombing of Damascus, the capital of Syria, by Israel aircraft; it discussed the fact that Israel's armed forces were advancing into Syrian territory and had occupied a considerable part of that country's territory, including the town of Kuneitra. Members of the Council will also remember how the representative of Tel-Aviv tried to deny certain indisputable facts, how he shamelessly prevaricated and deliberately tried to mislead the Security Council, and how—obviously on instructions from Tel-Aviv rather than on his own initiative, although he has plenty of that—he tried to gain time for the forces of aggression to carry out their criminal plans. This deceit was exposed in the Council. The reports submitted to the Council by the Secretary-General confirmed the fact of the bombing attacks on Damascus, and also the fact that Israel's armed hordes had penetrated deep into Syrian territory. Yet today the Israel representative is still trying to resort to the same devices; with the same effrontery he is still denying that Israel's armed forces have violated the Security Council's decisions and are preparing to commit further violations.

49. From several reports in the international Press it is clear that Tel-Aviv is openly defying the United Nations and the Security Council. Insults are being hurled at the United Nations from that quarter. The Tel-Aviv adventurers are no longer even troubling to conceal their expansionist territorial claims; they are issuing ultimatums and cynically declaring that Israel's troops will not withdraw from the Arab territory which they have seized as a result of their aggression. General Moshe Dayan, of whom we have already spoken here, is himself publicly boasting that the map of the Near East will be redrawn and that the State of Israel will have new frontiers. Moshe Dayan has said: "I cannot remember one single problem that has been settled by diplomacy or through the United Nations".

50. The extremists in Tel-Aviv are obviously following in the criminal footsteps of their protectors. Imitating the methods of other aggressors, their armed hordes are resorting to means of mass destruction; they are using napalm against the Arab States and bombing their capitals. Does this not remind us that those who are encouraging and helping the Israel aggressors are also savagely bombing the capital and peaceful towns of another sovereign State in

South-East Asia? There too it is not only the towns which are burning, but masses of completely innocent people are being burnt to death as well. And that piratical war has been going on for more than a year.

51. The Soviet Union brands the Israel aggressors with anger and indignation. Tel-Aviv's adventurism and demagoguery are condemned by all peace-loving peoples. The shameful gamble of the Israel representative, who is trying by the most nefarious means and with the support of Washington and certain other accomplices to ensure that the Israel army can seize as much as possible of the territory of the Arab States, has revealed the true intentions of Tel-Aviv's rulers for all the world to see.

52. It was precisely for this reason that the Soviet Government found it impossible to maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, an aggressor country whose leaders have a place waiting for them in the dock of the international tribunal. We should like to express the conviction that all peoples and everyone to whom peace on earth is dear, will support the joint statement by the socialist countries on Israel's aggression, will support the actions of the Soviet State and will, by their combined efforts, restrain the aggressor and all the instigators of war.

53. The Soviet delegation calls upon the Security Council to take decisive and immediate steps to ensure Israel's compliance with the resolutions which the Council has adopted. Israel's military activities and provocations must be stopped forthwith. The aggressor must be condemned by the Security Council.

54. The Soviet delegation is obliged to remind the Council once again today that the Soviet Government requested the Security Council to consider the question of the cessation of military action by Israel and the withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression.

55. It is our duty once again to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the draft resolution dated 8 June 1967 [S/7951/Rev.1] which the Soviet delegation has submitted for the Council's consideration. We would remind the Council that this draft resolution draws attention, *inter alia*, to the fact that Israel is not halting its aggression and is thus defying the United Nations and all peace-loving States. In the Soviet Union's draft resolution it is proposed that Israel's aggressive activities and its violations of the Security Council's resolutions, of the United Nations Charter and of United Nations principles should be vigorously condemned. The draft contains a demand that Israel should immediately halt its military activities against neighbouring Arab States and should remove all its troops from the territory of those States and withdraw them behind the armistice lines.

56. The events of the past few days, including the events occurring at this very moment, confirm the timeliness, urgency and importance of the Soviet Union's proposal. In this connexion, we should like to emphasize that the representatives of Bulgaria, India, Mali and the Arab countries have in the Council already declared that the

Security Council cannot allow Israel to enjoy the fruits of aggression. The demand that Israel should immediately and unconditionally withdraw its troops from the territory it has seized from the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan assumes special significance in the light of Tel-Aviv's outrageous aggressive and expansionist claims.

57. The Soviet delegation takes the view that the Security Council must do its duty in accordance with the United Nations Charter. It must take the most vigorous measures today, without any delay or procrastination, to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and lawful rights of the Arab States which are the victims of Israel's aggression.

58. We urgently call upon the members of the Council to do their duty with full awareness of their responsibility at this grave hour. In view of the situation which has developed, the Security Council cannot simply adjourn this meeting today without taking the necessary action to protect Syria.

59. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I think it is clear to all of us that tonight we meet to deal with a specific and limited problem. I am sure that we are all very conscious that we have ahead of us tasks of enormous magnitude, very great difficulty and indeed danger too. But I believe that we would all recognize that we cannot hope to make progress in dealing with those vast problems here and now.

60. Indeed, as I understand the statement of the Ambassador of Syria, he is directing our attention to a specific report which has reached him from his Government today and on which he wishes us to take immediate action; and as I understand his request, he wishes us to deal with this, and this alone, tonight. We shall have to turn our attention tomorrow, or whenever we meet again, to other questions of far greater consequence, but we need tonight to deal, and deal as promptly as possible, with a specific demand. And I believe it would be well that we should limit our attention to the request which has been put to us.

61. I would go on to say that I do not for one moment doubt the importance of the matter which has been brought to us tonight. We have worked for a week for a cease-fire. We hope that we have achieved it. Anything which jeopardized that cease-fire would be a matter of the utmost gravity. I for one—and I am sure I speak for all members of this Council—would be prepared to come here at any time of the day or night, to take action to ensure that what we have done is not frustrated or flouted.

62. Now we come to the actual report which has been made to us, which could, I entirely agree, be most serious. If the suggestion were that under cover of the cease-fire and following the cease-fire agreement there had been an advance to Sheikh Meskine and Dara and the Yarmuk, this would be a question which would require immediate and drastic action by the Security Council. But at the same time we must note what the representative of Israel has told us, that there has been no advance beyond the cease-fire line. And we must also note that the Secretary-General, through his observers on the spot, has told us what he can tell us at the moment, which does not go farther than the report we have in front of us.

63. Now, it is at the moment in that part of the world, I imagine, about dawn. It would be difficult, I suppose, to expect any further report before we conclude our meeting tonight; it would be difficult to expect the United Nations observers to give us any further account while we are still meeting.

64. Therefore, I suggest that what we can do, what we should do, and what we must do is to make absolutely clear, tonight, now, that we insist that there should be no breach whatsoever of the cease-fire. We should make it perfectly clear—we have done this before, but I think we should restate it—that if there were any breach, we in the Security Council would take the most serious and grave view of any such breach of any kind, and that we would not tolerate any advance beyond the points which were set down in the arrangements, which were made by General Bull on our behalf. I think we should make that absolutely clear and that that communication should go to those concerned immediately.

65. I should like to take this opportunity of joining the representative of France and others in expressing admiration for the work which is being done by General Bull in circumstances of confusion and danger, and the speed with which he and the representative of the United Nations on the spot have acted, and the determined attempt they have made, day and night, to bring to this Council the facts of the situation. I would hope that all of us share in a sense of pride that the representatives of the United Nations have not only achieved a cease-fire, but have quickly taken steps to ensure that it is carried out.

66. I believe that we should have no difficulty in dealing with this single and specific and highly important matter. And subject to your views, Mr. President, and those of the Council, I believe that if we were permitted a short suspension, this is an occasion when we could unanimously and by consensus come to conclusions which would be absolutely clear and absolutely definite, and which could be communicated—this seems to me very important—to General Bull and to the parties immediately concerned, as dawn nears on the approaches to Mount Carmel.

67. I would not wish, of course, to prevent other speeches if they are to be made, but I think that action is most important. I believe that if we agree on a short suspension, we might be able to take immediately the action which is clearly required, and to communicate it at once to all concerned. That is my suggestion.

68. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United Kingdom has suggested a short suspension, but has not made any formal motion.

69. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): The Council has been meeting here day after day, and night after night to discuss the serious situation now prevailing in the Middle East. Yet, in spite of all these meetings, which are being followed by the whole world, it is apparent that the Council is not reaching any decision. In my delegation's view, this means that the Council is failing in its duty, in a manner unworthy of such an important body. Unhappily, some occult force seems to be frustrating any attempt to

reach a decision here. I am bound to state, with regret, that this attitude on the part of the Council, at the moment of such gravity and in the light of the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, is not only shameful but unworthy of this United Nations organ. For too long now we have been offering the sorry spectacle of a body which is not impotent, as some would have it, but is guilty of tacit complicity in efforts to undermine the prestige of the Council and of the United Nations.

70. As the hours and the days go by, Israel, taking advantage of the surprise factor which has worked in its favour since the outbreak of hostilities, is continuing its advance into foreign territory. If the Council is waiting until Israel has established itself by force in the territories that it is conquering, so that negotiations can take place between Israel and the occupied countries, then I understand the situation and that explains or might explain the Council's unpardonable inertia.

71. As for those who insist at all costs and against all comers on maintaining their support for Israel, I wish to tell them that they are not serving the cause of peace or helping Israel by preventing the Council from taking a decision regarding the proven violation of the cease-fire decreed by the Security Council and accepted by the parties to the conflict.

72. Is it really supposed that, if Israel were now to occupy by force the territories into which it is advancing, it would remain there indefinitely? Is it really supposed that Israel would stay indefinitely in the territories which it is occupying? Surely not. Everyone here knows that the peoples over whose lands the Israel forces are advancing today, whatever their present decisions and promises, will never be able to accept this occupation by Israel as final. And if the Council were to fail now to take the necessary decision, it would be encouraging this state of affairs. Those who think that it is possible to allow Israel to occupy territories, and to give it a chance of remaining there are living in a world of illusions. Not only are they living in a world of illusions: they are accepting the fact that an atmosphere of continuous war—and I emphasize the word "continuous"—can easily be created in the Middle East.

73. It is time for the Council to come to a decision on the basis of the reports provided by the Secretary-General. By failing to make up its mind until now, on the spurious pretext that there is insufficient evidence, the Council, I am sorry to say, is making itself a laughing-stock, because it is perfectly clear from the Secretary-General's reports that Israel has violated the cease-fire.

74. My delegation demands that Israel should be condemned for its aggression and for its violation of the cease-fire. Only by so doing will the Council be able to save its prestige and that of the Organization. Let it be clearly understood that the delegation of the Republic of Mali will not associate itself with any—I repeat, "any"—resolution which attempts to place aggressor and victim on the same footing.

75. At this moment the war is continuing in the Middle East. Israel is continuing to move its troops forward into

Syrian territory and the Council remains bound and gagged. It is truly heart-rending to see the Council, at this grave hour, reduced to the position it is now taking. It is tragic that the Council, at this grave hour, is unable to come to any decision, despite the evidence contained in the various reports which the Secretary-General has made available to us.

76. I have already said that the Council is guilty of complicity, and I am unfortunately compelled to say it again. We are accomplices in a *de facto* situation. We are accomplices, and if the war continues in the Middle East we shall have been an accessory before the fact. The Council has the power to take a decision that would stop the war, restore peace and cause troops to be withdrawn to their original bases. Instead, however, since the beginning of the discussions, the Council has taken no notice of the fact that Israel's troops are occupying parts of Syria and Syrian towns, in spite of the cease-fire, and in spite of three relevant Council resolutions. We are going round in circles. There are meetings and more meetings and no decisions. The evidence is there.

77. My delegation is distressed about this situation and is not at all anxious to have on its conscience the responsibility which we are now assuming and which will be fraught with serious consequences because it means permanent, continuous war in the Middle East.

78. We have heard many arguments. We have been told that there is no evidence because the information made available came either from Syria or from Israel. But the Secretary-General's latest report contains such specific items of information regarding the cease-fire violation that, as I said the other day, the Council should already have taken a decision regarding them. But nothing was done, and I am wondering what the Council is waiting for. Why are we waiting? We come and sit here and listen to each other making speeches, the world listens to us, the world watches us, and all this time the war goes on, innocent people lose their lives, civilians, women and children are killed and foreign territory is occupied.

79. What is the Council's role to be, then? I must confess, this is all very lamentable, and still more lamentable are the underlying reasons why the Council comes to no decision. I am sorry to say it, but the situation is really deplorable.

80. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): The Security Council is meeting for the third successive time at an exceptional hour to consider the same question, namely, the flagrant and persistent violation by Israel of the Council's call for a cease-fire. I already stated two days ago that this treacherous behaviour of the Tel-Aviv authorities is a clear defiance of the Security Council and the United Nations. The persistent aggression is a serious manifestation of their contempt for the Charter and for all moral values.

81. Need I remind you, Mr. President, that yesterday and the day before the Tel-Aviv representative constantly and categorically denied facts which only a few hours later were substantiated by the impartial observers. While they claimed that Kuneitra was not occupied by the Israel forces, the factual report of the Secretary-General dis-

proved that unfounded claim. Thus they have throughout the debate deceived and maliciously misinformed the Council. It is evident, therefore, that they cannot be trusted nor can their statements before the Council be believed. But this is not strange nor should it cause any surprise, for they were based on deceit and cannot thrive except on deceit.

82. I wish to state that it is not Israel alone that bears the responsibility for these violations and for this shameful conduct. It is, in fact, the United States Government which bears the largest responsibility, for it has constantly aided, abetted, and encouraged this spoiled child of ours.

83. I also mentioned yesterday that the Council was paralysed and could not take any action against the violation by Israel because of the delaying tactics of the United States. May I be allowed to read from an article by James Reston appearing in *The New York Times* of today.

“For the moment, all the principals are covering their objectives with hypocrisy. Israel’s objective is perfectly clear. It is not trying to kill people, but it is determined to smash every enemy machine that flies or rolls or fires shells near its territory. For this it needed time—not much, but some—and it is talking at the United Nations endlessly, because every argument means a few more Syrian tanks or planes destroyed.

“The United States, likewise, is asking for a detailed and verified report on ‘the facts’ in the Israel-Syrian war, which it knows will give the Israelis time to knock out the Syrian guns and bring the last of the Arab States into line by threatening the capital of Damascus.”

These two paragraphs are self-explanatory. The antagonistic policy of the United States toward the Arab nations was not confined to assistance provided to Israel prior to and during the treacherous aggression against the Arab countries but is continuing vigorously.

84. It is ironic that the Tel-Aviv representative mentioned in a melodramatic statement that they were only two million people surrounded by several millions of Arabs. But did he forget, or evidently he does not want to admit, that behind those so-called poor two million people stand both the United States and the United Kingdom with all their military might and material wealth—and should I add, with their active participation in combat?

85. It is a strange logic indeed which was revealed yesterday in the debate by Mr. Rafael when he referred to the Israel air raid on Cairo after the cease-fire call, disclaiming its occurrence on the grounds that it was mentioned only once in the Council. Yet I wish to say that to mention the truth once is sufficient. On the other hand, no matter how many times falsehood is repeated, it does not turn into truth.

86. To conclude my brief intervention, I state again, and more vehemently, that the moment of truth has come, and it is indeed high time for the Council to take immediate action in the discharge of its primary responsibility by condemning Israel and calling on it to respect the cease-fire.

87. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The members of the Security Council, or at least

some of them—perhaps the great majority—had hoped that it would not be necessary to hold another emergency meeting of the Security Council as we have had to do this evening. Some members also supposed that, as a result of its act of aggression, Israel had already occupied so much Arab territory—more than it could hold—that it would not want to occupy more and violate the cease-fire. It seems, however, that those who did so misunderstood the character of the aggressor and international adventurer with whom the Council has to deal at this moment. In order to understand the character and nature of this international adventurer, one cannot simply base oneself on appearances, and on what is visible on the surface—these two and a half million people and the relatively small territory they inhabit; it is necessary to take into account their nature, their appetites, their actions, which are those of a determined aggressor; consequently it is a mistake to take things at face value, and merely to see this relatively small territory and the relatively small population based on it if one wishes to have a clear idea of what is at the root of this limitless violence.

88. It is important to remember that the rulers of this State, who have become the vanguard of imperialism, seem able to enjoy impunity because they are furthering the policies of certain imperialist circles in the Middle East. These well-known policies, as has long been clear, find expression in the attempts made by imperialist circles in certain Western countries, particularly in the United States of America, to halt the national liberation movement among the Arab peoples, or at least to hold it in check, to strike at the national independence of the newly liberated Arab countries, and to stamp out progressive development in the Arab countries. All this is reflected in certain draft resolutions which the United States submitted a few days ago and on which we will have an opportunity to express our views when we discuss them, as I have already said.

89. Today, at this meeting of the Security Council, we have before us a complaint from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic [S/7973] who informs us that Israel tank columns have already violated the cease-fire and are moving in a number of directions, especially towards the east, in order to occupy new territories and bring about new *faits accomplis*.

90. We have just heard the representative of Israel deny these facts. However, in spite of the limited information available, owing to the difficulties encountered by the United Nations representatives in the region, what the Secretary-General has placed before us today shows that every effort has been made in the area by Israel to prevent the truth from becoming known. We have been told, for example, that the Syrian representatives of the Mixed Armistice Commission have been arrested and that considerable difficulties are still being encountered in obtaining their release. Why? Simply because these representatives were on the spot and could have reported immediately, with all the necessary competence and knowledge, on what was occurring and could have shown the United Nations representatives there what violations had been committed by the Israel forces. The Israel authorities were doubtless very anxious that the Syrian representatives should not be there, since they have facilitated the work of those who

were trying to ascertain the facts. Why tolerate them there, when they could have seriously hindered the plans of the aggressors?

91. It is further indicated that it is difficult for the United Nations machinery to function because facilities for doing so are refused to it, and we can see this from the difficulties encountered by the representative of the Secretary-General in giving us the information we need. Even with this fragmentary information, however, we can see that what the Council has been told by the Permanent Representative of Syria is the truth, since we learn that Israel's columns are already on the move and are to be found at the points indicated by the Permanent Representative of Syria.

92. It is true that, in submitting his report, the Secretary-General explained that it was impossible to know exactly when the columns in question were at the points indicated. But movements have been observed. What is still more significant is the fact that these columns started to move towards these points after the Security Council had called for an immediate cease-fire.

93. The representative of Israel told us, several times, that it was not true that Israel's troops had occupied certain positions in spite of the declaration of a cease-fire. He denied that Kuneitra and other places had been occupied just when the United Nations had proclaimed a cease-fire. We asked a question: were Israel troops on Syrian soil or were they not? The question had to be asked several times before an answer was obtained from the representative of Israel. He said: "We are defending ourselves—we are acting in self-defence." The nature of this self-defence is such that the Israelis have been defending themselves in the air space over Damascus. No doubt it is from Damascus that villages in Israel are being bombed. These acts of self-defence were carried out from Syrian territory and against Syrian territory, and not from Israel territory.

94. I should like to point out, however, not only that the Security Council resolutions calling for an immediate cease-fire are applicable at once, and must be implemented, but that the United Nations Charter says: "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

95. In this Council, we have heard it stated several times by Israel spokesmen and the Israel authorities, including the Permanent Representative of Israel, that they had accepted the cease-fire. They laid down a small condition: not only must they be allowed to engage in self-defence, but these acts must also constitute an advance into the territory of the victims of the aggression. That is all. It is just a question of advancing into the victim's territory, the territory of the victim of aggression. What does this self-defence consist in? In military occupation which can be exploited and in advancing with the help of the surprise element created by sudden aggression. This has been repeated several times.

96. Then we were the witnesses of a comedy here. We were told that Mr. Dayan, who is in charge of the military operations, had invited the Secretary-General's representative, General Bull, to fix a cease-fire time. If you

remember, the representative of Israel told us: "They are meeting at this very moment. They are going to fix a time, but right now—there is no question of occupation. There are just some details to be arranged."

97. Later we were told that the occupation had taken place in three hours; today's occupation was announced by our colleagues from Israel. How could a large area have been occupied in three hours, since the representative of Israel, speaking here, claimed that no land had been occupied? It is strange. This is an action carried out not only in violation of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council on the question but also in violation of the Charter and of the most elementary principles of honesty in international relations.

98. Once again, we have to note here the attitude of some representatives who are always complaining that they have no information and do not know what is happening, pretending to be unaware that there is an aggressor who must be condemned; they just want to make it a question of censuring those who have violated the cease-fire. But as we have already pointed out several times, the person who violates a cease-fire is the one who refuses to stop firing after having started the firing himself. Those who defend themselves because they are under attack by those who started the firing and continue it are not violators. A man defending himself cannot be a violator. A violator is an aggressor who enters someone else's house and starts plundering it; in the present case, of course, it is taking place on an international scale.

99. With what is supposed to be supreme impartiality, certain Powers are endeavouring here to place the victim and the aggressor on an equal footing. This policy really is astonishing. On the basis of such reasoning, one can always throw the blame on those who are defending themselves and using weapons to do so, instead of on those who are the aggressors and are using weapons to commit aggression. When blame is apportioned in such a biased and inequitable way, you do not stop the aggressor and you invite him to commit further aggression in the future. Under those conditions, all international morality or international law becomes impossible. To see this, you need only read the text of the resolutions that have been submitted. It is no accident in the circumstances that some Governments have taken measures—as I pointed out the other day—to manifest their opposition with all their strength, through measures in keeping with the events which are taking place, first and foremost by breaking off their relations with Israel, as the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has done.

100. At this juncture, it is vitally important that the Security Council should take immediate action: first, it must condemn the aggression, for otherwise further acts of aggression, large or small, will be committed by those who launched the attack. Secondly, the occupation forces which have established themselves by means of aggression must be withdrawn. Thirdly, there must be a restoration of all the necessary facilities for the functioning of international organs, particularly the United Nations, thus making it possible to verify what has occurred in the region and to ensure compliance with the agreements which have been reached.

101. For our part, we fully realize that, to achieve anything and to avoid the possibility of any further cease-fire violations, the troops must be withdrawn. As long as the occupation forces are there, there will always be a possibility of violation, and not only a possibility but, I am sure, actual cease-fire violations. We certainly agree with some of the proposals that have been made for verifying what has occurred and taking immediate measures, in the case of this particular violation which has just been reported by the Permanent Representative of Syria, for an investigation, perhaps, and for a decision taken now, immediately, on the basis of the data made available or subsequently to be made available by the Secretary-General.

102. We are not opposed to a suspension of the meeting if the Council feels that this would be desirable so that we can ascertain what has happened and take immediate measures, as the United Kingdom representative has proposed. But we also feel that as long as the occupation forces remain where they are—as long as the occupation forces are in Syria, the United Arab Republic and Jordan—there will always be the possibility of violations; not only the possibility but a high probability of violations which will not allow a stable peace to be established in the region, and war will always be smouldering there.

103. We therefore consider that the Security Council should take the necessary steps to bring about the withdrawal of the troops and to enable the international organs which should be in the area to operate and to supervise the agreements which have been concluded, or which should be concluded. We therefore consider that measures could be taken immediately, but it is important that, this very evening or tomorrow, the Council should also take up the other questions which are on its agenda and come to decisions on those questions, too.

104. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): This meeting has been called at the urgent request of the Permanent Representative of Syria, who has outlined the nature of his Government's complaints and concerns at this time in clear and moderate terms. The Permanent Representative of Israel has also shown restraint in his comments in reply. My delegation expresses its appreciation to both representatives for the way in which they presented their remarks to this Council on the specific matters which led to the summoning of the Council in another emergency meeting tonight.

105. The representative of Syria asked us this evening to direct our attention to certain specific complaints which he made. I believe that we should heed that request, which was, in sum, to prevent any further aggravation of the situation. It must be quite clear to all members of the Council that troop movements into areas not occupied by those troops before the cease-fire is a very grave matter which, if proved satisfactorily by impartial witnesses, would have to be condemned by the Council.

106. It is essential in dealing with this question that we base our action firmly on impartial reports of the United Nations military observers. These reports are already

helping us to obtain a picture of the situation in the area, and I hope that further reports will provide material to us on which we can base forthright and unequivocal decisions. If necessary, as I have suggested before, the capability of UNTSO should be strengthened, and I should like to hear the views of the Secretary-General on that point.

107. If we proceed to urge upon the parties that any breach of the cease-fire is totally unacceptable, I hope we may also indicate our firm desires on two other points which seem to me of capital importance and to which the Secretary-General has also directed his attention: first, that complete freedom of movement be granted to United Nations observers by the parties concerned and second, that the United Nations headquarters in Jerusalem be restored at once to the Chief of Staff of UNTSO.

108. In conclusion, I should like to associate the Canadian delegation with the well-deserved expression of appreciation addressed by the Secretary-General to General Bull for the initiative and skill which he has shown in getting the cease-fire arrangements into operation under what are admittedly difficult conditions.

109. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): The basic question that we have to discuss this evening is that of the incident which has been brought to our notice by the representative of Syria. To this question, the Secretary-General, in United Nations Press Release SG/SM/745, has replied more by a question than by a statement, the question being whether Israel's troops arrived at Rafid before or after 4.30 p.m. on 10 June. I am in no way criticizing the Secretary-General for the reply he has given us, since he could not have replied otherwise; however, I wonder whether it would not be possible to ask General Bull to try to find out more and to investigate this matter, which is extremely serious, for the Council obviously cannot tolerate violations of the cease-fire.

110. Having said that, I would add—and I imagine that some of my colleagues share my view—that our work is rendered difficult by two factors. Firstly, we do not know, or at any rate we know very little as yet, about the positions that were held respectively by the two parties at the time of the cease-fire. Now there is no doubt at all that this information is needed, because our efforts to settle the incident we are dealing with this evening must not cause us to lose sight of the precautions which must be taken in the days to come.

111. Secondly, the United Nations observers—General Bull's observers—who alone are qualified to determine whether the cease-fire has been violated, do not yet possess all the necessary facilities for observing, travelling about and communicating, as indeed the Secretary-General told us in his report, and on this point I endorse the remarks of my colleague the representative of Canada.

112. Can we therefore ask, as General Bull requests, that his work should be facilitated to the greatest possible extent in order to avoid further incidents which might prove serious? In this connexion, it seems to me most desirable, in particular, that we should endorse the urgent request made by the Secretary-General in document

S/7930/Add.3, circulated this evening, that Government House should be handed back to General Bull's observers.

113. Lastly, I should also like to say that we support the Secretary-General's requests that General Bull's good offices should be made available to facilitate exchanges of prisoners.

114. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I am becoming more and more convinced that if we are to have an effective cease-fire on the ground—a cease-fire which both Syria and Israel have agreed to—we will first have to agree upon a cease-fire of words in this Council.

115. The representative of Syria, in presenting his complaint that an Israel tank column had moved to new positions, asked the members of the Council to confine themselves to this particular issue and to act upon it urgently. In the spirit of his request, I shall confine my remarks to what he has said. With reference to the accusations that have been made against my Government I would point out that I have already spoken about them at length, and I shall, by reference, again incorporate them into these remarks.

116. I wish to say specifically and clearly at the outset that it is the view of my Government that there should be no forward movement of troops beyond the positions held at the effective time of the cease-fire agreed upon with General Bull, that is 1630 hours GMT, 10 June.

117. We have before us the contention of the Syrian Government, through its Ambassador, Mr. Tomeh, that such movements have taken place. The representative of Israel, Ambassador Rafael, has denied any movements beyond the positions held at the time of the cease-fire and affirmed his Government's intentions to respect the situation prevailing at that time.

118. The United Nations observers have reported tank units in Rafid and a column in movement nearby. The Secretary-General has informed the Council that the key question is whether these were taking place in areas controlled by Israel as of the time of the cease-fire, and that he is urgently seeking clarification.

119. We concur that it is urgent to get more information. However, the Council need not wait to make it clear, in whatever form may be most appropriate, that any forward movement of troops beyond positions held at 1630 hours GMT on 10 June is simply not acceptable, and that if any such movements have been made, the units must be returned to the positions prevailing at that time.

120. It is also clear from the report of the Secretary-General, as has been mentioned by some of our colleagues—Ambassador Seydoux and Ambassador Ignatieff—that United Nations observers have experienced difficulties in their efforts to assure observance of the cease-fire, and that the United Nations is still experiencing communication difficulties. This is also apparent from the Secretary-General's reports. Obviously, freedom of movement and adequate communications are necessary so that the Council may be fully and accurately informed of the situation and

so that the work of the observers may be effective. Both Governments should co-operate fully in this task and appropriate instructions should be issued to all military commanders at all levels to have this done. And they should be issued immediately, so that the United Nations can perform its very necessary work, work which both parties have entrusted to the United Nations, that is the implementation of the cease-fire.

121. We have this urgent business to do. It seems to me that we can do it, and we ought to do it unanimously. What we have approved in General Bull's arrangement contemplates that there should be no further troop movements. We ought to say so and we ought to say so in plain and unmistakable terms. By doing so, we would be rendering a contribution in the situation. As our colleague Lord Caradon and others also have said, this does not mean that we shall not have to deal with other grave questions. We are at the beginning of our efforts to resolve this conflict. But let me say this: it is not to be assumed that the United Nations has not already made a substantial contribution in this situation. Under United Nations auspices a cease-fire has been arranged, and a cease-fire on several fronts. We do have problems in connexion with the cease-fire, one of which has urgently been called to our attention tonight, and in the exercise of our responsibilities we ought to act quickly and expeditiously to deal with that particular problem. My Government is prepared to do so.

122. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. As the Security Council table has already been filled as a result of invitations extended to four representatives, the representative of Jordan has very kindly indicated his willingness to withdraw temporarily from his seat at the Council table while the representative of Saudi Arabia makes his intervention. I appreciate this gesture of the representative of Jordan and I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

123. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I believe, with all due respect to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council, that time is being wasted here while aggression is proceeding against the Arab world. Let no one for a moment think that, because the Arab world is constituted of States, it is not one in purpose and does not have the same goals. I will elaborate on this statement lest you think that I am just engaging in diatribe.

124. I cautioned the Security Council last fall; I said incidents would recur and aggression would proceed. I do not have to repeat word for word what I said. The record speaks for itself. However, I must make it clear that Saudi Arabia considers the establishment of the State of Israel as a new crusade. The Crusade that started in the eleventh century was beaten off after a lot of suffering and tribulation. The motivation was religious. Peter the Hermit was the propagandist of those days. Pope Urban II said, "Why are you killing each other?", to the vassals of those days. "Go and wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the infidel."

125. Religion has lost its grip in the twentieth century. Christian theologians say "God is dead". There has to be another motivation. The motivation of the West was to play

up something new. The West is having a new crusade by proxy through the establishment of the Zionist State amongst us. Remember that the late Herzl was a European and not an oriental Jew. The whole incursion in the Arab world is a Western incursion. And we here deal with incidents. This is a major aggression, but it is a link in the long chain of aggressions, a series of aggressions.

126. I do not have to go into the religious argument or the historical argument or the humanitarian argument. I covered those last fall during my three interventions. But I must say that Jerusalem is holy and Bethlehem is holy to Christianity and Islam, perhaps more so than to Judaism. It was in Bethlehem that the Prince of Peace was born. It was in Jerusalem that the Prince of Peace was crucified. And the information media in the Western world used these opiates: Oecumenical Councils, rapprochement between Jews and Christians so that a Zionist State, a European State should be established in our midst. Remember that Jerusalem is holy to the whole Christian world and it is not less holy to the Moslem world. After Mecca and Medina comes Jerusalem. Do you for a moment believe that the Moslem world, consisting of 600 million persons, would agree to go to the Mosque of Omar through Zionist-held territory? No, sir. They will become emotional in the Moslem world, and then the population will have to be met with arms. The seeds of the third world war are being sown now. Why? Because by proxy the Western world is having a new incursion, sowing a new colonialism in our midst.

127. With all due respect, these meetings which you have been holding, even in my absence, are tantamount to filibustering while the Holy Land is being torn by strife and by war. Why does not the West leave us alone? What have we done to the West? When Hitler occupied France, the illustrious General de Gaulle did not accept the *fait accompli*.

128. I have just come from Europe. I know what the information media have done in Europe. I am not going to talk theoretically and in abstract terms. I was in Geneva only last week. There was an American and another gentleman of the Jewish faith; he might not have been a Zionist, I do not know. They saluted me, and I saluted them. The American said: "Have you finished chopping off those bastards, the Arabs." They did not know I was an Arab. They thought Arabs were barbarians. The other gentleman said, "They shall be a door-mat under our feet." I restrained myself. I did not want to make a scene. Then the American, who was a Vice-President of one of the biggest banks in this country, turned to me and said: "What do you think of this struggle?" I said, "Well, start chopping me off. I am an Arab." He said, "Oh, don't get emotional." I said, "No, I won't get emotional. You are cold-blooded, the descendant of ancestors who chopped down the red Indians in cold blood. No, I won't." To the other gentleman, I said, "I thought you were civilized. Door-mats are to be purchased in department stores; they are not human beings. Where is your humanity? You said you suffered at the hands of the Nazis."

129. None other than my erstwhile Iraqi colleague, Mrs. Afnan, was sitting in a bus in Switzerland, which is supposed to be neutral. This shows you how even the

Europeans have been brainwashed by Zionism. "Those barbarians, those Arabs"—two ladies were exchanging views—"they want to kill those helpless"—how helpless they were—"Israelis. Isn't that a shame?" And then they looked at her and said, "Why don't you comment?" She said, "Do I look like a barbarian? I am an Arab." "Shame on you," they said.

130. Why did I mention those two incidents? To show the mood of the West against our people, who gave them the alphabet. During the Crusades the West was made up of barbarians, real barbarians then. Richard the Lion-Hearted was imprisoned twice by Saladin the Chivalrous. And twice he was released on condition that he would not fight against the Arabs, and twice the Lion-Hearted was treacherous.

131. What have we done to you since the Crusades? What have we done, Lord Caradon? You know our land. What have we done to the British or to the French or to the Americans? Why don't you leave us alone?

132. On the religious argument—well, there are 900 million or a billion Christians. Why don't they say, "Jerusalem and the Holy Land should be ours". There are 600 million Moslems. If this is a religious argument, why don't they say, "The Holy Land should be ours". No, because the Western world has been worshipping Mammon, and you cannot worship Mammon and God at the same time. God is dead, erstwhile Christian theologians are saying that there is no more God. You Western Powers, whom do you think you are fooling at this table? Showing your teeth, smiling at us in the corridors: "When you see the lion bare his fangs, do not think he is smiling at you."

133. Do not devour us. They are devouring us; they are killing us there. You want me to act with decorum, to exchange legal niceties with you. Legal niceties on what? Based on what? The poor Secretary-General comes here and says that General Odd Bull says this and that. At this Greenwich Time he was here and there. But this is not the question. The fact is that this is an incursion in the midst of our land.

134. We have no quarrels with the Jews as such. We have told you that time and again. They are our brothers. I said they are not our cousins but our brothers. However, the Zionists were Jews of Europe, most of them converted into Judaism in southern Russia. And we are quibbling here, quibbling. On what? On cease-fire. Like Nero singing while Rome was burning. This is tantamount to filibustering: incursion into our homeland.

135. Again, I must not speak in abstract terms. Why should I speak in abstract terms when we have the facts, from none other than Mr. Rusk, who briefed various legislators the other day. I read it. It could not have been invented. There were two Senators, one of them from New Jersey. I think his name is Senator Case. He said: Mr. Rusk is happy about all that has happened. Mr. Morton of Kentucky said: It is a victory for the West. And then there is none other than the upstart Mr. Robert Kennedy; the upstart, the son of the whiskey merchant. He said: "Our commitment to Israel is clear and must be clear." I am

quoting him. The Senator praised Israel as the "tiny outpost of Western culture".

136. Why should we have Western culture in our midst? Are we trying to establish by force of arms Arab culture in your midst? He wants Western culture just because his money was made in whiskey or on the stock exchange, or by pools. Mr. Roosevelt appointed him.

137. I have to say that. They are slaying our men—the upstarts, the Rockefellers and the Kennedys and the legislators who support the Zionists. Who do they think they are? Just because they have money, can they get away with murder? They are not murdering themselves, but they are murdering us by proxy. I knew the father of Governor Rockefeller. I met him here. He was a gentleman. But how did the grandfather make his money? And they talk about our Cadillacs and our palaces. What about their trust funds, their ranches in Venezuela, their money scattered all over the world, in Switzerland? Let them clean their mouth before they talk about us, the upstarts. Just because you are affluent here, just because you have power, you can get away with murder. Yes, you are getting away with murder. Chop up—as this American of the Bankers Trust said; I am mentioning the Bank where he came from—chop up 100 million Arabs; let them be door-mats.

138. And we are quibbling here about a cease-fire, with diatribes. Baroody lost his temper. No, Sir, I am cool and collected. This is my way of presenting the case to the Security Council—not with the legal niceties.

139. And then when it suits certain Western Powers, they say that the territorial integrity of the Middle East should be respected. And they show off might with fleets and planes over the Mediterranean. Poor Mediterranean. They are there in the Mediterranean sky and in the Mediterranean waters. Poor Mussolini, when he said *mare nostrum*. Poor Mussolini. It is not Italian, it is not Arabic any more; it is not French any more. The Mediterranean is an American sea where the Sixth Fleet parades and Americans flex their muscles.

140. Do you think it is easy for me to say this? I love this country. I love its people. But they are sheep, like all people everywhere: brain-washed, machines, vote-buying. Mr. Kennedy wants to interfere with our institutions. It is all here in *The New York Times*. This is only a sample. Every day legislators are criticizing us, calling us slave-traders.

141. What about their white slaves? What about their narcotics? What about their promiscuity? Let them have their mini-skirts and hot dogs. We do not want that kind of civilization. They can have their mini-skirts and hot dogs. This is what Kennedy said in *The New York Times*, that they are introducing civilization to us, the Arabs, who have had 6,000 years of history. What we need is not the veil, but bikinis—the other extreme—and hot dogs. Well, they can have them. This is their civilization and culture, because they have computers and gadgets, and they have bath tubs, running water and plumbing. This is their culture. The culture is of the spirit, Sir. I am talking to the President too.

142. What happened to South West Africa is happening to the Arab world. When it suits the national or the economic interests of the Western Powers, they go to the Congo and chop the men of the Congo. But nobody goes to Rhodesia, nobody goes to the Arab world, nobody stops the Zionists. It suits them. Divide and rule. They say: Oh, those Arabs. Faisal might be on good terms with Nasser. We saw how Hussein was on good terms with Nasser. Of course, they would be on good terms. They are Arabs. Blood is thicker than water. They say: Oh, we have oil interests. Let us keep with them on oil. But this policy will boomerang; it will backfire; it will not get anybody anywhere. It will create anarchy. It will create riot. It will destroy us. It will destroy Western interests, all kinds of interests.

143. The Secretary-General scurried to the Middle East. Why? I am sure I am not giving him away. He did not scurry to Viet-Nam; he went to his country. Because he knows the Zionists are like a cancer in the body politic of every Western Power. They might engulf the whole world in a third world war. That is why the Secretary-General scurried to Egypt. He did not scurry to Viet-Nam, although he has been warning us about Viet-Nam. I am not speaking for the Secretary-General. Why? Because he knows what the Rothschilds do; they gave £1 million. I laughed. I read all the London papers before I came here. It was £1 million or £2 million, but not a penny goes to the Arab refugees. And here in Madison Square Garden something was going on. I came late here and on the way I saw a commotion. I said, "what is that?" They said it was for Israel. I happened to be there. And the Arabs? Their land is being occupied. There is a cease-fire and we are quibbling as to whether they are ten miles inside or seventeen, or about Greenwich Time or New York Time. This is something which is ludicrous.

144. I come to the substance of what is before us, and if I have hurt any of my colleagues around this table, I apologize, because there is nothing personal in this. There is something here that goes to the core of the Arab world. There is nothing personal about it. I am a monarchist, everybody knows that, and here is a communist, Mr. Fedorenko. Is it not paradoxical that a communist—oh, they say, of course, he is currying favour with the Arab world, the Russians are doing that. Here it says in a draft resolution of 8 June 1967 of the Soviet Union:

"2. *Demands* that Israel should immediately halt its military activities against neighbouring Arab States and should remove all its troops from the territory of those States and withdraw them behind the armistice lines and respect the status of the demilitarized zones, as prescribed in the General Armistice Agreements." [S/7951/Rev.1.]

145. Mr. Fedorenko is currying favour with the Arabs because he is being just to the Arabs. I was in Europe, mind you, in Western Europe, Not Eastern Europe, and I opened my ears wide. I am not going to say what countries of Western Europe I was in lest it become embarrassing. And I was told on high authority that if the Israelis had met with any reverse the integrity of Israel would have been preserved by intervention of Western naval forces and aircraft. This was made plain to me. In other words, you had better, Arabs, be beaten, because if ever Israel meets

with reverses, we will beat you after the Western intervention. They said no, no, you stay quiet. But the Arabs are under-developed—and there is nothing wrong with being under-developed. I think at one time they were highly developed, they had guns, they were corrupt with power when they were an empire, otherwise they would not have dissolved. We had our heyday; we know what empire is from our history; there is nothing which is happening to the world today that has not happened to others before in the trappings of power. No, nobody will touch Israel if she is the victor but if she is defeated, then they crush us.

146. Time and again I have said we never had a quarrel with the Jew, there was no anti-Judaism amongst us. Incidentally, there is no such thing as anti-Semitism. This is a misnomer. We are the majority of the Semites in the world today, the Arabs are. There is anti-Judaism, which is deplorable. It started in Central Europe during relatively modern times. We deplored it because, after all, we do not consider a Jew as a barbarian, as some of the Zionists call us barbarians.

147. This is a dark cloud in our clear sky of the Arab East. We have seen many dark clouds before. It will be dissipated. But it is a shame that in the era of the United Nations it should be dissipated by force of arms.

148. What are you going to do, Mr. President, with the honourable members of the Council, with all due respect to you? Are you going to adopt this draft resolution of the Soviet Union, the communist State? I remember, I am an old-timer here in the United Nations, that anyone who talked to a communist became a fellow-traveller and a bedfellow; you were stigmatized. But now things are different. The Soviet Union comes with a resolution which tries to help matters. No, the source is communist. Well, I am a monarchist, but I must say that his resolution is logical, it is humanitarian, and it sets everything as it was, with no deceit and duplicity. The trouble with the Arabs is, inasmuch as they are human as others, that they did not know how to deceive or engage in duplicity, because they talked too much. They were saying, "We will do this"; it was all in the Arab hyperbole, while the others had the European system of discipline. And the victor in any war should be ashamed of himself. You cannot crush the one who is defeated. You can kill him but you cannot crush his spirit if he survives, and the bitterness and the rancour which I deplore and which I have been fighting in the United Nations for twenty years in the Third Committee—this is what pains me—will come with a resurgence in the Arab world. Because, after all, the Arabs are human. There is the rancour, the vengeance. If the Zionists, who are European, said that they wanted to cry on the wall, why should not the Arabs cry for not 2,000 years but 4,000 years if the world survives a holocaust?

149. I am sure that the Soviet Union did not enter with perhaps a stronger hand because they wanted to preserve the peace, because the Zionists would have plunged the West into a third world war everywhere. You remember what happened in Argentina. The Zionists abducted Eichman. No doubt Eichman was a criminal. Everybody saluted them. Argentina said that this was illegal. Who is Argentina? Who is the Arab world? The Zionists claim

that they are the chosen people of God. But that type of God discriminates. What type of God is this that discriminates? What is better than to say that God is dead altogether, as some of them say today?

150. I have a lot to say but I will not keep this Council any longer. I think its energy has been taxed, with all due respect to every member of it, as human beings. To everyone sitting around this table, without exception, I would like to sound a warning, and I think I am entitled to sound that warning because I have been seized with this Palestine question since I was fourteen, in 1920. I should know a little about the temperament and the mood of the Arab world; I am part of it, and I am trying to be objective and altogether put aside my subjectivity as an Arab. Hatred and rancour will be intensified if this draft resolution of the Soviet Union is not adopted and the Zionists do not go back to where they were.

151. The fruits of victory will be bitter indeed, and might also create so much anarchy before, perhaps, the world comes to an end—anarchy which we would deplore, which the Jews who are not Zionists would deplore. As I said, the Jews who were in Yemen were Arabs. The Arabs, to the Chaldees, were the Semites—not the Jews who came, such as the Khazars, who were converted ten centuries ago. They claim they descended from Abraham. We are the descendants of Abraham; Abraham is lost in the myth of history. It is all in the Bible; we do not have to recite the Bible here. I think I quoted chapter and verse many times here in the United Nations.

152. There is the historical argument of "I was there." Therefore, why should not the Red Indians take Manhattan? They were here. They will return the \$24 they paid for it, with compound interest. What those western Zionists have done to us is exactly what the Americans did to those Red Indians. They live in reservations, and the Arab refugees live in tents. What is the difference? Of course, here the standard of living is higher. The poor Arab refugees are given only 7 cents a day to live on; I pay 10 cents to buy *The New York Times*, which has a monopoly on the news now—and 7 cents for the refugee.

153. We are quibbling here. Where is conscience? Where is Christianity? Where is charity? Or is it a ritual only? These are Christian countries, the Western countries. Where is Micah in Judaism—to walk humbly with thy Lord? Where is it? It is in the Bible only; it is not being practised.

154. Democracy? We have been told about democracy so much. I witnessed it. It has been reduced to a husk; the kernel has been devoured by abuse.

155. Do not sell us your wares, West. We will not sell you our ideals. Leave us alone. For heaven's sake, leave Asia alone; leave Africa alone. We will trade with you; we will have cultural exchanges with you; we will live like human beings with you. But do not come and extend this crusade into our midst. I thought the crusade was something of the past. Now it is another crusade, by proxy.

156. Do not expect the Moslem world—and we have Christians in my part of the world, remember—to have to

pass through Zionist territory in order to get to Jerusalem? Is it a monopoly of one faith? Where is the pride of the Western world? Mammon: Do not worship two gods—a god and Mammon. Worship one and leave the other; you cannot worship them both.

157. I am unorthodox in this intervention, for I think you must be tired of repeating to one another longitudes and latitudes, Greenwich time and New York time. It gets us nowhere. I am not talking over your heads here, gentlemen; I am talking to your conscience; not to your legal sense, but rather to your sentiment, if it can be aroused. There is nothing wrong with sentiment. Do you want us to live in peace with you? Treat us like worthy human beings who have a history, who have a background, and forget that we are Arabs. We are human beings. Treat the Africans, the small States, honourably. Do not prevaricate and rationalize and find excuses, as you have done in the Fifth Special Session of the General Assembly. God has given us minds like you have. This is not our era; it is the era of the United States, of the Soviet Union, and of emerging China. We have had our heyday; we do not want to have the heyday in power. But you are repeating the pattern of power which brought empires down. But, this time, with nuclear weapons, you will bring down the whole of mankind.

158. Leave us alone; we have had enough suffering. We have produced prophets whom you heed only in your places of worship because we have suffered a lot. Do not increase our suffering. Do two world wars mean anything to you? We have had two world wars in our lifetime. Do you want a third world war? When it suits a country, it rationalizes a war; when it does not suit it, it finds all manner of excuses not to raise a finger, as is the case now.

159. Our American friends—I am not saying they should or should not have, but they have gone to Viet-Nam. Why? It suits them.

160. Now it does not suit them, it seems to me, to tell the Zionists: "Go back to where you were", as our Soviet colleague is asking them to do. Why should the Americans go to Viet-Nam? To fight against communism? Whom do they think they are fooling? They are sitting here with communists; we are sitting here with communists. It is to their national interest to do so. But their interest in the Middle East is to divide and rule.

161. That policy has backfired; it has boomeranged. I have been telling you time and again, the United States has gone into Viet-Nam, saying, "We want to stop communism." But the Asian countries are no longer fooled. There are national interests there. The United States is afraid of Chinese expansion. But if the western Zionists go into our midst, the United States says, "You Arabs, we warn you, we are going to guarantee your territorial integrity", and, "You, Israel, we want to guarantee your territorial integrity." And then they whisper into Israel's ear, "Do not worry; we have our naval forces and aircraft in the area." And the Israelis say, "Oh, we can do it alone." They did it alone; I do not know how they did it alone. I do not think it is an honour for one to develop the implements of war. Where is Gandhi? If he were here living with us today, what would he have said?

162. The Deputy High Commissioner of India told me how the British came with their trains—I do not remember the locality, but there was a Gandhiist, may he rest in peace, and they laid him out across the rails, and the captain said to the engineer: "Go; proceed." He did not budge. They became angry at the captain. The Deputy High Commissioner of India told me that story in the thirties in London.

163. Finally the captain went stark mad and they had to send him to an asylum. The British soldiers rebelled. They whom the gods wish to destroy they first make strong. Do not take pride in your strength, you Western super-Powers. The ancient Greeks had a word for it: those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make strong. Do not get drunk with your affluence and your might. Smile, laugh, you American friends. We boil inside and you take it with a smile. If thou seest the fangs of a lion prominent, do not for a moment think that the lion is smiling.

164. The PRESIDENT: I will ask the representative of Jordan to resume his place and I wish to thank him once again for his gesture.

165. May I point out to all members participating in this debate that we have convened here tonight to discuss a concrete problem which is considered very urgent by the representative of Syria. In order to expedite our work, I would ask all representatives as far as possible to concentrate on the problem raised by the representative of Syria.

166. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): It gives me great pleasure to associate myself with what the representatives of the United Kingdom and Canada had to say about General Bull. Some of us who have had some experience of functioning in similar circumstances can specially appreciate his difficulties. We commend his sense of dedication and his untiring efforts to restore peace. In making his task less difficult, the Council should insist on providing him with all the facilities that he has asked for, particularly the restoration of his headquarters in Government House in Jerusalem.

167. I think that perhaps the Council is functioning at a disadvantage in having to meet night and day. It seems to me that we are apt to become bemused and the clear issues of persistent defiance of our resolutions and the stopping of further fighting have become obscured by arguments on single specific charges as they are raised at each meeting.

168. Are we to forget that we ordered the parties to stop fighting at 2000 hours GMT on 7 June? That was accepted by all the parties concerned by 8 June. But it was not observed. Last night we discussed violations of that deadline: the Israel bombing of the Damascus area and the advance of Israel forces deep into Syrian territory, including the occupation of Kuneitra.

169. We were informed yesterday of an Israel-Syrian agreement to stop fighting by 1630 hours GMT on 10 June, as arranged by General Bull. Today we are discussing a violation of this latest deadline with regard to the cease-fire, and we will probably proceed to issue another order to

cease-fire at a new time to be fixed. Meanwhile, Israel forces are not only in Rafid, but their tanks have also been seen south of the town and some are heading eastward.

170. Are we to meet again tomorrow to order another cease-fire? Are we to offer a series of cease-fires as Israel forces advance?

171. It is crystal clear what Israel wants. That has been stated categorically by the Minister of Defence, General Dayan. He wants to maintain his positions in the Suez area, in the Gulf of Aqaba, in Jerusalem, on the west bank of the Jordan and the heights on the Syrian borders so as to bargain from a position of strength. Israel's short-term aims have been succinctly stated by Mr. James Reston in *The New York Times* article which the representative of the United Arab Republic read out a little while ago.

172. What is the Council to do in these circumstances? Certainly we should meet our Syrian colleague's demands that no further deterioration should be allowed to take place and no more Syrian territory should be occupied. But I submit that we shall have to take more far-reaching steps, the most important of which would be to order an immediate withdrawal of all forces to the positions they occupied on 4 June 1967. Unless we take that step immediately, we shall be faced every day with situations like the ones we have had to deal with in the last few days. In view of this portent, I shall repeat again what I said in my statement last Friday:

"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 inalienable rights of the Arab people." [1352nd meeting, para. 102.]

173. I would earnestly urge the Council to ponder again over this four-point programme carefully and consider the desirability of taking a decision on these lines.

174. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The hour is late and I want to be very brief. Several times in the course of this debate I have pointed out that under the Charter of the United Nations it is not permissible to intervene in the domestic affairs of any country. That certainly encompasses comments upon personalities in our country who are in public life but who are not in the

Executive Branch of the Government making the foreign policy of the country. The country's policies are certainly the subject of legitimate debate in the Council, but what are impermissible are comments and characterizations of public and private figures in our life. That is not compatible, in my opinion, with the spirit and language of the Charter.

175. Mr. IYALLA (Nigeria): It is true that we are meeting on this occasion to consider one specific matter raised by the representative of Syria, and under normal circumstances the Council should address itself to that specific complaint. It is also true, however, that the sequence of the meetings to consider one specific complaint on each occasion is becoming habitual. Therefore the Council should, in the opinion of my delegation, consider taking such action or such steps as would ensure that the cease-fire orders and resolutions already adopted are respected. Normally, having arranged a cease-fire and the cease-fire having been accepted by the parties concerned, the Council should now proceed to the more important questions regarding the re-establishment of peace in the area, beginning principally with the withdrawal of forces to the positions they occupied before the hostilities broke out. This is clear. If, however, this is to be prevented by an endless succession of incidents generating an equally endless succession of meetings of the Security Council at all hours of the day and night, then we would never get to the substantial issues.

176. A cease-fire, as we understand it, must mean that the guns must be silenced and that the troop movements must be halted wherever they are. Any attempt to gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation must therefore be deplored. We are very pleased to learn that the Syrian members of the Mixed Armistice Commission have now been released, and we trust that they will in the future be enabled either by identifying themselves or through any other means to join in the work of the United Nations organ which is working under very difficult conditions.

177. I have one last point. In the course of the debate this evening, a new phrase has gradually come into circulation, that is the phrase "cease-fire line". Lest it be accepted merely by default, let me say, for my delegation at least, that we do not understand that there is a cease-fire line. There are the armistice lines. There is the cease-fire order which means that troops should stay where they are and that any movement, north, south, east or west, except such movement as to return from the scene of battle to one's own home ground, is a violation of the cease-fire.

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

179. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I have listened with great interest and attention to all the interventions that have been made so far. It does seem to me that there is a point which needs further clarification. I say this because during the discussion I was convinced that there was some confusion which ought to be clarified.

180. Let me start with our complaint which was contained in my letter to you [S/7973], Mr. President, and which was formulated by the supplementary information received by

the Secretary-General, document S/7930/Add.3; in paragraph 6 of that document, our complaint has been formulated as follows:

“At 1800 hours local time a column of Israel tanks and supporting elements including airplanes and helicopters moved out of Rafid eastward and southward in the direction of Naoua and other localities where no fighting had heretofore taken place.”

181. Now while I am making my remarks, I respectfully request the members of the Security Council to look at the map, starting with Rafid, and to keep our complaint in mind. Confusion has arisen regarding the decision to be taken by the Council on the question of our complaint that a column of Israel tanks and supporting elements including airplanes and helicopters moved out of Rafid eastward and southward in the direction of Naoua. I must immediately say that, since I am going to refer to the question by the Secretary-General, I do not mean in any way to imply any questioning of the Secretary-General, but, the question put by him in his second oral report to the Council [*Press Release SG/SM/745*] states:

“The key point in connexion with observance of the cease-fire is the question of whether the Israel troops were in Rafid and environs before 1630 hours GMT on 10 June, or whether they have advanced to that sector after the time fixed for the cease-fire to go into effect.”

182. There are two questions involved here. The first question is the occupation of Rafid. Was it before or after the cease-fire? The second question, which is the subject of my complaint today, is the advance of a column of Israel tanks and supporting elements out of Rafid eastward and southward. Now when that complaint was submitted to Mr. Sasson, he said that there was no advance anywhere on the front, that the allegation was completely baseless. Then we heard from Mr. Rafael when he made his statement tonight that the movement was within the truce line. But I am very grateful to the representative of Nigeria, because he really put the dots on the i's—as it is said in French: “*Mettre les points sur les i*”—when he said that the troops should be halted wherever they are after the cease-fire. Our contention is that Israel tanks and a column of armoured cars, as formulated in the document submitted by the Secretary-General, moved out of Rafid. We contend that that is a violation of the cease-fire.

183. This is the second complaint. This should not prejudice in any way the complaint which we put forward yesterday, that Rafid was occupied after the cease-fire.

184. But again I say that the question now is the matter of the troops that went out of Rafid in an eastward and southward direction toward Naoua and other localities where no fighting had previously taken place. I hope that this should be quite clear in the minds of the members of the Security Council when they pronounce themselves on the complaint which I submitted tonight.

185. Before finishing my remarks, there are two other points I should like to raise. First, in the report of the Secretary-General [*S/7930/Add.3*], to which the attention

of the Council is now directed, in paragraph 7 it states that Syrian liaison officers, working with the United Nations military observers, had been taken, but later were released. Since we are co-operating with the United Nations in carrying out its functions and objectives in accordance with the cease-fire resolution, we urge that no such violations occur again.

186. My last point is this. In the second oral report of the Secretary-General to the Council on 11 June [*Press release SG/SM/745*] reference is made to the following point: “At Rafid the road was blocked by the Israel Defence Force.” Now, when we know that Rafid is deep inside Syrian territory, what is described here as the “Israel Defence Force” is not at all a defence force; it is an aggressive force in the territory of a Member State. Therefore, although the Tel-Aviv authorities refer to their forces as the “Israel Defence Force”, it is clear from this that these forces are aggressive, since they are present on the territory of a Member State as the result of conquest and invasion.

187. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. Perhaps, if the representative of Jordan agrees, he could have the same arrangement. I would ask the representative of Saudi Arabia then to take the place reserved for him at the Council table.

188. I now invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

189. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If I have asked for the floor, it is to exercise the right of reply, given me by the courtesy of the Council, to none other than my good friend Ambassador Goldberg. I wish I had been here to know exactly what he said before. It was reported to me after I stepped outside, and I checked it with three different sources, that he took exception to my having touched upon the character or the pronouncements or the declarations—of course I am paraphrasing—of those who are not responsible for shaping the policy of the United States Government. In other words, it would be like interfering in the domestic affairs of another State Member, and I understand that he took exception to what he thought I had said.

190. I should like to draw the kind attention of my friend, Mr. Goldberg, to the fact that there are congressional committees and senatorial committees that, to a large extent, influence and shape the policy of the United States Government. There is the Foreign Relations Committee, the Budgetary Committee—all kinds of committees. I know a little about the structure of the United States Government, having lived here long enough. But we must not lose sight of the fact that this is a democratic country that uses the information media for influencing the voters. So, by virtue of the system and the media that they use, the Senators and the Congressmen, although they may not be members of the Government, do influence the voters to support the Government:

191. Then, Mr. Rusk and the two Senators, Mr. Case and Mr. Morse. Mr. Rusk, of course is a man of great experience. He is circumspect. He does not have to say, “Thank God for Mr. Case and Mr. Morse”, to tell us what is going

on inside Mr. Rusk's head. They let the cat out of the bag. Here they do let many cats out of many bags in this country, fortunately for us. But we have no power. We can only adduce what others say and bring to the attention of none other than our good friend Mr. Goldberg what goes on, instead of keeping it to ourselves. And we do know what is going on.

192. I meant no harm. But I must say, we ourselves are greatly hurt. We do not wish others to be hurt, but we are greatly hurt, the Arab people. I reflect the mood of the Arab people. We know that most Western countries are not with us. How do we know it? I have been living in the West, on and off, for forty years. I have two ears and I have eyes. I listen, and I scan not only the papers, but the pronouncements and parliamentary proceedings. I have been reading all the proceedings in Parliament and Congress, and I am quoting what I come across.

193. But I did not mean to assassinate the character of anyone. However, what I said is true. You might say, well, we should play the game here. But I am tired of playing the game, this kind of game which is getting us nowhere. I want the American people to know that I have replied to Senator Kennedy, or to Mr. Rockefeller for that matter. It shows you this is your system. Leave us alone.

194. Here [*indicating photograph*], this is Mr. Rockefeller. I showed this to my King. That is a synagogue. He is a Christian, but he puts on the skull cap, he puts on the garb. Mr. Robert Kennedy goes to the synagogue facing Mr. Fedorenko's mission—just to catch votes. Votes. And we should keep silent. They are no more Jews than you and I, Mr. Goldberg, are Buddhists. They are Christians. This is in the papers, and these are responsible people. Both of them might become President of the United States. Both of them are potential candidates for the Presidency of the United States, one a Republican and one a Democrat. And this is what the Arab world has to contend with. And the Zionists—they support them here. I think that the Zionists are clever—not the Zionists, the Jews. But the Arabs are clever, too. They know this. They know they are vote-catchers. But at whose expense? At our expense.

195. If the American Government is playing a game with us, we have no quarrel. We used to say in the Arab world: "God in Heaven and the Americans on earth." That was in my youth when they had ideals. Now, what has supplemented those ideals? Mammon, business. And we, ourselves, are being contaminated by business. Everything is business and money, the mighty dollar or the mighty rial or whatever currency one uses—I do not know about the ruble.

196. The PRESIDENT: I must appeal to all members. The hour is very, very late. A concrete matter has been brought before this Council. I would ask everyone participating in this debate to concentrate on the case brought before the Council tonight by the representative of Syria. He requested an urgent meeting in order to discuss the grave situation concerning the tank column and to take the necessary action with a view to putting an end to this quickly deteriorating situation. As was rightly said by the

representative of Nigeria, we also have, of course, every right to speak on all questions related to compliance with our resolutions concerning the cease-fire. But we should try to concentrate on those points tonight.

197. I call on the representative of Israel.

198. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I shall be very brief and confine myself to the matter for which the Council was convened. In any case, the representative of Saudi Arabia has fully briefed all of us on all questions of religion, race and theology, and other irrelevancies. I shall deal now with the matter for which the Council was called into urgent session.

199. Before dealing with that specific question, I just want to clarify one point for the benefit of the representative of Bulgaria. I may have misunderstood him. He spoke about the United Nations personnel that were apprehended or arrested and later released. I want to make it clear that these were Syrian officers attached to the Mixed Armistice Commission, acting as liaison officers or representatives of the Mixed Armistice Commission. In any case, these Syrian officers have been released and the problem does not exist any more.

200. I just want to bring to the attention of the Council the following fact—that we have not found any confirmation in any of the dispatches of General Bull that Israel forces have advanced beyond the front line established yesterday at the time the cease-fire came into effect. That is clearly borne out in Press Release SG/SM/745, because in the last two paragraphs it is stated:

"It should be kept in mind that the United Nations observers were not in that area on 10 June and could not proceed there until the morning of 11 June. Their report, therefore, is unavoidably limited to their observation on 11 June

"The key point in connexion with observance of the cease-fire is the question of whether the Israel troops were in Rafid and environs before 1630 hours GMT on 10 June, or whether they have advanced to that sector after the time fixed for the cease-fire to go into effect."

201. I have stated that our forces have not advanced and have no intention of advancing; they will strictly abide by their obligations under the cease-fire. We requested General Bull, immediately when these reports became known, or the request of the Syrian representative became known, to dispatch observers to the scene or should go himself, if possible, and investigate whether Israel forces had advanced or were advancing in this area. General Bull informed our representative that he would investigate the matter in the early hours of the morning—I think that might be very soon—and therefore he could not pass any final judgement on the allegation that Israel forces had advanced beyond the front line. Therefore, I must say that at this time and hour there is no confirmation whatsoever for the allegation that Israel forces have advanced beyond the front line established at 1630 hours GMT on 10 June.

202. I think that we should also take cognizance of the fact that there is no firing or fighting anywhere along the

front line, in no sector whatsoever of the front line. Again, I say that we are scrupulously respecting the cease-fire, and all our forces have been so instructed.

203. We are co-operating with General Bull. We are trying to facilitate his work. I have already mentioned that observer teams are operating along the front line, and we would certainly try our best to make available to General Bull any other facilities he may wish to obtain.

204. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I have only one point which I wish to make, very shortly. I wish to express my gratitude to the representative of Nigeria for raising an important point. I think that when I was speaking earlier I referred to the cease-fire line. If I did so, I did so inadvertently. I entirely agree with the important point which he has put to us. It is well, I think, to refer back to the actual words of the agreement reached by General Bull. I refer to the record of yesterday's meeting; the actual words of General Bull were: "(1). I proposed a cease-fire together with no further movement of troops to be effective at 1630 hours GMT, 10 June." [1356th meeting, para. 25.] That is the proposal which he made to both parties, and it was accepted by both parties.

205. I am very glad that I can confirm that, and if previously I used the word "cease-fire line", I was mistaken.

206. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): First of all, my delegation would like to associate itself with the expressions of appreciation of the work done by the Secretary-General and General Bull in the last few days in fulfilment of the tasks which this Council entrusted to them.

207. The Council has adopted three cease-fire resolutions. The most recent one, resolution 235 (1967), relating specifically to the problems on the Syrian-Israel front, was adopted more than two days ago, on 9 June. Thus the Security Council acted unanimously in the discharge of its primary responsibility. Both parties accepted the Council's request, and 1630 hours GMT on 10 June was fixed as the time of the cease-fire.

208. The prestige of this Council, and consequently of the United Nations itself, would be jeopardized if this body shirked its obligation to supervise and maintain a cease-fire which it has itself requested in order to put an end to the hostilities. Neither world public opinion, nor our own consciences, nor yet the responsibilities which we bear at this hour, can remain unaffected if we hesitate in this matter, for to do so would be to aid and abet a violation. In our opinion, what we must do in order to discharge the important and solemn task of judging the behaviour of sovereign States Members of the United Nations is to assemble as much documentation as possible and whatever evidence can help us to form conclusive and definitive opinions.

209. As my delegation sees it, there are three problems the solution of which brooks no delay. First of all, we consider it imperative that the Government of Israel should return Government House in Jerusalem to General Bull. Apart from the great difficulty which we have had in obtaining

information in the last few days, we feel that if the situation continues a few days longer, not only our right to be informed but also the actual prestige of the United Nations will be at stake.

210. Secondly, I should like to point out that the report of the Secretary-General [S/7930/Add.3] clearly mentions the discussions which have taken place in Jerusalem concerning the exchange of prisoners and which have had the Secretary-General's full support. My delegation, together with the delegations of Brazil and Ethiopia, submitted a draft resolution on this matter [S/7968], for we wished to ensure the strict application of humanitarian principles in the treatment of prisoners of war and of the civilians who are suffering the consequences of this conflict. Because of the important and urgent problems confronting the Council we have not pressed this draft resolution, but we feel bound to make it known that we whole-heartedly welcome the Secretary-General's idea and give it our support.

211. Thirdly, we have the problem which the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has put before us this evening, and which is the main reason for this meeting: the claim that the cease-fire has been violated today by Israel troops. There is no question that it is absolutely imperative—and I stress this point, as I did at the beginning of my statement—that the Council should take all the necessary steps to ensure the observance of the cease-fire and that severe sanctions should be applied to the party responsible for any violation. As far as the actual facts are concerned, my delegation fully endorses the last sentence in the report which the Secretary-General read to us this evening to the effect, namely that, before we come to any decision, it is vital to ascertain whether, at 1630 hours GMT on 10 June, Israel troops did or did not occupy the locality of Rafid.

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

213. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Mr. Rafael, in his answer, tried again to confuse and mislead the Council. My complaint refers to a violation that took place on 11 June, and my letter [S/7973] is dated 11 June. The second oral report of the Secretary-General [Press Release SG/SM/745] states:

"Second message received from General Bull at 2032 hours New York time:

"Hereby report just received from Damascus: 1. approximately 0950 hours GMT today, 11 June, United Nations military observer teams UN-203 . . ."

Then it goes on to say:

"2. At 1539 hours GMT, United Nations military observer teams 203 and 150 reported that they could observe two or three tanks in front of Joukada village."

And then—and this is the important sentence—it says:

"They also reported that on a ridge in front of this village a column of tanks was heading in an easterly direction and afterwards turning in a southerly direction."

I wished to bring to the attention of the members of the Council that statement of 11 June.

214. The PRESIDENT: I have no further speakers on my list at present. I am wondering whether it is the wish of the members to have a short suspension of the meeting as earlier suggested by Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom, or whether the members wish to adjourn until tomorrow.

215. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I should have thought it was most important that we should not adjourn until tomorrow and that we should complete our business tonight. I believe that it should be possible, with a very short adjournment—since I believe the purposes of the Council are quite clear—to come to a conclusion tonight, and I believe that it would be wrong to postpone our decision until tomorrow.

216. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to reply to the question which you have just asked about whether we should adjourn the meeting.

217. In my view, it was completely unwarranted and at variance with the proper procedure to raise the question of adjourning the meeting. We have met here to take a decision and we have no right, as members of the Council, to disperse without doing so. We have listened patiently to everyone, but we did not come here to listen to certain representatives lecturing us on how to speak and how not to speak.

218. We in turn would like to express our views on those moralizing rejoinders which were addressed in particular to the representative of Saudi Arabia. These remarks came first from the United States representative, and then we heard the same moral admonitions from the representative of Tel-Aviv. We have expressed our views about him enough already, and there is no need to reaffirm that one cannot believe a single word this representative says.

219. Yet he goes on raising his voice against the representative of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, and tries to lecture him on how he ought to speak. It is sadly ironical that long discourses are being delivered here about the inadmissibility of criticism, which is interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of a State. But what is happening in the territory of the Arab States—is that just a statement or criticism? What is happening there is a scandalous violation of every international law, an outrage against a nation's sovereignty and a shameful and disgraceful interference in its internal affairs. Yet these people still come here and reproach other representatives. What right have they to do so? Have they completely forgotten where they are?

220. Washington's representative admonished the representative of Saudi Arabia, saying that he had offended someone and had interfered in the domestic affairs of the United States. But what is happening in Viet-Nam? Is that what is called respect for the sovereignty of an independent State? What kind of farce are the diplomats of Washington and Tel-Aviv trying to play here?

221. We wish to protest most vigorously against these hypocritical, deceitful and cynical statements and lectures by a Member of this Organization.

222. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Unless there is objection, I would formally move for a short suspension of the meeting so that we can bring our proceedings to a conclusion as rapidly as possible.

223. The PRESIDENT: A motion has been made under rule 33, paragraph 1, of our provisional rules of procedure, to suspend the meeting, I assume for about a quarter of an hour. I will put the motion to a vote without debate.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

The meeting was suspended at 2.20 a.m. and resumed at 3 a.m.

224. The PRESIDENT: On the basis of consultations I should like, if the Council agrees, to submit the following draft resolution for adoption by the Council without debate. It reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Taking note of the oral reports of the Secretary-General on the situation between Israel and Syria, made at the 1354th, 1355th, 1356th and 1357th meetings and the supplemental information supplied in documents S/7930 and Add.1-3,

"1. Condemns any and all violations of the cease-fire;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his investigations and to report to the Council as soon as possible;

"3. Affirms that its demand for a cease-fire and discontinuance of all military activities includes a prohibition of any forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire;

"4. Calls for the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1630 hours GMT on 10 June 1967;

"5. Calls for full co-operation with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the observers in implementing the cease-fire, including freedom of movement and adequate communications facilities."

We shall now vote on that draft resolution.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.¹

¹ See resolution 236 (1967).

225. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning, I would ask the Secretary-General whether he has any supplementary information for the Council.

226. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have had no other information from General Odd Bull since the suspension of the meeting of the Security Council.

227. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General. I now intend to adjourn the meeting. The time of the next meeting will be fixed by me after consultations with all members and on the usual understanding that all members should hold themselves available in case of an emergency.

228. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I should like to say something about the time of our next meeting. I would have preferred that we should meet this afternoon at about 4 o'clock—I say this afternoon because it is now 3 a.m.—so that we can keep the situation under review and have an opportunity to consider what other measures the Council should take with regard to it. I think this would be acceptable to members of the Council. I therefore propose that we meet at about 4 or 5 p.m. today.

229. The PRESIDENT: Personally, I would have thought that perhaps it would be advisable to allow a little time to think of the problems raised, for instance, by the representative of India, and I would also take into consideration what the representative of Bulgaria has suggested and consult the members of the Council. If it were the view of the members that we should convene this afternoon, I would certainly reconvene the Council. But would it not be acceptable to use the formula I suggested: that I would reconvene the Council on the basis of consultations?

230. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I should have no objection if there are no further developments. But I think that we could meet at about 4 or 5 p.m. today. We might then have the opportunity to consider the second stage of our work and to see how the decisions we have already taken have been implemented.

231. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I would appeal to the representative of Bulgaria to allow the normal processes of consultations to take place. We are already well embarked on this day and many of us wish to reflect. Some of us indeed may wish to obtain fresh instructions before we proceed. I do not by any means eliminate the possibility of an early meeting, but it is the practice of the Council to consult all members. I am sure that we have full confidence in the President that he will do so with proper expedition. I would therefore urge the representative of Bulgaria to allow the processes of consultation to take place, realizing of course the great urgency of the matter with which we are dealing.

232. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): I would support in principle the proposal made by the representative of Bulgaria to have a meeting at 5 o'clock this afternoon. But I am not against consultations to work out the time for our next meeting.

233. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The purpose of my suggestion was to consult members of the Council. I think that it would be useful to schedule a meeting of the Council for about 5 p.m. To all intents and purposes we are consulting one another now. However, if it does not prove necessary to hold a meeting at about 5 p.m., the President could inform us that the Council will not meet. I think, however, that it will be useful to schedule a meeting for about 5 p.m. so that we can follow the situation. I should like that time to be fixed in principle, on the understanding that the meeting will be cancelled if it proves unnecessary.

234. The PRESIDENT: I understand that it is the wish of the representative of Bulgaria in principle to fix our next meeting for 5 o'clock this afternoon, but that he would agree that I complete the consultations that I have just started here in the Council and that, on the basis of those consultations, the final decision on the timing will be taken later today. Since there is no objection, that will be done.

The meeting rose on Monday, 12 June, at 3.10 a.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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