



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1361st MEETING: 14 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1361)	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)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 14 June 1967, at 5.30 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/1361)

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 tables and the representatives of Lebanon, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Tunisia, Libya and Pakistan 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. M. Kidron (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. R. Al-Rashid (Kuwait), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia), Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) and Mr. A. Shahi (Pakistan) took the places reserved for them.

2. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the four items on its agenda. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Argentina who, I understand, wishes to introduce the three-Power draft resolution contained in document S/7968/Rev.2. I now call on him.

3. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): While it is true that the Security Council is a strictly political body which concerns itself mainly with the major problems of war and peace, it cannot for this reason overlook the tragic reality of the scars left by armed conflict on a region where hostilities have taken place. Our delegation has associated itself with those of Brazil and Ethiopia, and on behalf of all those delegations it is introducing the draft resolution contained in document S/7968/Rev.2, in which the Security Council would recommend to the Governments concerned the scrupulous respect of the humanitarian principles applicable in time of war.

This draft resolution reflects the general concern of all delegations, as is clear from many of the statements made in the Security Council.

4. These obligations, which we should like to bring to the attention of the parties, are the result of a long tradition and of the considerable progress which has been made since ancient times in giving formal legal expression to principles based on respect for mankind.

5. First of all, we are deeply concerned at the fate of the civilian population whose persons and possessions are suffering from the consequences of war. A minimum standard of rights must be guaranteed to those who are not taking any active part in hostilities. We believe that these persons must be treated in a humane manner under all circumstances, that their family and residence rights, their religious convictions and practices and their habits and customs must be protected and, above all, that they must not be subject to any act of physical or moral coercion.

6. In our draft resolution this appeal is addressed specifically to the Government of Israel, since in present circumstances it is that Government which will be largely responsible for applying these humanitarian principles. We believe that the experience in the Middle East has been a melancholy one; and, as so often has been said here, the problems which confront us are due to a large extent to the fact that countless refugees have been left without land or shelter. The Jordanian delegation has told us of its concern at this situation, and many other delegations have in the Council expressed similar views. We must learn from this experience and try thereby to avoid any recurrence or, at least, any aggravation of conditions existing at the present time. We trust that, in this hour of uncertainty, the people affected by the war will not have to suffer its consequences any longer. In this connexion, my delegation was particularly interested in the statement made yesterday by the Israel representative. He said: "However, there has since taken place a large-scale return movement from the east bank to the west bank. And the Israel authorities are doing nothing to prevent this." [1358th meeting, para. 224.] My Government hopes that this policy will be maintained in the future and that the people who crossed the Jordan will be able to return to their homes.

7. The same humanitarian considerations also apply to the treatment of prisoners of war. As we understand it, this is a case where, apart from the strictly legal problems, the principles embodied in the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 relative to the treatment of prisoners of war are applicable to all parties. In co-sponsoring this draft resolution, my delegation is following one of the traditions of our country, which is always ready to defend humanitarian causes. Furthermore, my delegation, speaking also on behalf of the other two sponsors, would like to inform the Council that we accept the amendment proposed at this morning's meeting by the representative of Mali to the effect—as we understand it—that a third paragraph should be added to our draft resolution. The English translation of the original French text of this paragraph is as follows:

"3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow the implementation of this resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon".

8. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): My delegation appreciates very much the understanding shown by the three sponsors of the draft resolution with respect to our proposed amendment. I should like merely to draw the attention of the Argentine representative to what is probably an error in translation. In the amendment which I presented this morning [1360th meeting] the adjective "effective" appears before the word "implementation". I think it would be preferable to retain this wording.

9. I will now repeat the text of my amendment as I presented it this morning:

"*Requests* the Secretary-General to follow the effective implementation of this resolution and to report to the Security Council".

10. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): Unfortunately, I do not know English well enough to translate the French text accurately into English. If the text had been in Spanish, that would, of course, have been quite another matter. The text was translated for me unofficially by the Secretariat, and in the translation the word "effective" is omitted since I am informed that it is not required in English.

11. I would suggest that the representative of Mali should submit his proposal formally in French, and that we leave it to the Secretariat to produce an exact translation later.¹ We accept, in any case, the French text originally proposed by the representative of Mali.

12. The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of Mali accepts the suggestion of the representative of Argentina.

13. The next speaker on my list is the representative of India, to whom I now give the floor.

14. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): We have, in the past few days, in this Council, spoken about various aspects of the problems which face the international community in the Middle East. Now we find ourselves in a situation where, though war has been contained, tensions are still high and peace has not been restored. Though the cease-fire has been insisted upon and at last made really operative by the Council, withdrawals have not yet been ordered. This has resulted in an intruding army finding itself in control of large chunks of land and large masses of population rightfully belonging to countries which are the victims of aggression.

15. This unhappy situation brings to the fore the human problem of the population of the occupied territories which was mentioned, in the most poignant terms by the representative of Jordan, at the 1355th meeting on 10 June 1967, and also subsequently. We note with appreciation the sympathetic comments made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Canada, Ethiopia, Japan and the United States of America. I, myself, at the 1352nd meeting on 9 June only briefly touched upon the subject because

¹ The full text of the revised draft resolution was later circulated as document S/7968/Rev.3.

we were even then daring to allow ourselves to hope that the cease-fire would be followed by an immediate withdrawal. We dared to be so optimistic because we believed, and continue to believe, that all the great Powers, and not merely one or two of them, consider it their solemn duty to insist on withdrawals.

16. Unfortunately, this has not happened. Hence the urgent need for the draft resolution [S/7968/Rev.2] which has just now been introduced in such moving terms by my colleague and friend, the representative of Argentina. We must pay a tribute to our colleagues of Brazil, Argentina and Ethiopia for their initiative, because every day that passes without the Security Council taking any action itself or laying down any course of action to be taken by the one Government which holds large areas of alien soil, and controls large numbers of people who are citizens of other lands, brings fresh items of disturbing news. These news items present grim details of the suffering of both civilians and armed forces that have been cut off. Reports appearing in the world press—including the press of countries which have not been all that friendly to the Arabs recently—tell of hapless Arab soldiers and civilians wandering in the midst of the Sinai desert, with neither food nor water to sustain them. There are also reports of people—civilians, men, women and children—who were pushed out of their home and hearth in Jerusalem and other towns of Jordan, on the west bank of the Jordan River.

17. Our Secretary-General, U Thant, whose passion for peace and humanity is well known, has already taken prompt action in making his recommendations to the Government of Israel, in his letter of 13 June [see S/7930/Add.6, para. 5] addressed to the Permanent Representative of Israel.

18. In the circumstances, the present draft resolution is, to my mind, a necessary guide-line and a reminder to the Israel authorities to act with humanity. The draft resolution before us, which we support, is an anxious expression of the universal conscience which rebels against these palpable and obvious results of the scourge of war. Flesh and blood are cheap in war, but we should urge, plead and appeal in the name of our common humanity for the humane treatment of those who are victims of the conflict, ensuring their safety and welfare.

19. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): The representative of India has just mentioned that I had occasion to refer to the need to start on the long path of dealing with the grievous wounds of war that have been inflicted on countless men and women in the area of hostilities. As an immediate and necessary humanitarian measure, Canada welcomes the initiative taken by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia, which would focus our attention on the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the area where military operations have taken place.

20. Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons last week, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Martin, stressed that it is the collective responsibility of all nations, including those primarily involved, to meet the gigantic problem of dislocated families and peoples. In this connexion, I wish to make it clear that our immediate

humanitarian concern with the plight of thousands of unfortunate people does not in any way reflect on or prejudice their right to remain in the place of abode which they occupied prior to the outbreak of hostilities. I want to make that quite clear.

21. Let us turn, on this understanding, to the search for a just, healing and lasting peace in the Near East, and in so doing, in the view of my delegation, it would be highly appropriate in recognition of this agonizing human problem and the need of all nations to find a way to meet that desperate problem that we join in unanimous support of the draft resolution offered by the representatives of Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia.

22. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): In supporting the proposal that we recommend the Governments concerned strictly to respect the humanitarian principles as set forth in the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,² my delegation feels that it is fulfilling a duty which is in keeping with its most immutable traditions and is strengthened by the role which France, together with several other countries, has played when moral obligations recognized by the civilized world have had to be established as rules of law. That is why we reiterate our keen satisfaction at the initiative taken by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia.

23. In submitting draft resolution S/7968/Rev.2 for the consideration of the Council, the representatives of those three countries have translated into objective terms matters of concern to which none of us can remain indifferent. In particular, they were right to insist that the safety of people caught in the military cross-fire should be ensured so far as possible in conditions similar to those which existed before the outbreak of hostilities. It is absolutely imperative that every effort should be made—I repeat, every effort—to enable those who have fled from the fighting to return to their homes, their villages or their towns without delay.

24. The Governments involved in this conflict cannot evade their obligations towards prisoners of war. We should like to think that the first exchange of prisoners will take place on the basis of criteria inspired more by generosity than by mere reciprocity.

25. My delegation has paid particular attention to the letters dated 12 June [S/7974 and S/7975] from the representatives of Tunisia and Jordan, as well as to the statements made by those two representatives in the Council, concerning the fate of the population living on the west bank of the Jordan, including the Palestine refugees living in United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) camps. If reports are confirmed, and if it should appear that expulsion has been decided upon and organized, the Council would find itself confronted with a particularly serious situation. In the past the refugee problem has cast so dark a cloud over peace and stability in the Middle East that the Government of Israel should endeavour by every available means not to exacerbate it or allow it to assume proportions which would prevent any hope of an equitable settlement.

² Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of war victims.

26. Taking into account these observations, my delegation would favour an immediate investigation by UNRWA into the situation of refugees in areas where military operations have taken place. By adopting such a measure, the Council would also demonstrate clearly to the Governments concerned that they cannot disregard their responsibilities towards those who have come under their jurisdiction as a result of the fighting. This measure would strengthen the appeal made by the Secretary-General to the Permanent Representative of Israel on 13 June. The text of that appeal can be found in his supplementary report of 13 June. It would also be the first step in the implementation of the provisions of the draft resolution presented by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia which my delegation will certainly support.

27. Similarly, we think that the Council should take into account the suggestion of the United Kingdom representative that a special representative of the Secretary-General be entrusted with the task of investigating the fate of the refugees. We believe that the appalling problem of these refugees, and indeed of all refugees, should be regarded as a matter of the utmost urgency, as a non-controversial, a human problem, without prejudice to the long-term solutions upon which we shall ultimately have to agree.

28. May I say in conclusion that in fulfilling their humane duty, the Governments concerned will not merely be relieving the suffering of those for whom we feel so deeply. They will also be working for their mutual benefit and for their future, without which their reconciliation is impossible.

29. 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 Syria 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 Syria, and I now invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroodly (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.

30. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have taken the floor, not to exercise my right of reply to criticism of my two interventions. What I said stands on the record. I believe that I spoke long enough and I do not want to take more time in this Council because it has been seized of draft resolutions that should have been voted upon before now. I could easily have asked for the floor to reply to Mr. Kidron and others, but I kept aloof, not because I had no reply, but for the reason which I have adduced. However, something very serious happened, and I hope you do not take it as being personal, although a letter has been addressed to my person. If that letter had been addressed not on the stationery of the United Nations, but had been a personal letter, I would have accepted it with grace. But it was a letter typed on United Nations stationery, and signed

by none other than my friend, Ralph Bunche. And under his name is "Under-Secretary".

31. I have known Mr. Bunche for the last twenty years. Our relationship has always been cordial and friendly. But when I read that letter I thought that it might have been written in a fit of nervousness or anger, considering that I have always known Mr. Bunche to be a hard worker, and we are all under great strain.

32. So I called his office—luckily, he was not there—because I was taken aback when I read the letter; I do not hide it from you. I called the Secretary-General. He also was out of his office. I wanted to find out whether the Secretary-General knew about that letter or was associated with it in any way. Secondly, I wanted to know from Mr. Bunche whether, like any one of us, he was under a strain and had written the letter in a fit of anger or displeasure. Thirdly, I wanted to know whether he had a reason for writing it. I asked for a verbal reply from the secretary of the Secretary-General, and then I had to check with the Secretary-General whether he knew of this letter. And he advised me, and rightly so, to talk to my friend Mr. Bunche. So I saw Mr. Bunche and before I could tell him again what I had to say, he said: "You invaded my private life here in the Council and I will not allow you or anybody else to do that." I said: "I thought you must have been acting under a strain. You had no right to address me in this manner because, in addressing me in this manner you are addressing every member, not only of the Council, but of the United Nations." He said—I am paraphrasing—whether you like it or not, I stand on what I wrote. And that is what brought me to the table. Reluctantly, I came to the table. I tried to check with him as to whether he had written this letter under a strain, or whether he perhaps thought, mistakenly, that he could get away with what he did. This is not a tribunal, but the feud has begun. As if we had not enough feuds.

33. Perhaps you would like to know the contents of this letter. It is like Caesar's will. Here it is. First, it is typed on United Nations stationery. A friend could have written to me personally or talked to me personally, a friend of twenty years' standing. That is why I wanted to check with him as to whether we could settle this question amicably. He said: "I stand on my dignity." As if only he had dignity and others do not have dignity. He says this perhaps subconsciously because of the reverses of the Arabs now. As we say in Arabic, their wall is low; everybody can climb it. Nobody can climb our wall. I am a servant and it is an honour to be a servant. My good friend, Mr. Bunche, should also consider it an honour to be an international servant; and servants should be kind to each other and not write such letters. He should have asked me: "In what spirit did you pronounce your words?" I was solicitous that the Secretary-General would listen to every word I had to say because I had not seen him privately for weeks, or perhaps for months. And I quote what I said from the verbatim record, without rancour, without cynicism or criticism or arrogance. I said:

"Do not distract the Secretary-General, Mr. Bunche, I am talking. I want him to hear every word, my dear Mr. Bunche. He is my Secretary-General. I do not have

occasion to talk to him. He is so busy with Viet-Nam, and now with Palestine.”—in other words, I do not want to trouble him and I want him to know what I have to say—“He should learn what we have suffered.” [1358th meeting, para. 150.]

34. To this, he has taken exception apparently. He received many calls from friends: “How do you let that Baroody take such liberty with you?” He listened to the telephone calls. I have been receiving telephone calls since 1947. They told me, this Bunche is the biggest traitor to the Arabs. I never publicized them. “After the death of Bernadotte he fixed the Palestine question”: I never told him that because I knew he was a good man. He could have cleared this. If we were to listen to all that people tell us, God help us. Today I received about seventy-five letters. About seventy of them regarding my speech were laudatory. There were five that cursed me from the navel down; they used such language. I showed a letter to my good friend, Mr. Goldberg. He said that he received many such letters. This was after I had spoken in the Fifth Committee about moving or decentralizing the United Nations Headquarters from New York City. He said that he received such letters every day, or every now and then. If Mr. Bunche wants to lend his ear to every Tom, Dick and Harry who may have a grudge against Baroody because he represents Saudi Arabia, and he plays on his sentiments, the illustrious Mr. Bunche who was awarded the Nobel Prize should know better than to lend his ear. I believe that, subconsciously, unwittingly, he thinks we Arabs are down, and that he can take liberties with us.

35. Now what was the letter? It reads as follows:

“Our relationship over the years has been characterized by friendly but always completely frank exchanges of view. This letter is a case in point.

“I understand that during your speech in the Security Council yesterday afternoon (13 June) you mentioned me by name in cautioning me not to distract the Secretary-General while you were speaking.”—If he could have checked with the Secretary-General in what spirit I said it—“This was when I was consulting on an important matter with him at the table.”—I did not suggest that he was not—“I did not hear what you said at the time, which is just as well. Whether it was your intention to reprove me”—I reprove Mr. Bunche? Why should I reprove my friend?—“as some listeners interpreted it, or merely to make a typical ploy, I do not know, but in either case I reject it. The Secretary-General’s work has to go on during the long sessions of the Council and I frequently consult with him at the table, as do some of my colleagues.”

That is all right until now. But wait. Here is the climax now:

“Occasionally, I assure you, I have work to do and matters to take up with the Secretary-General, which are more important than listening to speeches, even to one being made by Ambassador Baroody.”

I am glad that some people are laughing. He says, even the ones made by me. But we represent sovereign States sitting

here. What are our speeches? Everything is fixed behind the doors; our speeches are for consumption of the gallery and arrangements behind the scenes are made. He says:

“Occasionally, I assure you, I have work to do and matters to take up with the Secretary-General, which are more important than listening to speeches...”

What speeches? Are they the speeches of persons or of representatives of sovereign States, even the one being made by Ambassador Baroody?

36. Even when I spoke about the Zionists, I did not show such rancour. What have I done to Mr. Bunche? I would take it personally from him with grace. But as the representative of a sovereign State, I could say many harsh words to him. But because he is sick, I will not use them now. After all, he is human and we all make mistakes. I gave him the chance to have an understanding with me there. Then he said “No”. I said “To heck with you, I will ask for the floor, and I mean that”. Now these things should never happen again. If this went by without any intervention, it may occur again. Each member of the Secretariat is a human being and stands on his dignity. But if it were to be a question of dignity, personal dignity, let him not use the stationery of the United Nations. Let him write to me with the letterhead of Ralph Bunche on it and I will take it very gracefully, and I would perhaps accept it. I reject this letter officially, although it has already done a great deal of damage.

37. It is only human, when people have reverses, for other people to take liberties with them. We are not fallen. We are still on our feet. Even in such a situation he should have known, because of the reverses, that he should not have written such a letter, even though I may have been at fault, assuming that I was at fault. Who does he think he is?

38. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Saudi Arabia. But I do think that we have to proceed with our work, now that he has made his views known to the Council. I have been very liberal, I think. This matter could not be said to be directly connected with the item we are discussing. We have now heard his view, and I believe that we should not be personal now, such as asking who Mr. Bunche believes he is. I think we should stop now and proceed with our work.

39. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, would you let me wind up my speech?

40. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia has the floor.

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, if you had not made this remark, I was going to wind up my speech because I had had my say. But this was the climax: Who does he think he is? Who do I think I am? We are all human beings. If you only were patient enough, Mr. President. I thought you were patient enough, coming from a Nordic country where people are cool and collected. We are all human, brothers in humanity, and if you think that this incident has nothing to do with our work, I can say that it emanated from the Security Council. Where did it emanate from? Arabia? Denmark? or in the United States? From this chamber here.

42. Anyway, I must thank you, Mr. President, for being very gracious, because you did not even contest my right to speak. When I say this to you, I say this without paying you any sort of compliment.

43. Before bringing this intervention—which I deplore because of its subject matter—to a close, I thank God that the Secretary-General was not associated with it. If my good friend Mr. Bunche had only consulted with him, or if Mr. Bunche had written to me on personal stationery, I would not have taken the floor.

44. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We have just heard the representative of Saudi Arabia address the Council for an unusual reason. This does not occur very often in our work; and when it does occur, we cannot remain indifferent. We feel obliged to state our views on occurrences of this kind. It is not only the ethical aspect of the matter which we have to consider in the present case. This is not just a breach of elementary courtesy in relations between an international civil servant and the representative of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations. This is something more, and we cannot therefore disguise the fact that we regard this occurrence as a kind of challenge to the other members of the Security Council as well.

45. We are not concerned with the inner feelings of those present at this table, in whatever capacity they may be here. But we are thinking of the official status of persons who, in view of the functions they perform, must display tact and self-discipline. We are not interested in the private opinions of a particular person. We are dealing with too serious a matter, and a sense of responsibility is expected of all of us.

46. We find it incredible that a member of the Secretariat should take the liberty of making offensive attacks on the representative of a Member State of our Organization. We do not think this was merely an emotional outburst. We wish to say that it is strange how certain names crop up in certain situations, at sudden breaks or in dramatic situations which occur in international relations. This name has now cropped up at a time when the Security Council is discussing the situation in the Near East; but one cannot help remembering the past, and everything that was written about it, where the very same name is offensively linked with the notorious "Congo Club".

47. Do we really have to point out that all staff members of the United Nations Secretariat, particularly the senior ones, must strictly observe the principles of impartiality and objectivity? Patience is an indispensable quality for staff members of an international organization.

48. The contents of the letter from Under-Secretary Ralph Bunche to the representative of Saudi Arabia are incompatible with the code of conduct governing the official activities of staff members of the United Nations Secretariat, and we want to say so outright, no matter who may be involved.

49. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General.

50. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, it was not my intention to intervene in this debate, but since the proceedings have developed to such a stage that, in my view, complete silence on my part would be construed as acceptance of the charges that have been made, I must make a brief statement.

51. Last night, during the meeting of the Security Council, Mr. Bunche, as usual, reported to me orally, from his seat behind me, about a very important cable that had been received from General Bull. That message came while the representative of Saudi Arabia was speaking. I turned around and listened to Mr. Bunche, for perhaps one minute only. While I was listening to Mr. Bunche's report, Ambassador Baroodi was continuing his statement, to which, of course, I had been listening very attentively.

52. When I read the verbatim record this morning, I found this extract from Ambassador Baroodi's statement:

"Do not distract the Secretary-General, Mr. Bunche. I am talking. I want him to hear every word, my dear Mr. Bunche. He is my Secretary-General. I do not have occasion to talk to him. He is so busy with Viet-Nam, and now with Palestine. He should learn what we have suffered." [1358th meeting, para. 150.]

Of course, I did not take any particular notice of that. I have known Ambassador Baroodi very well for a number of years. We have had very friendly relations. But just now, on my way down to the meeting this afternoon, Ambassador Baroodi came to see me and asked me if I had seen the letter from Mr. Bunche. I told him that I had not. That was the last of the story.

53. I have therefore been listening to Ambassador Baroodi's statement with interest. I did not intend to reply to him, but since Ambassador Fedorenko made some very adverse remarks about Mr. Bunche, I thought I could no longer keep silent.

54. I must say here and now that I have complete faith in Mr. Bunche. I must say here and now that to my knowledge Mr. Bunche has been an outstanding international civil servant; that to my knowledge he is a very objective international civil servant.

55. Therefore, for the record, I want to say, Mr. President, that any imputations of disloyalty to the Organization, or infringement of the tenets of an international civil servant, cannot be acceptable to me.

56. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has so far refrained from speaking on the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia [S/7968/Rev.3] on the question of the refugees now leaving their homeland because of the aggression that has just been committed against their country.

57. We had thought that this draft resolution was superfluous, because we had hoped that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [S/7951/Rev.2] condemning the aggression and calling for the immediate

withdrawal of troops would be accepted by this Council and that measures would be taken to ensure compliance with that decision by the aggressor. Some might say: "But Sir, as representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, you are living in a dream world. You know full well the position of certain countries in this Council, you know that they would never allow the aggressor to be condemned when that aggressor is an instrument of the imperialists". Perhaps they are right. But all the same we had hoped that there might prevail in this Council a kind of international morality—which in any case should be the rule in the Council—and that those Powers which encourage aggression would not dare at this time to block a withdrawal by the aggressor, and thus resolve the problem of the refugees.

58. Of course, this hope did not take the full measure of those who instigated the aggression, who gave it the green light, and who are now trying to reward the aggressor.

59. We are now confronted by this situation: at the moment, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria still thinks that the draft resolution may not significantly advance the cause of the liberation of the Arab peoples from the yoke which some people wish to place on them because it diverts attention to a question which, although a human problem, is ancillary at this stage.

60. However, in view of the humanitarian considerations underlying the draft resolution, and the human sufferings which could be prolonged still further by the resistance of the aggressor country as well as by those within the Council who continue to support it, we, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, will not oppose the draft resolution before us and will vote for it to help alleviate the sufferings that this aggression has caused.

61. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia who has asked to exercise his right of reply. I hope that the representative of Syria will agree to the same arrangement as previously.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.

62. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, I should like to appeal to all members of the Council and to all representatives taking part in our discussion to be as brief as possible on questions which are not directly related to the item we are discussing at the present moment.

63. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia to exercise his right of reply.

64. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I will heed your request and I will be very brief.

65. I should like to address myself to my good friend, the Secretary-General. I said in my statement that I believed that my good friend, Mr. Bunche, had written what he has written in a fit of anger or because of nervousness; we are all under a strain. I never questioned his loyalty to the Secretary-General in particular and to the Organization in general because, after all, the Secretary-General is the symbol of this Organization.

66. However, I take some exception to what the Secretary-General said, as if by implication to give the impression that I was questioning the loyalty of Mr. Bunche as an international servant. I never had that in mind, and I hope I will always consider him a friend, if he so desires. However, I must say that I hope that such an incident will not recur in the future and that the Secretary-General will see to it that such incidents do not recur on the stationery of the United Nations. This is a question of principle and not a personal question, and my statement should not constitute a slur on the work or character of Mr. Bunche because I hope he still considers me as a friend.

67. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We have little to add to what has been said by the representative of Saudi Arabia; but we should like to refer to the statement by Secretary-General U Thant.

68. A specific matter has been raised in the Council. A staff member of an international organization—in this case Mr. Ralph Bunche—has challenged or, if you wish, insulted the representative of a sovereign State—in this case Ambassador Baroody—and there is material evidence of this in the letter which bears the signature of the person who wrote it—namely, Ralph Bunche. This letter is written on the official notepaper of our international Organization.

69. It is clear from all this that the issue here is not one of personal relations or personalities. These circumstances affect the official status of our Organization. It is true, of course, that the Secretary-General of our Organization is the best judge of his own staff, and is entitled to give his own assessment of the work of any of his assistants. But we are not dealing here with the question of giving references in general: we are considering a specific case, which is a matter of great regret to all of us.

70. On the other hand, we know that, if a stone is thrown at you, you should not blame the stone; the stone is not responsible. But a stone has been thrown at one of us, at one Member of the United Nations, and we cannot disregard the question of who threw it.

71. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): I had had absolutely no intention of intervening in this particular, distasteful and unpleasant exchange. I think it is noteworthy that in his last intervention, as I interpreted his comments, the representative of Saudi Arabia had felt that he had disposed of his complaint to his satisfaction. We had also heard from our Secretary-General, who defended the conduct of Mr. Bunche in, I think, a very stirring and eloquent manner. But twice now, we have heard the representative of the Soviet Union intervene in this particular discussion.

72. I believe it was only yesterday, if I remember correctly the clouded schedule of this last week, when Ambassador Fedorenko challenged Ambassador Goldberg for having intervened in what he considered to be a dialogue between yourself, Mr. President, and him. Therefore, I think one must stop and wonder why the representative of the Soviet Union should find it necessary to intervene in what had apparently been a dialogue between the delegation of Saudi

Arabia and the President of the Council and the Secretariat. It may be that we can find some answers to that question as we re-read Ambassador Fedorenko's first intervention when he mentioned such United Nations operations as the Congo.

73. It seems to me that this Organization and its servants will find themselves in an impossible position if Members of the Organization and this Council in particular stoop to attacks of a personal character, such as we have just witnessed, to serve obvious political ends, and in particular when they involve an individual whose character, whose reputation and whose record are of such an outstanding calibre as that of Under-Secretary Bunche.

74. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I would not have taken the floor in this discussion concerning a question which is nevertheless very important to our Council, had it not been for the last statement of the United States representative, Mr. Buffum. I leave aside the personal qualities of the Under-Secretary, Mr. Bunche, who is certainly a remarkable man. Likewise I shall not dwell on the opinions expressed here by the Secretary-General of our Organization concerning Mr. Bunche's ability. I am sure that he must have them if the Secretary-General says so. What I am here concerned with are not his qualities or his faults, if he has any, or the qualifications which have been attributed to him. What is important is what is happening within our Organization. I do not believe that we should encourage the recurrence of such an incident, which after all is of some importance.

75. The Secretariat should certainly be able to rely upon our co-operation, but we, in turn, should be able to rely on theirs. We should respect them; but they cannot, I do not think they have the right, when addressing the representative of a country, arrogate to themselves the authority of our Organization. Personally, they may think what they please; personally, they may even say what they please; but to use the authority of our Organization is not in keeping with the Charter. From the human point of view, I have no right to tell Mr. Bunche: "You should think differently of Ambassador Baroody or of any other ambassador, whoever he may be". He is entitled to think what he wants, and may even have reason for thinking so. That is another question. But what he does not have the right to do—and this is the point I wish to stress—is to use the name and the authority of our Organization in order to express his thoughts.

76. This is all I wish to say at present, except that I do not want such a situation to recur in future.

77. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Just a few words by way of reply. We have just heard a statement by our United States colleague. His verbose intervention was quite extraordinary. Obviously his nervous system could no longer stand the strain, and he hastened first to give Mr. Ralph Bunche a flattering testimonial, which he hardly needs. But, since we hear the United States representative interrupting, we can only say: "Well, of course, no great imagination is required here." But allow me in all humility to tell my United States colleague that the conversation between the President, Ambassador Tabor, and the Soviet representative related to the fact that certain action had been taken rather hastily.

We took a tolerant attitude to this. We were prepared to give way, so as not to side-track the Council once again from our main task; but the President was so tactful that when he himself noticed that something had been overlooked, he immediately took steps to rectify the situation, and we duly appreciated this. But the President felt it necessary to apologize twice for his oversight; and it was just at this moment that our colleague from the United States, Ambassador Goldberg, decided to intervene. I ask you, distinguished colleague, was that the right thing to do? It was tactless and completely out of place.

78. Now there is another situation, the Saudi Arabian representative's statement about the letter, whose contents he has read out. If you listened carefully to the letter and noticed how Mr. Baroody read it out, you must have realized that its contents do not only represent impertinence to one of the speakers. The letter challenges speeches made in the Security Council and, in particular, a speech made by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

79. Does this not entitle us to raise our voice in defence of representatives who speak here? Does this not entitle us to express our views on the incident which has occurred between Under-Secretary Mr. Ralph Bunche and the representative of Saudi Arabia? In our view, this is quite reasonable. This is why we thought it was our moral duty to speak on this matter.

80. The PRESIDENT: I should like now to close the debate on this particular sub-item on our agenda, and I should like to do that by reading out a letter I have just received from Mr. Bunche:

"Mr. President,

"I am very sorry that a letter written by me should have diverted the attention of the Council from its consideration of matters of such transcendent importance. As Ambassador Baroody has said, we have long been friends, and I am happy to hear him say that we can continue so. I wrote the letter because I thought my personal dignity, which means very much to me, had been violated publicly. Ambassador Baroody has clearly stated that this was not his intention.

"May I say again only that I express my personal regret that I should have done anything to interrupt the Council's attention to the extremely pressing problem before it which means so much to so many suffering people.

"(Signed) Ralph BUNCHE"

81. I have no more speakers on the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia. We have several draft resolutions before us, and according to rule 32 of our provisional rules of procedure, draft resolutions shall have precedence in the order of their submission.

82. The United States representative informed the Council earlier that the United States will not press to a vote today the two draft resolutions [S/7916/Rev.1, S/7971] which it submitted before the draft resolution of Argentina, Brazil

and Ethiopia was submitted. Further, the representative of Canada has likewise informed the Council that he is not pressing his draft resolution [S/7541] to a vote today. Finally, the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union [S/7951/Rev.2] has already been disposed of. Therefore, if there is no objection, I believe we can now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia, as amended in accordance with the suggestion made by the representative of Mali [S/7968/Rev.3].

A vote was taken by show of hands.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*³

83. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

84. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Let me at the very outset pay tribute to our Secretary-General, U Thant, a great symbol of this Organization, and to Mr. Ralph Bunche, the Under-Secretary. We greatly appreciate their constructive work and their very helpful efforts regarding this problem.

85. We are grateful to the three sponsors, Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia, for their constructive initiative. They made genuine and helpful efforts to present a draft resolution safeguarding the rights of all the inhabitants within the illegally occupied area and of those expelled from there. This resolution, which was unanimously adopted, reflects the will of the Security Council. It calls for the restoration of the expellees to their homes, and it also calls upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of both the inhabitants who stayed within the illegally occupied area and those who were expelled from there.

86. I should like to pay tribute to all the members of the Security Council who gave this human problem their attention and who gave the draft resolution their support. We are grateful to the representative of Mali for his amendment, which referred to the implementation of the resolution. It is a most helpful amendment.

87. My delegation would like to record with gratitude the most constructive and helpful part played by the representative of India and the Indian delegation, not only on the resolution just adopted, but during the various stages of our deliberations on this tragic problem. The Indian attitude and its stand taken here in the Security Council on this question were dictated, and indeed inspired, by the great traditions of India, by the spirit of Gandhi and Nehru, and it is this same spirit which is now being followed by Mrs. Gandhi.

88. In conclusion, on this question, I am instructed by my Government to state that all expellees without exception desire to live in their homes, not in tents or caves or huts, a prey to hunger. We owe to this resolution, which reflects the will, the demand, the request of the Security Council, genuine and sincere and immediate implementation.

89. Having made these remarks on the resolution, I should like to make a few observations on the stand taken by the

Security Council this morning with regard to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [S/7951/Rev.2]. The vote taken on that draft resolution was most unfortunate. It did not result in a decision arresting the aggression of Israel and liquidating its consequences.

90. What remains before the Council is the United States draft resolution [S/7952/Rev.3] which, as I said in my intervention yesterday, does not reflect the reality of the situation and does not condemn the aggression or the aggressor; nor does it call for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israel forces from the area illegally occupied. As we see it, the United States draft resolution accommodates the invader and occupier. It enables Israel, through force, to acquire political gains. It amounts to encouragement of the aggressor. What is more, it reflects a new attitude of the United States—and this is very important—an attitude conflicting with the stand of the United States on the Sinai aggression committed in 1956.

91. The question arises: why is the United States Government changing attitudes and stands? Is it because the United States is now more involved in this problem than it was in 1956, one indeed wonders. Is it permissible or compatible with the principles of the Charter to permit Israel to use as a bargaining point a gain achieved by means of force? Mr. Goldberg, who is not at the meeting this evening, is a jurist and can clarify this question. Both the American nation and the Arab nation are entitled to know. I regret to say that the American attitude today is different from its attitude on similar aggression committed by Israel in 1956. Here is what the Permanent Representative of the United States, Mr. Cabot Lodge, had to say on that occasion concerning that aggression:

“... we”—referring to the Government of the United States—“have recognized that it is incompatible with the principles of the Charter and with the obligations of membership in the United Nations for any Member to seek political gains through the use of force”—then Mr. Lodge continued—“or to use as a bargaining point a gain achieved by means of force.”⁴

92. This was the attitude of the United States in 1956. We would like to see the same United States standing against aggression in 1967. There is something called continuity in a policy, and in a big State, a big Member, a great Power, a permanent member of the Security Council having a greater responsibility. I quote the words of Justice Goldberg: “The greater the Power, the greater the responsibility.” A great Power, a permanent member of the Security Council, is expected to have continuity in its policy, particularly on the very same aggression, in the very same area, against the very same people—with one difference, a difference in timing.

93. Does it not look strange to the members of the Security Council when they compare the attitude of the United States Government in 1956 with the present attitude of the United States in 1967? Does it not seem unique to call for discussions promptly among the parties concerned—according to the draft resolution of the United

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. II, 666th meeting, para. 25.

³ See resolution 237 (1967).

States—looking toward the establishment of arrangements encompassing many questions and leading to a stable and durable peace in the Middle East, while allowing the aggressor and the aggression to continue?

94. Let me reiterate the position of Jordan on this question. It reflects the position of the Arab homeland; it reflects the position of every Arab State; it reflects the position of every Arab individual on this question. On the day that we accepted the cease-fire in this Council we said that no pressure, no intimidation, no force would take away from us our determination to live and enjoy liberty and to work for it. No intimidation will bring us to negotiations with the aggressors.

95. Through force and intimidation you cannot, gentlemen, make peace. And at gunpoint you cannot make us sit with the aggressor. Patrons and protectors of Israel should know that in ignoring this, they would not be laying the groundwork for peace. In ignoring this, they would be encouraging the Israelis to take advantage of their aggression, to encourage them to try to acquire the fruits of their aggression. It will cultivate further aggression.

96. Finally, this morning, the report of the Secretary-General [*S/7930/Add.7*] referred to a very important thing which was not given adequate consideration, although it is a real reflection of the Zionist movement. I am referring to paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (vi), (c), of the report where it is stated that: "Movement of Israel forces approximately 2 kilometres east along Kuneitra-Damascus road" took place.

97. These are two kilometres of expansion. If you look at the history of our problem, you will find that the question of expansion took place either by one kilometre or two kilometres; by one village or two villages; by one area or two areas; by one district or more districts. That has been the story of the question of Palestine.

98. If you go to the homeland, you will find nothing but a promise given by Lord Balfour of the United Kingdom. Then it became a State; then a partition; then more additional areas; then more additional areas, sometimes by one kilometre, sometimes by more. The occupation of these two kilometres in violation of the cease-fire decision deserves condemnation by the Security Council. It is not a question of one kilometre or two; it is part and parcel of the whole policy of expansion. This cannot pass unnoticed. Two kilometres mean a great deal to us, knowing the aggressive expansionist designs of Israel.

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

100. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

101. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I am taking the floor with great reluctance. I am taking the floor in order to point out that too many speeches have been made in the Council by the representative of Israel, and we have already shown what these speeches are worth. The Israel representative has

tried to deceive the Security Council here and has been exposed. This has been confirmed by the objective evidence contained in the report by Secretary-General U Thant.

102. Now we see that some new characters have made their appearance. The former representative has disappeared into the wings, and a new individual has taken the stage, but the statements are still the same and the same deceit continues.

103. But is it really necessary to tax the patience of the members of the Security Council? How long must we go on listening to repetitions of the same thing?

104. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the rules of procedure and with established practice, I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

105. Mr. KIDRON (Israel): I have very little indeed to add to what I said this morning on the substance of the joint draft resolution which the Council has just adopted, except to repeat that in spite of the short time which has elapsed since the firing ceased, every effort has been made by my authorities to restore normal civilian life and to alleviate the lot of the refugees.

106. Local government has been reconstructed wherever possible, and municipal and other public services have been renewed. An agreement with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency has been negotiated and agreed, and I informed the Council this morning of its text. I have also informed the Council of our request to the delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross that it do its utmost to expedite an exchange of prisoners. We have anxieties as to the treatment of our men who are in United Arab Republic, Jordanian and Syrian hands.

107. Our policy is that the human miseries of this conflict should be brought to an end, and my Government is doing all in its power to implement this policy, with fairness and humanity. All the world can see what we do. There is nothing that we hide or that we can hide. Representatives of the world's press have visited all areas of hostilities and the diplomatic representatives of all States represented in Israel have been invited to do so. They will be free to see and report what they like. And the reports which have already appeared in the press do not in any way confirm the atrocity stories which have been disseminated in this Council. This is a human problem of which my Government is most sensible, and we are genuinely and sincerely doing our best to solve it.

108. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, to whom I now give the floor.

109. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Thank you for giving me the floor. I wish to associate myself with the representative of Jordan in thanking the authors of the draft resolution [*S/7968/Rev.3*] which was voted upon unanimously by the Council. We believe that this is a very timely resolution and a very necessary one. Unfortunately, in the comments just made by the representative of the Tel Aviv authorities, he tried again to obscure the issue. I should say that it is a

variation on a theme. But when one speaks of a variation on a theme, the words are associated with music. There are variations on a theme by Bach or Handel, or something of the sort. But when the variations on a theme are distortions and lies, the analogy can hardly be made, except that it displeases the ear and upsets the thought and the mind of man. The resolution, in operative paragraph 1, states the following:

"1. *Calls upon* the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities."

110. Surely, the authors of the resolution have definite proof that Israel is the party to which this appeal should be addressed. Furthermore, in the note of the Secretary-General of yesterday, 13 June, which was published today, we have the text of a letter addressed by the Secretary-General to the representative of Israel, which states:

"The Secretary-General . . . wishes to refer to the situation of the Arab civilian population in the areas occupied by Israel's military forces in the course of the recent fighting.

"The Secretary-General is sure that the Government of Israel will readily recognize United Nations interest in the well-being of the civilian populations in the areas now under Israel military occupation, both on broad humanitarian grounds and because of the long-established United Nations concern with the Palestine refugees as reflected in the United Nations Relief and Works Agency." [S/7930/Add.6, para. 5.]

111. In this connexion we wish particularly to thank the representative of Mali for having suggested an amendment that was incorporated in the resolution as operative paragraph 3, which states:

"*Requests* the Secretary-General to follow the effective implementation of this resolution and to report to the Security Council."

Surely this amendment is very necessary.

112. The representative of the Tel Aviv authorities has stated, and you have all heard him, that press correspondents and photographers are free to come to Israel and to let the truth be known. I am sure that all members of the Council saw on the morning of 9 June a photograph emanating from Israel, later published in many newspapers and more recently in *Life* magazine in colours. I am referring to a picture which showed some members of the United Arab Republic army, captives of the Israel forces, stripped of their uniforms, put face down on the ground, their hands tied behind their backs, and the Israel soldiers standing above them. The caption under the picture read: "Victorious and Defeated". If anybody wants proof that Zionism is equivalent to nazism, he has only to look at that picture.

113. We can only emphasize time and again that the party responsible for this whole tragedy is Israel. We have been

contending that Israel started the aggression in this war. The representatives of the Tel Aviv authorities, in their variations on their theme, have suggested the contrary. But I have in my hand here a news item published by Reuters, emanating from Vatican City, dated 14 June. This is what it states:

"The Vatican weekly newspaper *Osservatore della Domenica* said today Israel started last week's fighting, and its recent declaration could make peace even more difficult. An editorial by leading Vatican journalist Federico Alessandrini said: 'In practice, in starting hostilities Israel must have known with sufficient certainty it could move without risk in order to get it over quickly'.

"But the way to peace was long and difficult, he wrote. Declarations by the victors can make it even more arduous, he said. When he heard it said that there is no room on Israel territory for even one Arab refugee because economic conditions do not permit it, the least we can say is that we are very perturbed."

114. This Vatican weekly speaks in the name of the Holy Father, and I wish to state here that the Holy Father is holy not only to Catholicism, he is equally holy to us. This is witnessed by the fact that his visit to Jordan was a momentous and historic one. The whole population of Jordan, the majority of which is Moslem and the minority of which is Christian, came to welcome the Holy Father, especially when he came to the Jordan River, took up some water in his hand and sprinkled it. I think that in this news item there ought to be enough proof that the party that started the war was, as stated in the Vatican weekly, Israel.

115. In concluding, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not thank the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for having submitted to the Security Council their draft resolution [S/7951/Rev.2] which, as I had occasion to state, meets the situation, very much unlike the United States draft resolution, which is meant for nothing else but to serve as a cover for the aggressor and for the invasion. I wish also to thank all the members who voted separately for operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of that draft resolution.

116. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In our view the Security Council has in fact exhausted this question at the present stage, since it has not been able to take the necessary decision in accordance with the Charter. Mention has been made of the United States draft resolution. But, as we have stated several times, this draft resolution will not be adopted by the Council. We should like to warn members of this once again, so that there will be no misunderstanding in the Council. The Soviet Union will exercise its right in the Council in regard to the United States draft resolution.

117. Of course, if the United States delegation still harbours any ideas about its draft resolutions and is having consultations about them, that is its own affair. It can do that wherever and whenever it likes. That is of little concern to us. There is only one fate in store for the United States draft resolution. It will remain in the dusty archives

of the United Nations as a shameful document, as evidence of complicity in Israel's aggression.

118. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Before we complete our work, I would like to draw to the attention of the representative of the Soviet Union, a statement made by Ambassador Goldberg earlier today in which he indicated with regard to the United States draft resolution that we are very open-minded about its text. We will be glad to consider constructive suggestions for improvement. Therefore, particularly inasmuch as we have indicated we do not intend to press our text to a vote in its present form, it is difficult for us to foresee, although perhaps the Soviet delegation is better able to do so, exactly in what form the United States text will ultimately be put to the vote.

119. I am not completely clear whether the statement of the Soviet representative is intended to indicate that the position of his delegation will under any and all circumstances be a negative position, without regard for changes that may be suggested or made pursuant to the consultations which we do intend to undertake with respect to our draft resolution.

120. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, my United States colleague is anxious to know what considerations we were guided by in making the statement which we felt we had to make to the Security Council. These considerations are based not on fantasy or imagination, but on facts. Our attitude is based on recent facts illustrating the position of the United States delegation. This position was made clear when the Council voted on the Soviet proposal. It was a negative position.

121. Consequently, it is perfectly clear that there can be no basis for understanding between our positions, and no amendments or revisions of their drafts will help matters at all, whatever statements are made or whatever eloquence is used by the United States delegation.

122. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I would only say that I would have thought that consultations among members of the Security Council would continue with regard to further constructive measures as well as to the observance of the cease-fire, which is our continuing responsibility. It is our impression that the majority of the members of the Council wish to continue such consultations.

123. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The members of the Council cannot have been unaware of the manner in which the delegations of some Western countries seemed to be perplexed when we sought to establish the fact of Israel's aggression, claiming that they had no information to support the charge that aggression had taken place. Yet, now that we have reached the final stage of our debate, they are taking a very active part in the procedural discussion on how to do this or that and how to continue the work of the Council in order to prevent other United Nations organs from taking a decision which could at least help, although perhaps not as much as the Security Council's, to make a political contribution and to resolve the problem of Israel's aggression.

124. We have already expressed our opinion on the draft resolution submitted by the United States. We have already seen the draft resolution undergo three revisions, but in spite of all the embellishments introduced by successive revisions, in spite of all the consultations among the members of the Council—and we are not opposed to consultations—the substance of that draft resolution will certainly not be changed. Indeed, it is a statement of United States policy. That policy is, as has been stated on several occasions by the United States representative, not to allow the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of the Israel troops, but to try and find a way to change the *status quo ante* so as to reward the aggression and not return to the situation which previously existed in the Middle East.

125. You will remember that in the past the United States representative has frequently quoted the report of the Secretary-General of 26 May 1967 [S/7906] which stated that there should be a breathing spell and that we should go back to the previous situation so that we could discuss certain matters. Now the United States representative is no longer thinking of a breathing spell which would permit a solution of the problems of the Middle East; he is attempting to solve these problems so that the aggression will benefit.

126. The Soviet representative has stated that he cannot accept less than the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's troops. The Arab countries have also said this, and it is the desire of the whole world that this should be so. I do not think that the Security Council as a whole can agree to less than that.

127. What then does the United States delegation and the other delegations who wish to continue this procedural debate want and what is their purpose? They are simply trying to prolong this debate in order to prevent recourse to other procedures in the United Nations.

128. We believe that we should take the position from now on that the substance of the United States draft resolution, whether or not it is amended further, is unacceptable because we cannot agree to tolerate the aggression and refrain from condemning the aggressor.

129. That being the case, as has just been said, since the United States delegation has expressed its intentions this morning, we believe that this discussion in the Council, even if it continues, will have no purpose other than to delay other action than that which the Security Council can take at this moment. Therefore we think that we should bring our work to an end and seek within the United Nations a means of continuing our task, which is to condemn aggression and to demand the immediate withdrawal of all the aggressor's troops.

130. The PRESIDENT: With reference to the intervention made by the representative of Canada, I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that the Council has the following draft resolutions pending: the one in document S/7941, submitted by Canada; and the following three submitted by the United States, S/7916/Rev.1, S/7952/Rev.3, and S/7971.

131. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Mr. President, you have already made one point of substance which, I think, is very important, to remind us that there are several draft resolutions still pending before this body. While I spoke earlier of the United States draft, this was merely because that was the key substantive proposal which we had introduced before the Council. We will, of course, also wish very serious consideration to be given to the other pending resolutions.

132. I should just like to take one more moment of the Council's time to answer the question of the representative of Bulgaria as to our purpose in suggesting that further Council consideration of this grave situation is required. In his intervention, he recalled the Secretary-General's report and the Secretary-General's appeal for a breathing spell which he appears to believe has now been overtaken or forgotten. I should like to assure him that that is not the case. Indeed, as I read that paragraph again from the Secretary-General's report, I find that the purpose for which the Secretary-General asked for a breathing spell was the following: "to allow the Council to deal with the underlying causes of the present crisis and to seek solutions" [S/7906, para. 14]. That is our only purpose in seeking further Council consideration of this matter.

133. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I should merely wish to say, as I anticipate that you are about to adjourn our meeting, that I take it that it is open to any member of this Council to ask for a meeting

whenever he considers it necessary, and that we should not assume that the attitude of some members of the Council means that the rest of us are not free to pursue in this Council the efforts to make a valuable contribution in dealing with the grave situation which is before us.

134. The PRESIDENT: I would say that every member of this Council is, of course, always free to ask for a meeting of the Council.

135. I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic.

136. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): I believe that we have a draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic on 31 May [S/7919]. For the time being, we are not going to insist upon having it put to the vote, but I should like to say it is still before the Security Council.

137. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Arab Republic for drawing my attention to the draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic. That means that the Council also has that draft resolution pending.

138. I have no further speakers. It is my intention to adjourn the meeting. The next meeting of the Council will be fixed by me after consultations with members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Получите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже печатной продукции, 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.
