

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN/SA COLLECTION

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1351st MEETING: 8 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1351)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)	1
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907)	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)	

NOTE

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

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

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

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 8 June 1967, at 2.50 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/1351)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT: At 10.40 o'clock this morning I received a request from the Permanent Representative of the United States [S/7950] for an urgent meeting of the Security Council because the fighting, in spite of the call from the Security Council, was continuing in the area and he intended to submit a draft resolution. Accordingly, I consulted my colleagues on the Council and they all agreed to the convening of an emergency meeting for 2 o'clock this afternoon. Later, the representative of the USSR also requested an emergency meeting. That is the background on which I have convened this meeting on short notice.

3. Yesterday afternoon the Secretary-General presented a report to the Council on the responses received up to that point from the parties concerned with regard to the Council's call for a cease-fire. Since that time the following communications have been received and are being circulated as documents of the Council as quickly as possible: a cable dated 7 June from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan to the Secretary-General [S/7943]; a letter dated 7 June from the Foreign Minister of Israel to the President [S/7945]; a cable dated 7 June from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan to the Secretary-General [S/7946]; a cable dated 8 June from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan to the Secretary-General [S/7947], and a cable dated 8 June from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait to the Secretary-General [S/7948].

4. The Security Council will now continue its discussion of the three items inscribed on its agenda. I should like to inform members of the Council that two draft resolutions were handed in to the Secretariat just a few minutes ago: the first, submitted by the USSR [S/7951], and the second, submitted by the United States [S/7952]. Before giving the floor to the first speaker on my list, I would ask the Secretary-General to inform the Council of the latest developments in the area.

5. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I received this morning the following message from the Foreign Minister of Kuwait:

"Gratefully received your cable concerning resolutions of Security Council [233 (1967), 234 (1967)] for cease-fire. I am sorry to inform you that Government of Kuwait will not observe nor adhere to these resolutions which do not condemn Israel aggressors. The resolutions also ignored the just rights of the Palestinians in their homeland." [S/7948.]

15. It is for this reason that my delegation has asked for this urgent meeting of the Council today and has submitted the draft resolution which has been distributed to the members of the Council. The draft resolution reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Recalling its resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967),

"Recalling that in the latter resolution the Council demanded that the Governments concerned should as a first step cease fire and discontinue military operations at 2000 hours GMT on 7 June 1967,

"Noting that Israel and Jordan have indicated their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire, and that Israel has expressed with respect to all parties its acceptance of the cease-fire provided the other parties accept,

"Noting further with deep concern that other parties to the conflict have not yet agreed to a cease-fire,

"1. Calls for scrupulous compliance by Israel and Jordan with the agreement they have reached on a cease-fire;

"2. Insists that all the other parties concerned immediately comply with the Council's repeated demands for a cease-fire and cessation of all military activity as a first urgent step toward the establishment of a stable peace in the Middle East;

"3. Calls for discussions promptly thereafter among the parties concerned, using such third-party or United Nations assistance as they may wish, looking toward the establishment of viable arrangements encompassing the withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel, the renunciation of force regardless of its nature, the maintenance of vital international rights and the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East;

"4. Requests the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to take immediate steps to seek to assure compliance with the cease-fire and to report to the Council thereon within twenty-four hours;

"5. Also requests the Secretary-General to provide such assistance as may be required in facilitating the discussions called for in paragraph 3." [S/7952.]

16. It is obvious from the text of this draft resolution that the provisions in the draft resolution fall into two distinct parts. First, operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 are designed to complete the essential—and I emphasize "essential"—first step of the cease-fire. Fighting must stop. It must stop now. It should have stopped before, but it certainly must stop now. We welcome the fact that a mutual cease-fire has already been accepted by Israel and Jordan. We also welcome the fact that the Government of Israel announced officially in a letter today to the President of the Security Council [S/7945] that it accepts the Security Council's call for an immediate cease-fire if the other parties accept. It is necessary that all the other parties now agree to put into

6. I have received the following information from General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of UNTSO.

7. On the morning of 8 June, General Bull received a message from the Foreign Minister of Jordan to the effect that, despite the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council, Israel troops were bombing Mafrq and that Israel forces were also concentrating on the west side of the River Jordan south of Damiya bridge and some troops had crossed to the eastern bank. General Bull communicated this information to the Israel Foreign Ministry and was informed that Iraqi troops and aircraft were in the Mafrq area. I may mention, in this regard, that the resolutions of the Security Council were transmitted to the Government of Iraq, in addition to the Governments which I had informed previously, but no response has been received.

8. United Nations military observers in Tiberias reported on the morning of 8 June that very heavy continuous air and ground fire was taking place in the general area of the Israel-Syrian central demilitarized zone.

9. The Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) is continuing to concentrate UNEF troops prior to evacuation by ship off the beaches. One ship is already in the Gaza area awaiting clearance and two other ships are on their way to the area and are expected to arrive within forty-eight hours. It is hoped to resume the evacuation of UNEF within forty-eight hours.

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

11. I also wish to inform members of the Council that the representative of the United Arab Republic has communicated to me that he wishes to make an important statement at this meeting of the Council.

12. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the United States, and I now call on him.

13. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): In its two resolutions calling for and then demanding a cease-fire, the Security Council in the past three days has taken the first essential step on the road back to peace in the Middle East. But we have not achieved our objective, as is evident from the letter read to us by the Secretary-General and by the oral report which he has just given to the members of the Council.

14. The increasing gravity of the situation makes it perfectly clear that we must take further steps in order to maximize the chances of building a peace in that tormented region, a peace which will be stable and just to all concerned. The cessation of hostilities and the building of such a peace, it is obvious, cannot be done quickly. But the steps towards it must be taken without delay.

effect a cease-fire immediately, and this draft resolution so provides.

17. It further provides, in operative paragraph 4, for the assistance both of yourself, Mr. President, and the Secretary-General to assure prompt compliance with the Council's call for a cease-fire. In this respect, this provision draws on the useful idea put forward yesterday in the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Canada [S/7941].

18. Secondly, the draft resolution, in operative paragraph 3, calls for prompt discussions after a cease-fire has been achieved, looking toward the establishment of viable arrangements encompassing the withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel, the renunciation of force regardless of its nature, the maintenance of vital international rights and—what I am sure every member of this Council hopes for—the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East.

19. Paragraph 5 requests our Secretary-General to assist in whatever way may be necessary to facilitate such discussions.

20. My Government believes that this dual approach, in which the completion of the cease-fire is combined with a call for longer-range discussions, is the approach most likely to bring progress towards real peace in the Middle East. In simple realism, in the light of all that has occurred, we must all recognize that immediately beyond the first essential step of cease-fire there still lie the basic political issues which have fed the fires of conflict in this region for two decades. Indeed, the entire debate in the Security Council over the last several days has emphasized this essential fact. It would not do justice to the problem to confine our concern exclusively to the cessation of hostilities, without also thereafter promptly addressing ourselves to the causes of the hostilities.

21. In order to initiate a prompt approach to the causes of the hostilities, we have included paragraph 3 in our draft resolution. Our purpose is to provide for movement towards the final settlement of all outstanding questions between the parties which the United Nations envisaged nearly twenty years ago. And I should like to emphasize that when we say "all outstanding questions", we mean all. No outstanding question should be excluded. The objective must be a decision by the warring Powers to live in peace and to establish normal relations, as contemplated and pledged by the United Nations Charter.

22. Clearly, such major controversies as the one which has plagued the Middle East for these many years cannot be solved without difficulty, and anyone conversant with the situation would be lacking in candour if he did not acknowledge that. To minimize the obstacles to a prompt beginning to such a discussion, we have included in paragraph 3 the suggestion that the parties make use of such United Nations or third-party assistance as they may wish; and in paragraph 5 we have included a particular request to the Secretary-General, in his unique position as an impartial international servant, to provide such assistance in this connexion as may be required.

23. Speaking for the United States, let me add that our view on all these many problems has been stated many

times and has not changed. I wish to reaffirm, in all sincerity, that my country's wish for all the nations and peoples of the Middle East is a true peace of justice, mutual tolerance and creative growth.

24. We want to see that region get away from the dreadful cycle of arms races and war, and we are ready to do anything necessary in order to achieve that essential result. We want to see the gifted people of all nations in the area devote their talents and energies to the works of peace and construction, the eradication of disease, ignorance, prejudice and poverty and to the building of a better life for all the people, since we are convinced that this is what the people of the area truly want and seek.

25. To this end, I renew the pledge of the United States to join in efforts to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East and to lend all our energies to achieving that aim.

26. A wise philosopher once observed that there is no conflict which cannot be resolved if it is dealt with at a higher level than that on which it occurred. Let us now call on the parties to this conflict to rise to such a higher level, one which takes fully into account both all the hard realities of this complex situation and all its creative possibilities. Now, in this moment of sad conflict and danger, is the time for the United Nations, through this authoritative organ, the Security Council, to point the way, and now also is the time for all loyal Members of the United Nations, inside and outside this Council, to put their influence at the service of peace.

27. It is in this belief that my delegation has offered the present draft resolution, for which I ask the Council's prompt and constructive consideration.

28. When war breaks out, it touches all of us. No one is immune. In the last few days we have heard sad reports about the deaths of United Nations personnel—Indian personnel, Brazilian personnel, and Irish personnel. And today it is with sadness that I report that this morning we received information that an unarmed United States ship in the Mediterranean had been attacked and hit by a torpedo, with a resulting loss of life, American life. The Government of Israel has admitted responsibility for the incident and has expressed apologies. I wish to express dismay at this incident and to call for vigorous steps to ensure that it is not repeated, and to inform the Council that the United States Government has already protested against the attack directly to the Government of Israel.

29. This Council has a great responsibility, and that responsibility is to see to it that all fighting stops in the area. This is the purport of our draft resolution, which I commend to the members of this Council.

30. THE PRESIDENT: I have just been informed that the representative of the United Arab Republic does not wish to make a statement. I now give the floor to the Secretary-General, who wishes to make an important statement.

31. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have just received the following communication from Mr. El Kony, Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations. It is dated 8 June 1967:

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

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

33. I think it is indeed encouraging that, with this communication, three Governments—namely, those of Israel, Jordan, and the United Arab Republic—have accepted the call for a cease-fire made by this Council. Let us hope that this is the beginning of more auspicious developments in the troubled area of the Middle East.

34. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, at earlier meetings of the Security Council my delegation, as you will of course recall, warned that the continuation and expansion of Israel's aggression against the United Arab Republic and other Arab States was creating an even more threatening situation in the Near East. Now the Council can see that the situation has indeed become one of extreme emergency.

35. There can no longer be a shadow of doubt that it was Israel that planned in advance and carried out a treacherous attack on the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries. It is well known that the troops of the aggressor not only struck surprise blows in the first hours of the hostilities and penetrated deep into foreign territory but also exulted over their military victory.

36. The rampant forces of aggression are presenting ultimatums and claims, such as, for example, the statement by General Dayan that Israel will not leave Jerusalem, and so forth.

37. In Tel Aviv a war fever, a war psychosis has set in. This ominous circumstance is extremely significant in many ways.

38. If Israel had not been thinking about aggression and had not prepared for it, events would have taken a different course. We now know that Israel ignored the resolutions adopted by the Security Council on 6 and 7 June 1967 [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)] concerning the cessation of military activities and not only did not halt those aggressive activities but used the time elapsed since the adoption of those Council resolutions to seize additional territory of the United Arab Republic and Jordan by force.

39. The Council is now meeting in urgent session in response to the Soviet delegation's request for consideration of the 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 and Jordan which they have seized as the result of an aggression".

40. The extremists in Tel Aviv are obviously intoxicated by their temporary armed incursion into the territory of the Arab countries and are even laying down the conditions on which they could accept the demands of the Security

Council. That can be seen from the response by the Government of Israel to the Security Council's resolutions of 6 and 7 June—a response in which an attempt is made to lay the blame on the victim of the aggression. But of course that trick is nothing new. The forces of aggression have been resorting to such tricks for centuries.

41. In essence, Israel has flung a challenge at the United Nations, the Security Council and all peace-loving States, and this has created a new situation which is fraught with the most serious consequences. The Arab countries, which have become the victims of aggression, have now been placed in a situation in which they must take defensive measures against Israel until such time as Israel puts an end to its military activities not in words, not in declarations, but in deeds, and until such time as it withdraws its troops from the territory it has seized.

42. All this means that the Council must at this point severely condemn Israel as the aggressor, as a State which has flagrantly violated the resolutions of the Security Council. Israel has thus taken upon itself the full burden of responsibility for the crime committed, for the consequences of its adventurist, provocative and aggressive actions. For this it must be severely punished.

43. Even at this meeting of the Council, as we have just heard, the United States representative uttered many fine-sounding words, but in reality he was again shielding the aggressor, his ally, for he completely ignored, as before, the question of responsibility for the aggression. It is significant that in Washington, too, according to American press reports, people in positions of great responsibility are proclaiming that Israel's aggression is a victory for the West. But are they not over-hasty in beating the drums at Tel Aviv and in the capitals of the States that have most closely supported the aggression?

44. At this point, therefore, it is not enough to reiterate the appeal for the cessation of military activities or read out documents containing assurances, conditions and demands of every kind. What we must do now, what constitutes our main task, is not only to condemn the aggressor but also to call for the immediate withdrawal of the troops from the territory they have seized in the Arab countries.

45. The Security Council must take a decision which will not allow Israel to enjoy the fruits of its criminal aggression, as they are dreaming of doing at Tel Aviv, a decision which will fully secure the rights of the victims of aggression.

46. My delegation confirms the position it has repeatedly set forth in our earlier remarks to the Council and again draws the attention of the Council's members to the Soviet Government's statements concerning the situation which has arisen in the Near East as a result of the aggression by Israel. We call upon the members of the Council to do everything in their power to put an end to Israel's aggression, to halt the armed invasion of foreign territory, to ensure respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and to prevent unseemly manoeuvres by the forces of aggression and their supporters.

47. My delegation wishes to submit the following draft resolution for the Security Council's consideration:

"The Security Council,

"Noting that Israel has disregarded the Security Council decisions calling for the cessation of military activities [resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967 and 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967],

"Considering that Israel not only has not halted military activities but has made use of the time elapsed since the adoption by the Council of the aforementioned resolutions in order to seize additional territory of the United Arab Republic and Jordan,

"Noting that even now Israel is continuing military activities instead of halting its aggression, thus defying the United Nations and all peace-loving States,

"1. Vigorously condemns Israel's aggressive activities and its violations of the aforementioned Security Council resolutions, of the United Nations Charter and of United Nations principles;

"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." [S/7951.]

48. It goes without saying that in submitting this draft resolution we have in mind not only the withdrawal of the forces of the aggressor behind the armistice lines but also respect for the status of the demilitarized zones as provided for in the General Armistice Agreements, and we intend to submit the necessary particulars in due course. The proposal we have submitted is an extension of the Security Council's resolutions which takes into account the fact that Israel has not taken the first step called for earlier by the Council.

49. We appeal to the members of the Security Council to take the necessary decision, without procrastination or delay, so that the Council may fulfil its duty in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

50. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): None of us can have failed to be greatly moved by the announcement by the Secretary-General just now, an announcement which we trust will be of far-reaching consequence, will rapidly bring the tragic conflict to an end, and will be the start of a return to good sense and justice.

51. Some of us who have served in this Council before will go back in our minds to a similar dramatic statement—which I so well remember—when a declaration was made here by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan accepting the United Nations call for a cease-fire [1244th meeting]. I do not think that we can possibly over-estimate the far-reaching importance of what has been reported to us. We believe that that statement, together with the actions already taken by others, should and must transform the whole situation and give us not only relief and thankfulness, but also new hope.

52. I might also say that I feel, in hearing what was said, that this is not a victory in a conflict between Arab States

and Israel. It is certainly not a victory in the cold war. This is a success, I am glad to say, for the United Nations. I do not think that it is necessary, in the new circumstances, to deal in any detail with the speeches to which we have this afternoon listened—or, indeed, with the draft resolutions that have been presented, since the situation, so we trust, has now been so radically changed. I would only say that, in referring to those speeches and, indeed, to the activities of the Council on this or other occasions, I would apply the test of whether the speeches and the resolutions inflame animosities or not; whether they increase tensions or not, whether, on the other hand, they contribute to the possibility of peace or not; whether they contribute to the likelihood of just settlement or not.

53. On this occasion, I would wish to speak for a few minutes to the theme of international responsibility. It may be that after the tempest and the strong wind, the still small voice of international understanding might be heard.

54. I came here this afternoon wishing to support the purpose of the draft resolution put to us yesterday by Canada. It seemed to me entirely right and urgently necessary that the question of how our call for a cease-fire could be put into full effect should be raised immediately and be given top priority. My delegation, for one, regretted that the Council did not deal with and dispose of the matter yesterday.

55. Our actions in this Council each day this week, since we were first summoned early on Monday morning, have been—as they should have been—connected and continuous. They also had to be very urgent. We were utterly against delay on Monday. We have been utterly against delay throughout. Indeed, had there not been delay last month, delay in endorsing the Secretary-General's appeal, delay which we strenuously opposed from the first, we might even have been able to avert and prevent the war altogether.

56. I greatly hope that we shall not through division sink back into the attitude that most disastrously prevailed for two weeks amongst some members of this Council, the attitude that the dangers were overdramatized and the urgency artificial. No one underestimates the dangers which remain. No one should doubt the urgency of the work ahead of us, work which will urgently occupy us for long to come.

57. But before I go on, I beg your indulgence, Mr. President, to reflect for a minute on what has taken place in the Council this week. I do so because, as I say, our actions in this critical week have been and must remain connected and continuous. None of us will forget the sense of urgency which all of us felt when we assembled early on Monday morning, 5 June [1347th meeting] with the news of a new war in our ears. Most, if not all, of us felt then the need for an immediate call for a cease-fire. We are not likely to forget our sense of exasperation and frustration as the whole day and part of the night went by without members of the Council being willing to take together that first essential step.

58. We were ready to make provision in a first resolution not only for a cease-fire, but also for disengagement and withdrawal. We urged throughout that long day that,

whatever else we did or did not do, we must call for a cease-fire at once. It was not until the next day, Tuesday, that the Council was prepared to act, and then it acted unanimously [1348th meeting].

59. We remain of the strong opinion that the Council should have acted twenty-four hours earlier. The Council should have acted as we urgently advocated on the Monday morning. Nevertheless, we took the essential first step together, and I pay my respectful tribute to all those, including the representative of the Soviet Union, who contributed to making that result possible. By Tuesday evening we had been able to achieve a unanimous call for a cease-fire. We realized that the next urgent step must be to provide for the implementation of the call we had made.

60. Since early Monday morning we have worked for a cease-fire. But what we should have been doing yesterday was not repetition but urgent consideration of ways and means to put the demand into effect and how we could then go on to the next stage of disengagement.

61. Here let me say how greatly we have admired the efforts of General Bull and all those who have worked with him in conditions of confusion and danger. We renew our tribute to him, to General Rikhye and to all those who have served under the United Nations flag. We honour the dead of India and Brazil and Ireland, who gave their lives in the cause of peace. We do not forget those who sadly have lost their lives, as reported to us by the representative of the United States today. But the brave United Nations rear-guard is not enough. We have to find new means of establishing an effective United Nations presence. We have to set out on the hard uphill road back to international authority. The draft resolution before us is a step in that direction. It may not be a long step, but it is a first step along the road of restoring the effectiveness of the United Nations. And I trust that the purposes of the draft resolution which was put forward by Canada [S/7941] can now be promptly and effectively completed.

62. There are those who have been quick to declare the failure of the United Nations. Those who have sought to denigrate international effort rejoiced. There are some—who have never been ready to strengthen the international Organization while there was time and opportunity to do so—who were very ready to pronounce its impotence. There are those who are prepared to see the efforts of the past twenty-one years to establish international co-operation and international authority destroyed and betrayed. Others may be so prepared; we cannot be.

63. We now have the opportunity to prove such people wrong. We now have an opportunity to show that there is nothing wrong with an organization which includes great nations and medium-sized nations and small nations and rich and poor nations alike. We now have an opportunity to prove that there is nothing wrong with the principle that every nation has a right to be heard, but no nation has a right to dominate. We still have an opportunity to show that there is nothing wrong with the Charter or the Organization, except those who refuse to use it. The events of this week have themselves emphasized the necessity of using it.

64. We know that there are members of the Council who have been unwilling to see the authority of the United

Nations maintained and strengthened. It must be said too that the parties to the conflict have fallen far short of readiness to respect and employ international authority. In the crisis and challenge which we now face, I appeal both to the members of the Council and to the parties to the conflict to realize and accept that international authority must be established. I appeal to them to realize that this cannot be done by sitting in New York and adopting resolutions. That is necessary, but it is not nearly enough. It is on the ground, in the deserts and the hills and the villages and cities of the Near East, that action is required. There must be in the areas of conflict effective United Nations representation to cope with all the tasks ahead of us.

65. What are those tasks? They are to stop the fighting—and we pray that the fighting may very soon be stopped; to ensure and secure disengagement; to bring relief and succour to the wounded and the homeless; and then to move on to the greater tasks of conciliation and the establishment of order and justice. These practical tasks are enormous. They will occupy us for a very long time to come.

66. I most earnestly and sincerely beg all members of the Council, especially the permanent members, to approach these tasks with a will to work together, to abandon old prejudices, to realize that the world looks to us not to perpetuate animosities, but to heal the wounds and repair the damage, and to give to all the peoples of the Near East the security they need and the security they long for, to make their lives tolerable and their future not a future of fear, but a future of hope.

67. In all these purposes we, round this table, have an inescapable obligation. I trust that we shall show that we are determined to rise to it.

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

69. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Owing to the failure of certain Arab States to comply with the cease-fire resolutions adopted in recent days, fighting and bloodshed have continued in various parts of the Middle East. This fighting and this bloodshed have taken a heavy toll amongst all the participant States.

70. There has also been tragic and accidental loss of life to those not involved in the conflict. Some of these have been the officers and servants of the United Nations charged with the supervision of international agreements. Today we have heard the painful news of the tragic and accidental error which cost the lives of four Americans and injury to many more in Middle Eastern waters. I have today conveyed to the Secretary of State of the United States my Government's deep regret at this tragic and accidental error, a sincere regret accompanied by deep and respectful condolences to the families of the dead and injured who have become innocent victims of the tragic turmoil of war.

71. These developments emphasize the urgency of bringing to swift and complete fulfilment the unconditional cease-fire resolutions which the Security Council has adopted. The position when this Council meeting convened

was that the only established and effective cease-fire agreement was that concerted between Israel and Jordan, and I was glad to be able to convey to the President of the Security Council last night the news that this agreement had been mutually accepted and had become effective. We have now heard the decision of the Government of the United Arab Republic to accept the cease-fire resolutions as formulated by the Security Council. My Government conveyed to you, Mr. President, last night our general acceptance of the cease-fire resolution and its applicability to all the fronts and all the sectors in which hostilities have been going on. It seems evident, therefore, that the Council now celebrates the real and, I hope, the immediate prospect of achieving between the United Arab Republic and Israel an effective cease-fire agreement.

72. This is, of course, a notable step. It is a pity that it was not taken a day or two ago when the cease-fire resolution was first proposed.

73. In welcoming this new development, I feel that it would be candid to point out that special and accentuated responsibility now lies on those parties which have not yet accepted the cease-fire resolutions. I refer especially to the Government of Syria, which has not indicated its attitude on the cease-fire resolution. On the Syrian-Israel frontier the fighting has indeed, according to my reports, become intensified in recent hours. Nor have we heard of any acceptance of the cease-fire resolution by the Government of Iraq, whose forces have been operating in various sectors of the front. And the Government of Kuwait has conveyed to the Security Council its refusal of the cease-fire.

74. Therefore, still much has to be done before the integral structure of the cease-fire system is established. My Government sincerely hopes that the consent now formally conveyed by the Governments of Israel, Jordan and the United Arab Republic—in that order—will be swiftly followed by the other Governments concerned. Of course, the establishment and the stabilization of the cease-fire is the indispensable prelude to any further progress towards the pacification of our tormented region. Not only the Governments directly concerned, but all members of the international community have a responsibility in this regard. The hand of historic responsibility lies heavy upon this Council, which holds primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

75. Whether utterances made at this table are true or distorted, whether they are balanced or unbalanced, is a question which has its psychological and political effects upon the events in our region. It is for that reason that we react with deep regret and indignation to the address of the representative of the Soviet Union, which contained many abusive words but very few facts. I am sorry to say that the same lack of balance, a totally inequitable distribution of innocence and responsibility, marks the draft resolution which has been submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union. We have one overriding objection to that draft resolution: the overriding objection to the draft is that it is not true.

76. The first preambular paragraph is not true. It states:

“Noting that Israel has disregarded the Security Council decisions calling for the cessation of military activities . . .” [S/7951].

The fact is that Israel was the first of the States involved in hostilities to pay any regard to the Security Council decisions calling for a cease-fire. We were the first to indicate our acceptance of the cease-fire, and as soon as any other of our neighbours gave similar intimation of acceptance, the cease-fire was concerted and rendered effective. So far that has been the case with Jordan.

77. The draft resolution asks the Security Council to accept the declaration that Israel has not halted military activities. The fact is that Israel halted military activities as soon as a cease-fire had been achieved with any of its neighbours, and will halt military activities as soon as a cease-fire with Egypt, Syria and Iraq is achieved, completed and implemented faithfully on the other side.

78. It is not true that Israel is defying the United Nations and all peace-loving States. I have been astonished and deeply moved beyond any expectation by the fantastic volume of applause and encouragement which has flowed in to Israel from most peace-loving States and from vast multitudes of people in different walks of life all over the world.

79. The defiance of peace-loving principles arose from the sudden, brutal, sustained concentration of hostility with which the United Arab Republic and its leaders disturbed a situation which for ten years had ensured a relative stability upon our southern frontier. I have already recounted and the Council fully knows the various phases in this campaign which shook and shocked and agitated the world community in the latter half of May. We all saw how the design was unfolded: constant acts of sabotage, a vast and intimidating concentration of forces on our southern frontier, the war-like act of blockade, the attempt to strangle Israel's commercial and maritime relations, the issuing of Presidential announcements concerning the purpose of that campaign, namely, the total destruction of Israel, and the issuance of appropriate operation orders to commanders in the field.

80. That, then, is the background which the Soviet draft should have addressed itself to. It is this criticism of the Soviet draft that I make, namely, that it rests upon premises that are not accurate and upon responsibilities that are not fairly distributed. For that reason, we consider it inconceivable that the Security Council could adopt, or that anybody could implement, a draft such as that presented by the Soviet Union.

81. Perhaps I could best illustrate the real background of the events of early June if I were to add certain evidence that has come into our hands as a result of the movement of forces up and down the Sinai peninsula. I hold in my hand, for example, Operation Order No. 67/2 of the United Arab Republic Eastern Region Air Command of 27 May 1967, amending the previous order of 21 May 1967. It begins:

“1. *Mission of Second Air Brigade:*

“(a) 18 Squadron, comprising 12 aircraft concentrated at 258 Air Base will bomb Ekron (Akir) airfield and

radar, on condition that it is above the target at H hour.
Armament: Rockets and cannon.

“(b) 25 Squadron with 12 aircraft located at 210 Air Base, as first objective, will bomb three Hawk missile bases at”—various map references, remarkably accurate—
“Time above target: H hour. Armament: Rockets and cannon.”

The operation order then details the missions of the Twelfth Air Brigade, of the First Air Brigade, of the Sixty-fourth Air Brigade, of the Sixty-fifth Air Brigade, concluding with the exhortation that “all squadrons will study enemy targets in accordance with Intelligence Branch reports and observations in tactical range from low level” and that “the determination of bombing objectives will be made before takeoff”.

82. And there are other elements in this background: the Order of the Day of General Mortagi announcing that “the hour of the final solution of the Palestine problem is near”; the speeches by President Nasser describing the reasons for this strangling encirclement of Israel from the south and the north and the east; the purpose of the so-called defence pacts which were to bring this campaign towards its consummation; and the decisive act of blockade which, in all previous legal and historical experience, has been associated not with peace, but with hostility.

83. Never in history have an illegal blockade and peace coexisted. How could it be expected that they would long coexist here?

84. This, then, is my Government's comment on a draft which must surely have surprised all Members of the United Nations by its one-sidedness and by its total refusal to identify itself with the dilemma, the dangers, which Israel faced during those three nightmare weeks when so many throughout the world began to doubt our nation's prospect of security and survival. This volume of world opinion was not artificial. This concern, this agony of anxiety were not fomented. I have received, amongst so many thousands of letters from people in every country, a great number which include this phrase that I quote from a very humble citizen in a foreign land: “Don't get pushed around.” This is the advice that Israel has been receiving so often in recent days. And our Government made the decision no longer to be “pushed around”.

85. That, then, was the origin and the background and the basis of the tragic hostilities which have raged for most of this week, and which we ardently hope will now be brought to an end.

86. The fact is that we turned out to be less co-operative than some might have hoped with the plan for our extinction.

87. It seems to me that the urgency of the cease-fire resolutions is so great that we should await their implementation before detailed consideration can be given to other proposals. My Government will, of course, examine the document which has just come to the table from the United States of America [S/7952]. It seems at first sight to be a proposal for completing the cease-fire, and

thereafter for holding discussions between Israel and the Arab States, looking to mutually acceptable arrangements on the disposition of armed forces and a simultaneous liquidation of all belligerency and the establishment of a permanent peace.

88. The emphasis seems to be on the need to move not backwards to belligerency, but forward to peace; and it is in that context of peace negotiations that the draft proposes agreed measures of disengagement.

89. We have not, however, been able to study this text in detail and, therefore, my Government will reserve the opportunity to make further comment when the text has been submitted to the detailed examination which all such texts require. I therefore would like not to comment more substantively on this draft which has so recently come to my attention. I would, however, in the spirit of the words uttered by the representative of the United Kingdom, just say a few words about the horizon that opens out from here.

90. The first stage, as I have said, should be the completion and the effective fulfilment of the Egyptian-Israeli cease-fire, which now becomes possible as a result of the message that we have received. I have drawn attention to the necessity to achieve similar agreements with Syria and Iraq—in fact with all those Governments whose troops are officially engaged in hostilities. The phase thereafter must be a purposeful, resolute, patient, but urgent quest for a peace settlement.

91. Is it not obvious, after the tragic events of recent weeks, that positions which are intermediate between peace and war are fragile and seldom tenable? Perhaps the very shock that all of our nations have received, the sacrifices which some of them have undergone, the brink upon which we have stood—perhaps all of these will have a salutary effect in bringing the world community, and especially the States of our area, to the realization that there is no alternative to peaceful relations; that is to say, to the acceptance of certain minimal criteria of mutual respect for the sovereignty of States, for their peace, and for their security. In other words, with the structure that had stood the test of ten years so strangely but violently shattered, the need is now to build a new structure of inter-State relations in the Middle East.

92. I believe, as I have said before, that the States of the area must build this structure mainly by themselves. There is much that others can do to assist them in the construction of this new edifice of relations. The emphasis in Israel's thinking is not so much on the authority of international bodies but on the sovereign responsibility of the Governments concerned, by direct and bilateral contact, to work out the conditions and the elements for their coexistence. This, for us, is the starting point. Mechanisms and procedures and channels of assistance are also, of course, an important theme.

93. That, then, is our reaction to today's events: satisfaction with those announcements that have been made of acceptance of cease-fire; deep concern at the fact that there are some sectors in which cease-fire agreements have not been accepted in principle, still less carried out in practice;

and a belief that once the cease-fire is stabilized the major responsibility falls upon the Governments in the area to come face to face no longer in violence and conflict but rather in the understanding of the compulsion of a future to be shared in peace.

94. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): We have taken due note of the letter from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony, read to us by the Secretary-General, indicating that the United Arab Republic Government is prepared to accept the cease-fire called for by the Council on the condition that the other party ceases fire. This acceptance of the Council's resolutions calling for a cease-fire parallels the acceptance made by the Government of Israel with respect to a cease-fire. My Government is very glad that that declaration has been made and conveyed to the Security Council. We hope it will lead to similar declarations by other countries concerned which have not yet responded affirmatively, that it will lead to the end of the military conflict and that it will be the beginning of the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East.

95. Accordingly, in the light of the information received since the circulation of our draft resolution, we have made the following revisions in that text and have asked the Secretariat to distribute these revisions. We have revised the beginning of the third preambular paragraph to read: "*Noting that Israel, Jordan and the United Arab Republic . . .*". We have revised operative paragraph 1 to read:

"*Calls for scrupulous compliance by Israel, Jordan, and the United Arab Republic with their agreements to a cease-fire*".

The Secretariat will distribute these revisions,¹ but I wished now to call them to the attention of the Council.

96. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The Security Council has again been called upon to consider the problems arising from Israel's aggression against the Arab States. All the statements by Israel's representatives, including that by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country a few moments ago, have so far been made with the obvious intention of denying responsibility for the aggression; but they actually prove that the speakers must recognize their responsibility for initiating the attack and the aggression perpetrated by their troops.

97. The quotations read out by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, and taken from certain documents seized by Israel, do not prove that the other party committed the aggression or started the attack. These are demonstrations in the void, for we have all learned—not from press agencies but from the admissions of official Israel representatives themselves—that it was Israel that started the attack, the troop movements and the aggression.

98. A short time ago the Secretary-General read a letter addressed to him by the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony. In this letter, of which I have only the English text, he said:

"I have the honour to inform you, upon instructions of my Government, that it has decided to accept the cease-fire call, as it has been prescribed by the resolutions of the Council on 6 and 7 June 1967 [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)] on the condition that the other party ceases the fire."² [S/7953.]

99. In our intervention yesterday [1350th meeting] we indicated that the United Arab Republic and its Government could not halt the resistance to aggression until the aggression stopped. This letter is thus a confirmation of the position we took, and which we assumed the United Arab Republic had already taken.

100. Faced with this situation, the Security Council, in its resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967) adopted on 6 and 7 June, requested the Government concerned to cease fire immediately and to put a stop in the area to all military activity connected with the Israel aggression, which is still going on. This was an imperative call, made without reservations and without conditions. Contrary to the explicit and clear-cut stipulations of these resolutions, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, in his statement yesterday to the Council and then in his letter to the President of the Council [S/7945], sought to establish preliminary conditions for acceptance of the Security Council's summons. In his statement yesterday, he said: "We . . . support . . . the resolution calling for immediate measures to institute a cease-fire." [1350th meeting, para. 44.]

101. Despite repeated statements of this kind, the aggression by Israel and the invasion by its troops of the countries that have been attacked, are still going on. We have received no word to the effect that Israel's aggression has ceased. What value can such statements have in view of the patent fact of this continuing aggression? None, of course.

102. Twice during the last ten years or so, Israel has engaged in aggression and has demonstrated the same attitude towards all Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. The aggressor, the one who has invaded the territory of his victims, is calmly laying down conditions in the Security Council for acceptance of its call for a cease-fire. Such an attitude, such arrogance on the part of the aggressor can only arouse our indignation and remind us of the many resolutions adopted by the Security Council or the General Assembly while Israel, the aggressor, was engaged in military activities in violation of the provisions of the Charter, the General Armistice Agreements and international law. Those resolutions condemned Israel. When the Government of Israel was called upon to fulfil its obligations with regard to the cease-fire and the immediate withdrawal of its troops, the United Nations resolutions proved ineffectual.

103. I need only recall resolution 1123 (XI), in which the General Assembly:

"*Notes with regret and concern the failure of Israel to comply with the terms of the above-mentioned resolutions*".

¹ The full text of the revised draft resolution was later circulated as document S/7952/Rev.1.

² Quoted in English by the speaker.

The resolutions in question were General Assembly resolutions 997 (ES-I), 998 (ES-I), 999 (ES-I), 1002 (ES-I) and 1120 (XI). To those may also be added many Security Council resolutions. And that is far from being an exhaustive list of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

104. The present situation reminds us of Israel's attitude towards the appeals made by the Security Council over ten years ago.

105. In our statement yesterday we said: "You cannot ask a people not to resist aggression against its own territory." [1350th meeting, para. 66.] I do not believe there is a single person at this table or in this room who could tell a nation suffering aggression not to defend its dignity, its life, its existence, against the foreign invader. It is the aggressor who must effectively cease fire and halt his military activities. But instead, we find that the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Government of Israel are setting conditions. It is the aggression that must stop. The resistance to that aggression, we believe, cannot stop until the aggressor ends his attacks. This call upon the aggressor is urgent and indispensable. In condemning the premeditated aggression which Israel has committed, the Security Council must require the Government of that country immediately to withdraw its troops from the territories it has invaded in the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. That is the imperative, the primary, condition for the re-establishment of peace in the Near East. The United Nations cannot remain indifferent in the face of this aggression, which is a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity of the Arab Member States of the Organization and an imminent threat to international peace and security.

106. The delegation of the Soviet Union has just submitted a draft resolution which, in the context of what I have said, affirms that the Security Council:

"Considering that Israel not only has not halted military activities but has made use of the time elapsed since the adoption by the Council of the aforementioned resolutions in order to seize additional territory of the United Arab Republic and Jordan,

"Noting that even now Israel is continuing military activities instead of halting its aggression . . ."

—nor have we yet in fact been told that Israel has halted the aggression—

"1. Vigorously condemns Israel's aggressive activities and its violations of the aforementioned Security Council resolutions, . . .

"2. Demands that Israel should immediately halt its military activities . . .". [S/7951.]

107. We not only support this draft resolution, but, as we have already said several times over, we believe it is an absolutely indispensable measure if the war in the Near East is to be brought to an end. A nation defending its territorial integrity and its freedom cannot be asked to halt its resistance while the aggressor is in its territory and is continuing the aggression.

108. The Council also has before it a draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States of America. It is a rather strange text. What is strange is not that it was submitted by the United States, but that it was submitted to the Security Council, inasmuch as the United States position has been known for some time. What do we find in this draft resolution? It says, first of all, that the Security Council:

"Calls for scrupulous compliance by Israel, Jordan and the United Arab Republic with their agreements to a cease-fire" [S/7952/Rev.1].

109. If we are to ask Jordan and the United Arab Republic scrupulously to fulfil their promises, the aggression of which they are the victims must come to an end. But the Secretary-General has just informed us that, according to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan, the Israel aggression is still going on, despite his country's acceptance of the cease-fire. In these circumstances, can we expect Jordan to stop resisting Israel? Such a course of action would bring discredit upon the Government of Jordan, all authority in that country, and the Jordanian people itself.

110. What can the United Arab Republic do, when, two days after the Council has adopted a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire, all the news we receive reports that the Israel advance is continuing? The Israelis are even saying: "We are advancing and are not encountering resistance." What can that mean? It clearly indicates that naked aggression is still going on, despite the Security Council's resolutions.

111. The United States resolution, by the very fact that it places Jordan and the United Arab Republic on the same footing with the aggressor, is unacceptable, we believe, to all the Members of the United Nations, and especially to all the members of the Security Council.

112. Operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution *"Calls for discussions promptly thereafter among the parties concerned, using such third-party or United Nations assistance as they may wish, looking toward",* in the first place, *"the establishment of viable arrangements encompassing the withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel".* That means the aggressor's armies can remain there as long as they wish, for it would take months, if not years, to negotiate such arrangements. What can such a provision mean in view of statements in the press reporting that the Israel authorities say they will not withdraw their troops until they have been able to ensure that the whole of the city of Jerusalem will remain in Israel's hands, until they have been able to secure their right of passage through the Strait of Tiran and through the Suez Canal, and even until the state of war with the United Arab Republic and their other neighbours has ended?

113. This provision of the United States draft resolution is unacceptable, therefore, for it would mean agreeing to all the conditions which Israel has begun laying down for the United Arab Republic and other neighbouring countries. It would, in fact, enable Israel's troops to remain in place until they were satisfied that all Israel's demands regarding territorial or other concessions from the Arab States had

been met. That would be unacceptable to the Members of the United Nations, particularly to those who have undertaken to respect territorial integrity and all established rights. The aim is, in fact, to give Israel already the rights it demands and to satisfy already its territorial claims.

114. Further on, the same operative paragraph of the United States draft resolution speaks of ensuring "the maintenance of vital international rights and the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East". That is tantamount to saying that in order to bring about a stable and durable peace in the area, Israel must again be given everything it wants. What is the purpose of this draft resolution? To place on record United Nations acceptance of these conditions. Its aim is to enable Israel to satisfy all its claims and bring the Arab States to their knees, thus placing them in an impossible situation. And it is our Organization which is being asked to do that.

115. My delegation, for its part, cannot accept this and cannot vote for such a document. We doubt whether the Security Council can adopt a draft resolution like that. Moreover, with such a text before us, we can well wonder what has become of all the statements we have heard here regarding respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and the rights of all countries in the Near East. We are indeed baffled by these statements of the United States Government. If the United States representative really wants his statements not to ring false, he must immediately withdraw his draft resolution and vote for a text requiring Israel to cease fire, withdraw its troops and comply with the resolutions the Security Council has adopted.

116. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We have asked for the floor in order to make a few observations on the statement addressed to the Council by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel.

117. In the statement, or rather, if I may say so, in the lecture, he gave us a short time ago, the Minister tried in every way to defend Israel and whitewash its criminal aggression; and he complained, of course, that the Soviet Union's position was, from his standpoint, too critical and not sufficiently objective. He even tried to tell the Council that it should not accept the draft resolution submitted by us today. We are thus compelled to remind the speaker that such preaching and advice are the last thing the members of the Council seated at this table are in need of.

118. If the Minister has a great store of wisdom at his command, he might put it at the service of the leaders at Tel Aviv, who need wisdom more than anything else. The Minister should not forget that, as the representative of Israel, who has been summoned to the Council to give an account of the aggression committed by his country, he should try to describe the true state of affairs instead of resorting to falsehood and shifting the responsibility to others.

119. The irony of it is that the speaker tried not only to refute facts that are known to all, but also to blame the United Nations, to shift to this Organization the responsibility for those lawless acts which were committed, in violation of the United Nations Charter, by the extremist

circles in Israel and which have created a dangerous hotbed of war in the Near East.

120. We are not here to be lectured to by the representative of Tel Aviv. The members of the Council would like to know when the Government of Israel is going to cease its aggressive actions against the Arab countries—actions which we most vigorously condemn, not only because they have created a hotbed of war in the Near East but also because they are a threat to peace throughout the world. Yet about this the speaker made no comment in his statement today, to say nothing of his earlier speeches here.

121. It is not surprising that the representative of Tel Aviv should be displeased by the fact that in our draft of a Council resolution things are called by their proper names. There is not the slightest doubt that it was Israel which launched the aggression against the Arab countries, invading the territory of the United Arab Republic and Jordan with its armed hordes, as many of those who addressed the Council have convincingly shown, including, among others, the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Iraq.

122. Among other pieces of evidence, one which is particularly striking is a National Broadcasting Company dispatch from London to the effect that Israel was the first to engage in military operations in the war in the Near East. That was stated, according to the United States news agency in question, by none other than the Israel Ambassador in London, Aharon Remez. If the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs wants to deny or disavow anything, this is another opportunity for him to do with the right hand what is being done by the left. And here no tricks or subterfuges will save the Israel aggressors from responsibility for the crimes committed—from responsibility for flouting all standards governing international relations, the principles of the sovereignty of States, and the Charter of the United Nations.

123. We categorically reject as totally unfounded and meaningless the arguments put before the Security Council by the representative of Tel Aviv. They constitute a baseless attempt to escape from responsibility and justify the war of aggression unleashed by the ruling circles in Israel.

124. My delegation, confirming the position we have stated, expresses the hope that the members of the Council will demonstrate a deep sense of responsibility and support the draft resolution which we have submitted today with reference to this item.

125. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The representative of Bulgaria, Mr. Tarabanov, our friend and colleague, has addressed himself to the question of what he terms the conditions of the cease-fire exacted by one party to the conflict and not present with respect to the other.

126. I should like to make very clear what the position of my Government is in this regard. We welcome, as I said—and I have amended my draft resolution to indicate this—the acceptance of a cease-fire by all of the parties to the conflict. It is quite apparent from the official documents before the Council that the terms in which these acceptances have been cast are identical.

127. If we look at the declaration by the Foreign Minister of Israel, which is before us in document S/7945, we find that "the Israel Government accepts the Security Council's call for an immediate cease-fire, provided that the other parties accept". Today we have the equally welcome statement from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the Secretary-General, which reads:

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

128. It is quite apparent from the language used, and quite understandable when we are dealing with a cease-fire, that to be effective a cease-fire must be mutual. That indeed is the context of the communications addressed to the members of the Security Council.

129. My friend, Ambassador Tarabanov, also does not, I fear, fully comprehend the context of operative paragraph 3 of the United States draft resolution [S/7952/Rev.1]. That paragraph was based upon the discussions here in the Security Council and upon the declarations made both by the spokesmen for the Arab countries and by the spokesmen for Israel.

130. I do not want to take the time of the Council at this stage of our proceedings to go back into the verbatim records and read out all that was said. But if there is any theme that is common to all the presentations that were made, it is the theme that the underlying causes of the present crisis must be dealt with and solutions must be sought. The first person who pointed that out to us in our present debate was the Secretary-General, when he pointed out in his report the necessity for the Council "to deal with the underlying causes of the present crisis and to seek solutions" [S/7906, para. 14]. That theme was repeated by all who spoke on all sides of this grave conflict. Therefore, our paragraph was addressed to something known by everybody in the world. Again, we would be burying our heads in the sand if we did not realize that throughout the more than twenty years that this problem has been with us, the Security Council and the United Nations have attempted to apply adhesive patches to this grave conflict, and that what is imperatively required is to deal with the basic elements of peace in the area as soon as a cease-fire is achieved.

131. When we propose that particular paragraph of the draft resolution, we start with the basic concept, which every Member of the United Nations supports, of the obligation of the parties to address themselves to the problems involved. That is in recognition of their sovereignty as sovereign nations and as Members of the United Nations. The paragraph addresses itself to them and asks them to meet together to resolve those problems, with the assistance of the United Nations if they so desire, or any third party that they may choose.

132. What better way is there to achieve peace in the area? What greater necessity is there than for peace in the

area to be achieved? That, therefore, seems to be an elementary proposition. The basic elements of peace in the area must be dealt with. In the presentation that I made to the Council on behalf of my Government I said that all of the elements that lead to peace in the area should be dealt with. I must repeat that now. I think that the representative of Bulgaria did not fully comprehend the import of what I had said.

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

134. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): The Israel invaders continue to defy the United Nations authority. They continue to violate the two cease-fire decisions taken by this Council. They continue to attack Jordan.

135. It may be very appropriate at this stage to say that we are greatly astonished that until this minute the Council has not attempted to establish the fact, although the fact is very clear, that Israel committed an act of aggression. My distinguished colleague, the representative of the Soviet Union, referred to the admission, or let me say the confession, uttered this morning by the Israel Ambassador in London, Aharon Remez. The evidence is very clear, but the Council is attempting to discuss issues which are secondary when we consider the gravity of the crime committed.

136. Mr. President, you called for restraint and the answer was invasion. You made many appeals and the answer was killing, murdering, bombing and destroying. The Israelis found the time appropriate and convenient for further expansion so that they could pass through another stage in fulfilment of their dream, a Zionist State extending from the Euphrates in Iraq to the Nile in Egypt. To them this is the right time to kill, to murder, to destroy and to bomb innocent civilians and use world Zionist machinery to cover up for their crimes.

137. To that attitude of Israel and that of its patrons and protectors we have one simple answer: our struggle is a struggle for liberty, a struggle for liberation. It is not different from any struggle in Asia or Africa. Indeed, the catastrophe that has befallen the Arabs of Palestine is not different from that which is now being experienced by the majority of Africans in Rhodesia. We know that the way to liberty is not an easy one. It has its ups and downs. It may face many set-backs. With the forces of Zionism and imperialism working against our aspirations, we do not expect the task of our movement to liberation to be an easy one. But one thing is certain. Eventually liberty will triumph and the spirit of the Charter will prevail because it is the spirit of right and the spirit of the day. It is stronger than the spirit of aggression.

138. Let me say in all frankness that the tragedy is now unfolding itself. Some members around this table feel that only through force and humiliation can the Arabs make peace, that only at gunpoint would the Arabs compromise and that only through intimidation would the Arabs enter into negotiations. Let me, in all sincerity, tell those patrons and protectors of Israel that they are grossly mistaken, that they are wrong. They do not understand the Arab mind. We

do not compromise with aggression. Jordan may not have the means now to repel the aggressor, but this does not make us compromise one iota of our rights.

139. The generous United States help given to Israel through all kinds of tax-deductible donations, the arms, the American Patton tanks given for defensive purposes but used for invasion, the heavy machinery and the stronger aerial cover enabled Israel to acquire more of our land and displace more of our people. But it will not enable Israel to conquer our strong spirit, our faith and our determination.

140. We are losing land, we are losing more towns, we are losing villages and shrines, losing more territory and having more victims, more refugees to be added to the 1 million refugees who were displaced by Israel in 1947 and in the years that followed. Israel, together with its accomplices, may commit many more crimes and many more conspiracies may be planned and may be now in the making. Israel may be encouraged to attempt to move to the Euphrates and to the Nile to fulfil the dream of Zionism. It may even have the ambition to move to take Amman, Baghdad, Cairo and Damascus.

141. But there is one thing that it cannot and will not take away from us, and that is our determination to live and enjoy liberty and to work for it. That is the will of the people, the will of the victims, but it is a strong will, a will to repel the invader at any cost and protect our homeland at any price.

142. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria in exercise of his right of reply.

143. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): A few minutes ago, the representative of the United States, Mr. Goldberg, to whom I am most grateful for counting me among his friends, sought to demonstrate that there was a misunderstanding on my part and on the part of other delegations with regard to the proposals he has just submitted.

144. Although we cannot match the United States representative—not, of course, because he is the representative of a great country, and we must certainly acknowledge that in all fairness, but because he is an eminent jurist—we should nevertheless like to point out that we are trying to understand, as hard as we can, the “elementary propositions” set forth in the American draft resolution. If I am not mistaken, the United States representative stated that these were “elementary propositions”, truly simple ones, “basic concepts”, to repeat the words he used in his statement a moment ago. That is why we should like to understand them, and believe that everyone should understand them, in a simple way.

145. What did the United States representative say? If I am not mistaken—and these may not be his exact words—he said that he had received identical acceptances from the various parties: from the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Israel. But—and this was the crux of my statement, and I believe he understood it—can we place the aggressor and the victim of aggression on the same footing? Can we ask the same things of the aggressor and the victim? That is the basic point. Aggression must cease if self-defence and

resistance to aggression are to cease. That is what we meant. That was the important point we wished to stress. We cannot accept the United States resolution because it puts two totally different things on the same footing. That was the first point we wanted to stress, and I do not wish to dwell on it any longer because I believe it is simple and can be understood by everyone at this table, even though they are not all legal experts.

146. Paragraph 3 of the United States draft resolution seems to indicate a desire to solve the problem in an entirely detached manner. But the fact that there has been an aggression puts an entirely different complexion on things, and it is in the light of that aggression that an effort is being made to settle matters. In his statement, Mr. Goldberg even tried to bring the Secretary-General's report into it. True, the Secretary-General proposed that the important problems should be dealt with. But when? When the necessary calm has been restored, and provided an aggression has not been committed; but not, if an aggression has been committed, in the light of and under cover of that aggression.

147. Those are some elementary propositions to which I wished to draw the Security Council's attention, propositions which we do not think the members of the Council, the States involved, or the international community can accept. They must not be accepted, for, if they were, that would in fact create a situation in which any aggression, anywhere in the world, would, if supported by some other great State, be at a premium. That is what we in the Security Council do not mean to accept.

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

149. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I wish to make a very brief statement. The representative of the Soviet Union referred to a statement attributed to the Ambassador of Israel in London, and the representative of Jordan repeated that statement. I can say categorically that no such statement was made by Ambassador Remez. The Israel Embassy in London has denied these allegations and legal proceedings have been instituted against those who have published this false statement. There is documentary proof in Israel's hands that Egypt had prepared the assault on Israel in all its military details.

150. With regard to other allegations which were brought forward and insults against the honour of my country, I shall deal with these matters if the President of the Council will give me an opportunity to do so when the Council convenes again.

151. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We have just heard the statement which Mr. Rafael, the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, hastened to make in connexion with the information referred to by us and by Mr. El-Farra, the representative of Jordan. All this reminds one of a bad joke which the teller tries to excuse by saying that that was just what it was meant to be.

152. The Israel Ambassador in London, according to none other than United States sources, made an unequivocal

statement that it was indeed Israel which started the aggression against the Arab countries. And now, as though following a scenario, Israel's representative to the United Nations comes on stage and categorically refutes what was said—presumably not without instructions from Tel Aviv—by Israel's Ambassador in London. Whom, then, are we to believe? What is truth? This often happens when people try to cover up, to obliterate the traces of their crime. This is what has actually happened in the case of Israel's aggression.

153. First the aggression was started, Israel's armed forces invaded the territory of the neighbouring Arab States, and then this was immediately followed by statements denying that such a crime had been committed.

154. We do not know what the reason was—that, of course, is for the representatives of Israel to say—but the denial was made, not by the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs, who delivered his classroom lecture here, but by the Israel representative. We did not, of course, wish to cause any embarrassment to the exalted personage of Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs, we simply reminded him that here in the Security Council he was not addressing a class and that the people sitting here in front of him were not schoolchildren looking at their teacher's book of rules. Those seated here are the representatives of sovereign States, invested with high authority not only by their own Governments but also under the Charter of the United

Nations, and bearing a special responsibility for the fate of the world and the maintenance of international security. We merely wished to recall this fact for the benefit of the Israel representatives, who have apparently also yielded to the war fever and psychosis.

155. But the crime has been committed and it will not go unpunished. There can be no doubt about Israel's aggression, and although the Israel interventionists and occupiers have temporarily succeeded in invading foreign territory and grinding it beneath the heels of their American hob-nailed boots, no one will save them from their responsibility; and the blood, the righteous blood of the Arab peoples which is now being shed on their soil will not be washed away by any torrents of words either from Tel Aviv or here in the Security Council.

156. We want to make it fully clear just where the Israel representatives are and what is expected of them, so that they do not forget themselves.

157. The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers on the list, and if no one else wishes to speak now, I would suggest that the Council adjourn until 3 p.m. tomorrow so that consultations on the three draft resolutions before us may take place on the understanding that all members of the Council will hold themselves available in case developments should necessitate the convening of an urgent meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.