



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1359th

MEETING: 13 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1359)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)	} 1
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907)	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)	
Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967)	}

NOTE

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

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

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

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 13 June 1967, at 10.00 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/1359)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

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

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

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

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. 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. S. Al-Shaheen (Kuwait), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) took the places reserved for them.

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

3. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The Security Council is at a crucial juncture because at stake is the very future of the United Nations as an international Organization created to preserve the international community against disintegration, against aggression, and to lay down the rules of contemporary international conduct, within international co-operation.

4. This happens at a time when the Arab world is witnessing, in the early summer of 1967, twenty-two years after the establishment of the United Nations, what Europe witnessed in the late summer of 1939. What we are facing now is a neo-nazi onslaught, well prepared to realize its dreams of expansion.

5. Has the stand of the Council vis-à-vis this Israel conquest of Arab countries been on a level with this grave

responsibility, or compatible with these purposes? Does not the attitude of indifferent spectators, after ten days of Israel conquest, constitute a most dangerous precedent on which the attention of the small States in the world should focus, since they all, sooner or later, may fall victims to unchecked, ruthless imperialist forces?

6. Most certainly, the pressure exerted by the United States of America, in order to defeat any move in the Council to condemn Israel and to check its aggression, has been a decisive factor in the paralysis immobilizing the Council. And even at the time we are deliberating here, crimes are being committed by the invaders: mass destruction on a large scale and crimes against the civilian population. If these crimes being committed today are met only by silence from members of the Council, will not history attribute to the Council not only failure to fulfil its duties, but complicity as well?

7. In the hour of truth, how else can the silence of some members be viewed? I cannot add much to the most accurate description of this lamentable state of affairs, given to the Council on 11 June by the representative of Mali. He said:

"In my delegation's view, this means that the Council is failing in its duty, in a manner unworthy of such an important body. Unhappily, some occult force seems to be frustrating any attempt to reach a decision here. I am bound to state, with regret, that this attitude on the part of the Council, at a moment of such gravity and in the light of the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, is not only shameful but unworthy of this United Nations organ. For too long now we have been offering the sorry spectacle of a body which is not impotent, as some would have it, but is guilty of tacit complicity in efforts to undermine the prestige of the Council and of the United Nations." [1357th meeting, para. 69.]

8. Is it not clear to any man of conscience that the conflict is not merely between Arabs and Israelis? It is between the Arab people, who fight to live, and all the forces that put petroleum and strategy above morality and human dignity, and want to dictate the régime they must adopt and the ideas they must embrace, as though the clock had been turned back to the diplomacy of the nineteenth century. As a matter of fact, this struggle today is the struggle of the Third World, the struggle of all people who want emancipation, the struggle of freedom in the world.

9. To those who wonder how Israel can have succeeded in its military operations, the answer is in its awareness of the extent of the forces behind Israel: the backing—military, political, material, financial—that it received. Perhaps only one example among thousands will suffice. The Israel Minister of Finance is now, as I understand, in New York to collect \$200 million; the figure has since been raised, as we understand it, to \$1 billion. Let the Third World think about this amount. How many African-Asian countries can afford to raise this sum, and in how many years? What is their economic potential that would allow them to put aside for military defence, from their revenues, up to \$1 billion, for example, an amount that Israel can collect in a few months here?

10. These are the dimensions of the struggle. These are the forces that array themselves with Israel. Let us give a hypothetical example that can be applied to the situation of Israel. Suppose that a battle arises between the white minorities in Africa and all the African peoples. What would be the outcome? Let our African brothers think about this analogy very carefully, because, as the imperialist potentialities are the same, so are the strategy and the outcome.

11. United States intervention is the force that leads the struggle against the Third World. The representative of the United States has, with some frequency, felt called upon to remind the Council of the limitation of its competence with respect to intervention into what he considers domestic United States affairs.

12. It cannot be disputed that when the usual proprieties between sovereign States fully obtain, the distinctions which the United States representative has made are valid. I believe most of us here are experienced enough in the rules of diplomacy to respect the usual proprieties without such frequent admonitions as the United States representative has felt called upon to offer. If this fairly obvious presumption of our individual competence is accepted, the question must arise as to why, in the debates that have proceeded here, there have been so many occasions when something said has appeared to transgress generally understood proprieties.

13. My delegation has, from the outset, stated clearly that what Syria was doing was of a defensive nature. We therefore expressed the earnest hope that this Council, first, would prevent the fighting which was initiated by Israel on 5 June, and then would bring the fighting to an end.

14. We have all been advised by the United States, with some frequency during these trying debates, that these first considerations of preventing and then of halting the war must come first. And we have also been advised that it is the position of the United States Government that when the hostilities ceased, this Council, in a search for peace, would then have the responsibility to confront basic and fundamental causes of the conflict.

15. Those statements were repeated earlier today by the representative of the United States in his intervention [1358th meeting]. It is at this juncture, and taking the representative of the United States at his word, that I now feel free to address myself to the frequently raised question of the proprieties and the competency of the Council to discuss certain aspects of the problem which the United States representative seems to want to avoid discussing, on the grounds that they are internal and domestic United States affairs.

16. In ventilating this problem here and now, I wish to state in advance that the evidence I shall adduce is not gathered from the propaganda speeches of either Israel officials, Zionist demagoguery or electioneering addresses of United States politicians. I state that in advance, and with great emphasis, because what I have to say is based upon the public, international law duly enacted by the Israel Knesset, on definitive statements of responsible Israel

governmental officials who provide insights into the legislative history of the Israel law I shall specify and upon clearly evident public policies of the United States. The distinction between evidence from such sources, on the one hand, and propaganda from any source, on the other hand, is crucially important. None of us wishes to attempt, even by indirection, to invade the rights granted United States citizens by their own laws and form of government. But we who represent other nations in the United Nations also cannot withhold comment when public policies of the United States or any other nation affect the national interests of our country.

17. What I have to say, therefore, is—in the opinion of my Government—of vital interest to the Member States represented at this Security Council. It is relevant to the debate on fundamentals of the Palestine problem in which we must engage. And it is relevant to the frequent interventions of the representative of the United States with respect to the amenities and proprieties of international diplomacy which we are admonished time and again to respect. These amenities and proprieties, I said, would be respected if all States maintained normal postures embracing the usually recognized respect for sovereignty.

18. But by its own duly enacted law, the State of Israel flouts these amenities, as it flouts so much of the established rules and laws of the international community. My first piece of evidence supporting this contention goes back to 24 November 1952. On that day the Israel Knesset enacted a piece of legislation known as the “World Zionist Organization—Jewish Agency for Palestine (Status) Law, 5713-1952”. The full and official text of this law is published in English in the *Government Year-book of Israel*. Let us look through a few articles of that law:

“1. The State of Israel regards itself as the creation of the entire Jewish people, and its gates are open, in accordance with its laws, to every Jew wishing to immigrate into it.

“2. The World Zionist Organization, from its foundation five decades ago, headed the movement and efforts of the Jewish people to realize the age-old vision of the return to its homeland, and with the assistance of other Jewish circles and bodies, carried the main responsibility for establishing the State of Israel.

“3. The World Zionist Organization, which is also the Jewish Agency for Palestine, takes care as before of immigration and directs absorption and settlement projects in the State.”¹

19. I submit that no understanding of the problem of Palestine can be accurate without a full study of this law which I have quoted. But it is particularly paragraph 5 of this legislation which I wish to read out here in full:

“5. The mission of gathering in the exiles, which is the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist movement in our days, requires constant efforts by the

Jewish people in the Diaspora; the State of Israel, therefore, expects the co-operation of all Jews, as individuals and groups, in building up the State and assisting the immigration into it of the masses of the people, and regards the unity of all sections of Jewry as necessary for this purpose.”²

I submit that this may be one of the most unique paragraphs in any legislation of any State which is a Member of the United Nations.

20. The meaning of that language is clear. The Zionist movement is a public body or an Israel Government organ. Its activities in Israel are required to be in accordance not only with broad statutory regulations of the country, but also with departmental regulations and administrative instructions as well.

21. What is the meaning of these facts and how are they relevant to our debate? During the time that the Council has been debating the fate of war and peace in Palestine and the Middle East, this body, the United Jewish Appeal, has been raising, as I stated before, \$200 million as an emergency measure, now to be raised to \$1,000 million for this institution of the Israel Government. True, the labels on the packages which this \$200 million or the \$1,000 million to be raised later is supposed to buy are things like relief, construction and rescue. But the fact, supported by incontrovertible legal evidence, is that the money will go to the treasury of the State of Israel. I do not believe that it is possible to construe this fantastic campaign in any sense other than as helping to subsidize the mobilization of the State of Israel, its occupation of Arab territory, its conquest and invasion and perhaps the reconstruction of its war damage.

22. It is relevant to remind the Council of the slanderous references to Arabs accompanying this campaign—which I have referred to—made daily in the strident newspaper advertising and in some of the fund-raising speeches in which Senators of the United States Congress and mayors have participated and are participating and of this whole campaign against the Arabs, which constitutes clear-cut interference and intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries. Suffice it to mention that a United States Senator found it necessary and possible yesterday—and even legal—to fix the limits and the frontiers of the Arab States and Israel.

23. But the campaign for this staggering sum of money is not the beginning or the end of the work of this institution of the Israel Government which performs in the United States what the State of Israel itself cannot do, to quote a former Primer Minister of Israel. There can be little doubt, as the Senate investigation by Senator Fulbright in 1963 showed, that this world Zionist structure poisoned the minds of all the American people with respect to Arab rights in Palestine. The vast sums of money collected, even in normal years, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$70 million, as the United States Senate learned and put on record, are used in part to influence the American Press, television, academic institutions, colleges and all the media of mass and even sophisticated information.

¹ *Government Year-book, 5714 (1953-4)*, (Jerusalem, Government Printer, 1953), p. 243.

² *Ibid.*, p. 244.

24. There is more evidence for all this. But perhaps I have submitted enough for my purpose at this time. These funds are tax-deductible by the laws of the United States. That is certainly an American prerogative. But the exercise of it also makes these funds part of the public funds and relates them to public policy.

25. It is also United States public policy to tolerate and endorse the American branches of the World Zionist Organization or Jewish Agency or both of them. That, too, is an American prerogative. But I do submit that the representative of the United States, quite properly seeking to defend the good name of his Government and the integrity of the rights of its citizens here, cannot have it both ways. The Government of the United States cannot tolerate, encourage and even indirectly subsidize a specifically defined institution of the belligerent Government of the State of Israel and, at the same time, ask representatives of other belligerents or their friends at this table to grant immunity to the public policy and the governmental officials which permit the State of Israel through Zionist establishments to do inside the United States what the State of Israel wants to achieve in this country. While the representative of the United States has been proclaiming his country's neutrality—or whatever word was eventually used to describe the United States position—his country in public policy and indirectly with public funds has been fully, even munificently, supporting one protagonist in this war. And the support is not only in terms of words, but in terms of material substance and political agitation, not of innocent, impartially informed United States citizens, but political agitation, organized, directed, focussed and timed by the "institution" of the Government of the State of Israel known as the World Zionist Organization and/or Jewish Agency for Israel or Palestine.

26. The time has come in the unhappy history of the Palestine problem to speak plainly. And I say plainly and calmly out of all the pain, the shambles, the sufferings, the tragedies and the shattered international relations, let the United States also speak plainly. We Arabs do not ask the United States to take our side. We know that this has been, is and will remain impossible. Nor are we in our national freedom to be expected to give blank cheques to the United States or any other Power. But it is too much for the United States to sit at this table of aspiring peacemakers to allow the institutions of my country's enemy to operate inside the United States with impunity, and then to reprimand us Arabs when we refer to this impropriety and inequity. The least that could be requested is to ask the United States Government to adopt in the circumstances an objective, even a minimum of an objective, policy in the face of a naked aggression recognized by the aggressors themselves.

27. In the light of the evidence supplied—and unless the representative of the United States has an answer with equally valid and legal documentation—I must say that I shall continue to regard relevant references to Zionist activities in the United States to be proper, relevant and material in the context of this debate.

28. On the other hand, we are entitled in all due respect to ask the representative of the United States to give this

Council a clear-cut statement about the attitude of the United States Government, which has not changed in the last twenty years, since the beginning of the Arab-Israel conflict, with regard to the world Zionist movement. Either that movement constitutes, as I have proved it to be and as in fact it is, an institution, an organic part of a foreign Government, and in that case it could be removed from the life of the United States, or if permitted as a foreign instrumentality, as this law has proved, then the conspiracy between the United States Government and the world Zionist movement is categorically established.

29. The old myth of American guarantee of frontiers and peace in the Middle East was exposed by America itself when the United States declared that it was no longer committed to former attitudes with respect to the borders. On the contrary, we hear today from different quarters that these boundaries have become inadequate and the Arab countries should accept the political reality. *Real-politik* is a term that recalls many unhappy phases of history, even in our own lifetime. We are confronted today with a tragedy—an invasion and occupation prosecuted by imperialist forces. We request the Council to discharge its responsibilities by condemning Israel and by demanding that Israel evacuate its forces and put an end to this international act of piracy. We do not accept invasion. We shall resort to whatever energies the Arab people can muster against it, today and in the future. All we can say is that the Arab people are passing through disaster, but the disaster will not last forever. Throughout history the Arab people have witnessed many disasters and tomorrow is another day. We should like to remind the Council of this and, at the same time, the United States and the other Western nations.

30. This ordeal will always remain vivid. The Arab people will bear friendship towards its friends and enmity towards its enemies, and the future will decide the outcome.

31. The United States delegation has submitted a draft resolution in document S/7952/Rev.2 dated 9 June. Any resolution that does not clearly condemn Israel and provide for the withdrawal of forces from Arab countries falls short of meeting the situation and lessening its dangerous implications for the peace of the world and for the survival of the United Nations. On the other hand, my Government and delegation fully support the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, because it actually meets the situation, condemns the aggressor clearly and asks for the withdrawal of the invading forces.

32. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I wish to be as brief as I can, but even at this late hour I cannot help but refer to the tragic loss of human life suffered by a number of nations as a result of this short but violent war. The seriousness of those losses, which are only now beginning to be revealed, should evoke from us not only profound sympathy, but also the desire to take most seriously the responsibilities we have in this Council.

33. Several representatives have made references to the responsibilities of members of this Council. In the view of the Canadian delegation, the approach to which we are committed under the Charter and our responsibilities are

clear. Article 2 of the Charter, in its third principle, enjoins that:

“All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.”

It is that principle which, in the view of my delegation, should guide action in the Council and on the part of the parties most directly concerned at this time. If this Organization is not concerned with the peaceful settlement of disputes and the prevention of war and threats of war, then what, I ask, is its purpose?

34. It is very difficult, in the light of that approach, to see what useful purpose will be served by an attempt to force a vote upon the draft resolution in document S/7951/Rev.2. While there are aspects, no doubt, of that draft resolution which must indeed be dealt with by the Council, they should be dealt with in a manner which will ensure the successful outcome of our work.

35. The Canadian delegation is interested in achieving practical and lasting results which we believe the Council should seek by stages. The cease-fire calls by this Council are, to the best of our knowledge, being respected by all the parties concerned. This objective, as we all agreed, was only a first step, a step which must be followed by other steps. On this point, I entirely agree with the Soviet representative, but, in the view of the Canadian delegation, those other steps which will pave the way to a peaceful settlement of the burning issues which have constantly inflamed the situation in the Near East, must clearly include, firstly, an arrangement for the disengagement and withdrawal of the forces; secondly, immediate attention to the urgent “human problem” described by the representative of Jordan last week and again today, and, thirdly, the development of understandings which will, now that the smoke of battle is clearing away, guarantee the vital interests of all the States in the Near East.

36. Canada believes that work along these lines should be the focus of our efforts, and any proposal which deals with these matters in an objective and balanced way and which would advance us towards a peaceful solution will gain the support of the Canadian delegation.

37. On this point, I would again like to mention the idea raised by several speakers of the designation and dispatch to the area of a special representative of the Secretary-General. A suitably qualified representative could, I believe, be of great assistance in reviewing the application of the cease-fire and looking into the situation in general. He could report to the Council on an urgent basis. The United Nations, by means of UNTSO, is already playing a valuable role, and that role could be made more useful still if a special representative were appointed as a matter of urgency.

38. I must also say that it is the firmly held view of my Government that the permanent members of the Council should concert their actions. They should not work in a way which divides the Council and diminishes the chances of any useful results emerging from our work. They must, on the contrary, exercise the special responsibilities which

the Charter and history have given them, and co-operate in finding positive solutions.

39. It is in the light of this approach that the Canadian delegation will determine its position on the draft resolution on which the Soviet representative has asked for a vote.

40. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

41. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I have three observations to make in reply to the statement made by my colleague, Mr. Goldberg, this afternoon. The first observation relates to the territorial integrity of all nations of the Middle East. I raised this question before, and I raise it again. When the term “territorial integrity” is used, I often wonder what is the definition of that term. Territorial integrity was violated, and we have neither heard nor seen any move to protect the territorial integrity of Jordan. Our lands were invaded and a substantial part of Jordan was occupied illegally. But despite the assurances about the territorial integrity of all nations of the Middle East, nothing was done to prevent an act of aggression against Jordan. Of course, the Sixth Fleet was there; it was manoeuvring to show its presence. But when we found that we had become subjected to aggression and that the Sixth Fleet stood idly by doing nothing to protect the territorial integrity of Jordan, we wondered whether it was intended to safeguard the members of the Middle East or whether it was there as an assurance for the Israel aggression.

42. My second question relates to the question of knowledge. It can be argued that the United States had no information about the invasion. My delegation feels that the United States, with the Liberty ship standing there for a purpose, had good reason to believe that the Israelis were contemplating aggression against Jordan.

43. My third point relates to the question of pressure groups, and this is my last point. Reference was made to a certain Arab-American society, Dr. Mehdi's organization. This is a purely American organization, and we have nothing against purely American organizations. There is the American Council for Judaism, and this is an American organization. It is an organization which has the interests of the Americans at heart. We have nothing against organizations of this kind, whether they be Arab, Jewish, Polish or whatnot. We do have every objection to a destructive expansionist movement which works for certain plans and goals which are not related to the United States people and Government, but to a foreign Power, and I am referring to Israel.

44. The Zionist movement has nothing in common with any United States organization; it has everything in common with Nazism, and I would hope that either the Israel representative here or any other member of this Council will refute the evidence. I maintain that both Nazism and Zionism have everything in common. They both hold to the concept of race. Both Nazism and Zionism hold to the concept of nazi supremacy and Zionist chosen people. The third element is that both Nazism and Zionism hold to the concept of *Lebensraum*. The Zionists want a

space to be made for the gathering of exiles from all over the world into Palestine.

45. What the Security Council is discussing now is a glaring example of an act of aggression and expansionism. The same thing happened in 1956; it did not work. There was the same thing in 1947, and it is still on the move. The problem before the Council proves the point which I am raising. Both Nazism and Zionism hold to the concept of the fifth column. The Nazis used to have a fifth column, and the Zionists in the United States have pressure groups; they have a city within every city and they have a town within every town.

46. They have a pressure group within every single branch of the United States Government. These are facts. Let the Israelis refute a single one of them. Therefore, a movement of this destructive purpose should not be permitted to function against the interests of both the Arab people and the American people; a movement which has this expansionist design aimed at displacing my people, expanding in our lands, displacing more of our people, acquiring more of our towns and cities—this movement should not be permitted to function in the United States.

47. Those were the points which I wished to raise before this Council.

48. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): It is confirmed that Israel is continuing its conquest and occupation of Arab territories. The most recent statements by the Israel leaders reveal Israel's intention to remain in the Arab countries, which it now controls as a result of the advantage gained by its surprise attack. There is talk that it will administer those territories, and the exploitable resources are already being surveyed. Israel, encouraged by the silence and the passive collusion of this Council, is already behaving like a conqueror in the Arab lands.

49. It must, however, be recognized that Israel can never retain indefinitely its control over the regions it now occupies. It will have to abandon the lands it has invaded as a result of its surprise attack. Those who desire peace in the Middle East must understand here and now that Israel will be forced to evacuate the lands it has occupied by a future war. It is thus in the interest of peace and of the whole international community that Israel should abandon those lands now. That is the only way to avoid an inevitable war.

50. The Israel aggression is a precedent which my delegation most severely, as it does any act of force. This aggression is a defiance of our Organization, an insult to the Charter, and a warning to the Third World and to Africa. The impunity enjoyed by Israel after its aggression is an encouragement and a guarantee that the Council would apparently be ready to grant to any future aggressor.

51. Those who think that it is for Israel, which is now in a strong position, to undertake negotiations with the Arab countries with a view to achieving a stable peace are deluding themselves and mortgaging Israel's future in the midst of the Arab world. Everyone should realize that there will never be a stable peace in the Middle East based on present conditions, and that Israel will be unable to remain

master indefinitely in the regions it now occupies. The first positive step towards peace would be the unconditional withdrawal of the Israel troops to their positions of 4 June 1967.

52. In the light of these considerations, my delegation considers that the least the Council can do is to adopt the Soviet draft resolution [*S/7951/Rev.2*] unanimously. My delegation proposes that the Council should vote on this draft resolution immediately. We believe that any delay in the adoption of this draft resolution by the Council would perpetuate the present serious situation in the Middle East. In view of all the statements of good intentions which have been made around this table, we believe that we will be able to adopt this draft resolution unanimously.

53. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker before we adjourn tonight is the representative of the United States, to whom I now give the floor in exercise of his right of reply.

54. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I shall try to be very brief.

55. The representative of the United Arab Republic, our esteemed friend and colleague Mr. El Kony, this evening repeated unwarranted allegations that the United States supported and encouraged the recent hostilities in the Middle East and was guilty of collusion. That is simply not true. No member of this Council has made greater efforts than the United States, both in the Council and outside the Council, to prevent this conflict. The United States simply has not intervened in any way in this conflict. That, perhaps, is also my reply to what our friend and colleague, Mr. El-Farra, has said. I had not assumed that any intervention of any sort by the United States would have been regarded as appropriate or proper in the circumstances of the present conflict.

56. As for the remarks of the representative of Syria, Mr. Tomeh, who has asserted the idea that the Israel military establishment has been sustained by United States military and economic aid, the fact is that United States military aid to the Arab States in the last twenty years has been more than ten times the amount of United States military aid to Israel. I repeat, more than ten times the amount. As for economic aid afforded by the United States Government, the amount given to Arab States in the past twenty years has been almost three times that given to Israel; and this aid has been made available as part of our desire to maintain friendly and co-operative relations with all countries in the area.

57. It is true that many United States citizens have made generous gifts to Israel. That is their right as individuals. And it is also true, if we want to keep the record completely straight, that the Arab States have received substantial aid, both economic and military, from the Soviet Union, which Israel has not. This is also a part of the record of the past twenty years.

58. But really, all of these things have no bearing immediately on the basic point, that the United States Government, as a matter of public policy, has helped both the Arab States and Israel over the past twenty years, and

that the amount accorded to the Arab States has been substantially greater than that accorded to Israel.

59. It is our desire—and I said this earlier in the debate—to have the economic conditions of the whole area improved and to play a constructive role in the improvement of those economic conditions in the entire area.

60. With respect to the statements made by our colleague Mr. Fedorenko, he has given a most distorted interpretation to our draft resolution. If I heard him correctly, he said that unless the territorial demands of Israel on the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan are met, there will be an explosive situation and war—that this is the effect of our draft resolution. This is, to say the least, a gross and flagrant distortion of our draft resolution and the statement I made to the Council, which speaks for itself, and our desire to bring about the conditions that can create the basis for a just, equitable and peaceful solution to the conflict.

61. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall now adjourn the meeting until 11 o'clock tomorrow. I consulted

with all members before this meeting and I think it was the general understanding that there would be no more speeches. Is there any objection to our adjourning now?

62. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria): Mr. President, I see that there is a request from the Permanent Representative of Syria to exercise his right of reply. Do you not think it would be possible to give him the floor for that right of reply?

63. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bulgaria for calling it to my attention. I repeat what I said, that I had consultations before the meeting and it was the general understanding of members of this Council that there should be no more speeches. Having said that, I asked whether there was any objection.

64. Is there any objection? Does anyone want to speak? Since that is not the case, the meeting is adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 10.55 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. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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