



SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

MAR 40 1971

UN/SA COLLECTION

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1369th

MEETING: 24/25 OCTOBER 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1369/Rev.1)	1
Statement by the President	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President and welcome to the representative of Denmark	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8207);	
(b) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8208)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 24 October 1967, at 9 p.m.

President: Mr. Senjin TSURUOKA (Japan).

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/1369/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8207);
 - (b) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8208).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The present meeting of the Security Council has been convened at short notice because the President received a message this afternoon from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council [S/8207]. I immediately contacted the members of the Council with a view to holding a meeting this evening. Subsequently, the Permanent Representative of Israel also requested an urgent meeting of the Council [S/8208].

Expression of thanks to the retiring President and welcome to the representative of Denmark

2. The PRESIDENT: Before turning to the business for which the present meeting of the Security Council was urgently called I should like, on behalf of the Council and in my capacity as President for the month of October, to pay a very warm and sincere tribute to my predecessor, our good friend Ambassador Parthasarathi, the Permanent Representative of India, who was President of the Council during the month of September. Ambassador Parthasarathi's devotion to peace, his rich experience and his profound wisdom have set very high standards of excellence which will greatly inspire me in the performance of my duties as President of the Council this month and which I shall do my best to emulate.

3. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Mr. President, I thank you for your very generous reference to me. May I in turn

congratulate you on your assumption of office as President for the month of October. We are meeting today under the shadow of a grave threat to peace in West Asia. Tonight and in the days to follow the Council will have to grapple with the problem of restoring peace in the area. May I say with all respect, Mr. President, that you have already shown your mettle by the able manner in which you have been conducting consultations among the members. I am sure that under your able and wise guidance the Council will take steps to consolidate peace in West Asia. My delegation offers its full co-operation to you and wishes you Godspeed in your efforts.

4. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I should also like to take this opportunity, on behalf of all members of the Security Council, to welcome the new Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations, Ambassador Borch, and to express the hope that we shall be working together with him for a long time. Every one knows how much Denmark, the country Ambassador Borch represents, is guided by the desire for peace and how it is working effectively towards that end.

5. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): I am deeply touched, Mr. President, by the kind words of welcome you have just addressed to me as I participate for the first time in the work of this Council. I am conscious of the responsibility and the privilege of serving in the Security Council. In this task, however, I shall be aided by the fact that the Danish Government believes in the United Nations and supports fully and whole-heartedly the ideals and purposes of the world Organization. I realize that the previous Danish representative on the Security Council, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, enjoyed a relationship based on friendship and co-operation with his colleagues. It shall be my endeavour, Mr. President, to establish a similar relationship with you and the members of the Council.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8207);
- (b) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8208)

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the

usual practice of the Security Council, I now propose with the consent of the Council to invite the representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic to take places at the Council table in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. Rafael (Israel) and Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic) took places at the Council table.

7. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have received a letter dated 24 October [S/8210] addressed to me by the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan requesting that he be allowed to participate in the Council's discussion. If there is no objection, I shall invite him to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. M. Rifa'i (Jordan) took a place at the Council table.

8. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have also received a letter dated 24 October [S/8211] from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, asking that he be allowed to participate in the Council's discussion. If there are no objections, I shall invite him to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) took a place at the Council table.

9. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Council will now begin its consideration of the item before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, on whom I now call.

10. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): The Security Council has been convened upon the urgent request of the United Arab Republic to consider the most violent and barbaric act of war committed by Israel since it launched its perfidious aggression against my country on 5 June 1967. The action taken by Israel today in the area of Suez and against its peaceful inhabitants, with the aim of demolishing a most vital civilian industrial complex of the United Arab Republic, violently defies every element of civilization, law and morality.

11. At 2.30 p.m. Cairo local time, the Israel armed forces took upon themselves the wild task of virtually destroying every element of civilian life in the area of Suez. The targets were as follows: to set aflame the oil refineries of the United Arab Republic; the total destruction of the fertilizer plant and the petro-chemical plant, as well as the harbour of Suez and many other civilian and industrial establishments of the United Arab Republic. This mad undertaking by Israel was entirely without provocation. The city of Suez is at present in flames. The loss of life is great. Israel's aggression is without provocation and totally premeditated, pre-planned and wantonly carried out.

12. The report of General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of the military observers in the area is self-explanatory. It clearly states that Israel carried out its sinister attack on the civilian targets in the Suez and port of Tawfiq area. The

report equally reveals the criminal character of the Israel attack. From the moment Israel began its attack the Chief of Staff of the military observers in the area made various proposals to arrange for a cease-fire, yet they were rejected by Israel.

13. It is also revealing that when the Chief of Staff of the military observers made his first proposal for a cease-fire to take place at 1330 hours GMT, the Israel side proposed instead that the cease-fire would go into effect at 1530 hours GMT. The Israel plan of aggression obviously needed two more hours to be fully effective, and on aggression Israel would not compromise. Other proposals were equally rebuffed until Israel managed to secure the implementation of its massive plan of aggression and destruction.

14. The Security Council is required to examine the most grave and serious aspects of this new Israel aggression. First, the Israel aggression was carried out against the entire civilian and industrial life in the Suez area, one of the most vital industrial sites of the United Arab Republic. The Arab States have already been accustomed to the barbaric nature of the Israel aggression against civilian life since the cease-fire was put into effect. This aggression today comes as the most serious and criminal act of aggression, a most violent defiance of the provisions of the Charter and a most flagrant violation of the Security Council decisions on the cease-fire.

15. Israel's policy has been aimed at the total destruction of civilian and industrial achievements of the United Arab Republic, as well as the indiscriminate murdering of as many as possible of the civilian inhabitants. Its various attacks on and bombardments of the cities along the Suez Canal and the canal installations; its attacks, which have caused heavy losses in civilian life and property, were just the beginning of its plan of destruction of civilian and industrial life in the United Arab Republic. Equally, Israel's violation of the cease-fire decisions have been marked by a dangerous escalation against civilian targets—hospitals, schools, churches and mosques and other humanitarian sites have been the chosen targets of Israel attacks. Today, Israel's aggression has been widely extended and aimed at the total destruction of industrial and civilian life in the Suez Canal area.

16. Israel's aggression today, on a massive and unprecedented scale, comes as a most serious and grave landmark in the outstanding criminal record of Israel. The Israel aggression against the civilian population of the United Arab Republic today is an act of the gravest magnitude and the most vicious nature. The Security Council, therefore, has the inescapable responsibility of applying the relevant provisions envisaged by the Charter to punish the aggressor. Secondly, Israel's massive act of aggression today against the United Arab Republic is totally unprovoked and premeditated. It follows immediately upon Israel's aggressive act of last Saturday, 21 October, when the Israel destroyer *Eilat* was spotted by the United Arab Republic naval defensive forces speeding in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic towards Port Said.

17. This act naturally prompted the United Arab Republic defensive forces to resort to measures of self defence. The

subsequent sinking of the Israel destroyer was only the result of its violation of the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic and its attempt to carry out aggression against the city of Port Said. The record of this Israel destroyer is well known and it was the *Eilat* which previously, on 12 July, sank two United Arab Republic boats in the territorial waters of Port Said. These boats had instructions from the United Arab Republic Command not to engage in any combat. The Israel destroyer *Eilat* fired upon them and bombarded them, nevertheless, without any reason whatsoever. They were sunk, in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic.

18. It was natural, therefore, that when the Israel destroyer again was spotted speeding in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic the United Arab Republic defensive forces responsible for the defence of the city of Port Said should attempt to stop its penetration of the territorial waters and its advance towards Port Said. The fact that the destroyer *Eilat* was speeding in the territorial waters has been confirmed by the Israel side.

19. In his report of 22 October to the Secretary-General [S/7930/Add.43], General Odd Bull reported that the Israel liaison officer told him that the destroyer *Eilat* was ten miles off the shores of Port Said. In view of the record of the destroyer, its previous aggression which led to the sinking of two United Arab Republic boats in our territorial waters and the fact that it was this time again speeding in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic towards Port Said, and in the light of the systematic acts of destruction which have been carried out by the Israel forces in the area, the United Arab Republic naval forces had no alternative but to stop the advance of the destroyer. There is no other act which makes self-defence more fully legitimate than the act which forced defensive actions upon us.

20. The Council must observe that the advance of the destroyer *Eilat* is fully prohibited under the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council, particularly its resolution 236 (1967) adopted on 12 June 1967 which prohibited "any forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire". But when the destroyer was sunk last Saturday, all the Israel leaders and the neo-Nazi generals made it abundantly clear that they would not tolerate the defensive action of the United Arab Republic forces and that the Israel retaliation would be forthcoming.

21. Israel committed its aggression today at exactly the same time when the United Arab Republic was opening up its territorial waters for the rescue operations carried out by the Israel forces in relation for the sinking of the Israel destroyer. This act on our part, motivated solely by humanitarian considerations, was again met by a sinister and criminal attack on the United Arab Republic.

22. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of Israel publicly refused to resort to the United Nations machinery and emphatically stated that Israel would not ask the Security Council to consider the acts which led to the sinking of the *Eilat*. This position of arrogance and total disregard of the United Nations has become the standard policy of Israel —total disregard of the United Nations, its machinery and

its Charter and full resort to the policy of aggression, of armed attack.

23. The Security Council, by any yardstick of objectivity, cannot but condemn this policy of Israel and compel the Israel leaders to account for their complete and unequivocal disregard of the authority of this Organization. The Israel aggression against the United Arab Republic today has reached intolerable limits in threatening international peace and security. The Security Council must be fully aware of the serious consequences which the aggression might set in motion. It should be emphasized here that the inaction of the Security Council following the Israel aggression on 5 June has only led to the aggression which took place today, and previously to the many unlawful acts committed by the the Israel armed forces against the people of the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries still occupied by the Israel forces.

24. The grave nature of the Israel aggression today, aside from its criminal and unprovoked character, brings the Security Council face to face with its inescapable responsibilities under the Charter. What we face today is a situation which can neither be tolerated nor allowed to fall into the pattern of inaction and the policy of drift which the Security Council has been following since the war of aggression committed by Israel on 5 June.

25. The Security Council is called upon to apply to its full capacity and in full awareness of its responsibilities the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter and the enforcement measures against Israel, the outlaw of the international community. Not only the people of the United Arab Republic are watching this meeting, but also the entire Arab nation, as well as people everywhere who are rightly and legitimately entitled to expect the most responsible organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security to take a responsible course of action in meeting this most barbaric aggression committed by Israel today. This would be the only sincere, faithful application of the Charter. It is equally the only course of action which is required if the Council is aware of its responsibilities for peace and security.

26. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

27. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): On Saturday, 21 October, Egyptian naval craft, supplied by the Soviet Union and equipped with Soviet Komar missiles, attacked the Israel destroyer *Eilat* at 1730 hours on the high seas. The ship was on a routine patrol on its normal course, noted and observed by the Egyptian authorities for the last few months. At the time of the attack the *Eilat* was on the point of completing its regular patrol along its normal course. It was sailing on the high seas outside Egyptian territorial waters and was not engaged in any unusual activity. Suddenly it was struck by an Egyptian missile. The hit immobilized the ship, its power plant was put out of commission, it listed heavily and dropped anchor. More than one and a half hours had passed while the *Eilat* remained crippled and helpless when the Egyptians renewed the attack. They launched two more missiles; one of them struck the ship and sank her.

28. The Egyptian military command admitted that it returned to the attack after having received explicit orders from its highest authorities to do so. Nothing can demonstrate more convincingly the premeditated nature of this callous act of aggression than this renewal of the attack on a helpless and immobilized vessel. The second strike came to complete what the first strike had intended to do. As a matter of fact, immediately after the first attack the Egyptian authorities informed the United Nations observers that they had sunk the Israel destroyer. Realizing that their first missile strike had not completed its mission, the Egyptian authorities—military forces—after deliberation decided to press on with their aggression. It resulted in casualties of nineteen killed, twenty-eight missing and ninety-one wounded, twenty of them seriously.

29. The United Arab Republic's action was the gravest extension to the high seas of Egyptian maritime lawlessness and belligerence, after they had instituted naval blockades in international waterways in the area. The use of missiles, their introduction into Middle Eastern warfare, was a deliberate act of military escalation. Evaluating the situation, *The Times* of London of 23 October said:

"The gravity of the incident needs no emphasizing. Ships of one navy do not sink ships of another unless they are at war or spoiling to start a war."

30. It is obvious that the Government of the United Arab Republic had been preparing for this situation for some time. By government decree the civilian population of the Suez area was evacuated and a general atmosphere of tension was deliberately created. The Egyptian Press and radio dramatically announced during the last three weeks that the renewal of the fighting was imminent, and even at an earlier stage, soon after the conclusion of the cease-fire, Radio Cairo said on 12 July: "The war has not ended—it has only begun". And on 20 July the Voice of the Arabs, Saut al-Arab, said: "With the help of our beliefs, of Allah, of neutralism, of revolutionary principles, and of those seeking peace—we will march forward with assurances towards the battle". And the noted journalist, Mohamed Hassanien Heikal, wrote in *Al-Ahram* on 11 August: "Nothing but a miracle could prevent renewed warfare and I do not believe that we live in a time of miracles." *Al-Mussawwar* on 1 September 1967 said: "In Port Tawfiq all are alerted for the battle and the readiness is at its peak." *Rosa al-Yusuf* on 9 October said: "We wish to feel the battle . . . this feeling should be translated into deeds and active movement." On 15 October, a week preceding the attack on the Israel naval craft, radio Saut al-Arab said: "Prospects of renewal of the war in the Suez Canal zone still exist because of the Israel presence in the occupied areas."

31. After Egypt had succeeded in its attack, patriotic fervour was whipped up. The news of the great victory was spread throughout all available channels of its vast propaganda network. A pro-Cairo newspaper published in Beirut, *Al-Muharrir* said: "We can now say that the Israel army is going to suffer defeat that will make the world forget the Arab defeat of last June." *Al-Ahram* stated the day after the attack: "The results of the six-day war did not reflect the accurate picture of the power balance in the area.", and

Mr. Shukairy's comment, broadcast over Radio Cairo on 23 October, was: "The destruction of the *Eilat* is the first step in demolishing the military legend which is called Israel." The Iraqi newspaper *Al-Fajr al-Jadid* of 23 October said: "The blow to the Israel destroyer indicates the time has come for revenge." In Syria, Radio Damascus had the following comment: "This achievement of the Arab people proves that the way of force should be followed and that compromise and surrender are unacceptable. Resistance must continue also in the occupied areas."

32. That was the general trend of the gloating repeated in the Press and on the radio. The elegiac version given by the representative of the United Arab Republic tonight is not exactly attuned to yesterday's exhilaration of the radio and Press of Cairo. The attack on the Israel destroyer was not an isolated act of Egypt's violation of its obligations under the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council. There is enough evidence in the records of the Security Council of the opening of fire by the United Arab Republic forces against Israel positions that I do not have to tire the Council at this hour by giving a full account of them. Again and again the United Arab Republic has broken the cease-fire by shelling the Israel forces from gun emplacements in the close vicinity of, or inside, built-up areas.

33. The Egyptian forces did not content themselves with operations on land but also interfered with Israel shipping in the Gulf of Suez. The incidents of today are of exactly the same nature, bringing to a culmination a long series of Egyptian provocations. The policies and actions of the Government of the United Arab Republic are clearly designed to undermine the cease-fire. In doing so, it is reverting to the old techniques which it practised under the armistice régime when it claimed for itself the right of war and for Israel the obligations of peace. It is now applying these methods to the cease-fire régime.

34. But reciprocity is the very essence of the cease-fire. If there is no reciprocity as regards the cessation of fire then naturally the whole system collapses. I am reminded of an Arabic saying, "Those who light a fire cannot ask for protection from the flames." Again and again Israel has emphasized its policy of strict observance of the cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity. The attack on the destroyer *Eilat* has placed in jeopardy the cease-fire obligations.

35. We are again engaged in a vicious and dangerous circle, followed with such perseverance by the United Arab Republic, of shooting and shouting and shouting and shooting. Where does that lead to? To more suffering and more destruction. The time has come to put a stop to this folly. Israel again declares that it is ready right here and now, tonight, under this very roof, to meet representatives of the United Arab Republic and of any other Arab State and to discuss with them all measures designed to ensure security for all and to lay the basis for a peaceful future.

36. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): First of all let me convey my respects to you, Mr. President, on your assumption of your duties as our President. Already in the consultations which you have conducted you have earned the admiration of us all. I should like also to add a word of welcome to the Ambassador of Denmark. Denmark has

established already in this Council the highest reputation, and I am sure that the new Ambassador will fully maintain that reputation in the future.

37. I do not wish to pursue recriminations of recent tragic developments. I do not think that accusation and counter-accusation will take us anywhere. All of us, I am sure, deplore and condemn the grave breaches of the cease-fire which have taken place, breaches which have occurred in spite of the persistent and admirable efforts of General Bull and the United Nations observers.

38. It is well that we should meet urgently tonight. We meet to put the whole weight of the Council and of the United Nations behind a demand that the cease-fire shall now be observed and that belligerence from either side shall once and for all be abandoned. I wish to speak tonight only to urge—I would hope on behalf of all of us—that we should turn from hate and conflict. I trust that all that has happened will now at last require a change of heart and a change of direction, that we should not go back to bloodshed but go forward to a secure peace. Surely we can now all of us see that delay has had frightful consequences. Surely no one now can claim that we should hesitate any longer. Surely the need for urgent action is now clear to everyone.

39. I am glad to have the opportunity to speak once more openly here in the Security Council on the issues which we last discussed in the Council more than three months ago—three wasted months. It is true that we had a month's debate in the General Assembly in June and July, and our fears that that debate would not lead to effective and urgent action were unhappily confirmed. Our conviction that the right place to take action was here in this Council has been reinforced.

40. Our view is that the Security Council should have met much earlier and acted much sooner. That view is stronger still tonight. Before the conflict began we were amongst the first to call for the Council to meet and to act. We supported the Secretary-General's call to forgo belligerency; and had the Council acted then, the conflict could have been averted. When the war broke out we at once advocated an immediate cease-fire; and had our recommendation been approved, Jordan and Syria need never have been involved. For months we have been urging the appointment of a United Nations special representative. I recall that the representative of India was also amongst the first to make that proposal, and we were amongst the first to support it, as long ago as last June. What a difference in the present situation there might now be if our proposal, first made last June, had been promptly approved.

41. In July we supported and voted for the draft resolution in the General Assembly calling for urgent action by the Security Council. Had action been taken then, we might now be well on the road to a settlement. All along we have worked and spoken for action in the Security Council. We have done so openly and consistently. Our proposals throughout have been absolutely clear.

42. We were balked and frustrated in our purposes. We were criticized and even attacked by different interests, at

different times, for different reasons. But no one can say that we were not clear in our recommendations, and no one can say that we were not consistent in our aims. No one can accuse us of the delay and the hesitation and the opposition to United Nations action which first led to conflict and then to deadlock, has led to so much unnecessary suffering, and has now led to more death and destruction. It was delay that led to the conflict; it was delay that led to the deadlock; it has been delay that has now led to more death and destruction.

43. We all know that members of this Council have been working with increasing urgency, particularly in the past few days, to establish and declare the principles which should govern a settlement and to take the first practical steps on the hard road to peace. We know that they have set themselves the task of preparing a fair and balanced draft resolution—I emphasize “a fair and balanced draft resolution”—under which a United Nations special representative can go without further delay to deal with the situation on the spot, in consultation and co-operation with those directly concerned. That is what we have been advocating all along. My Secretary of State said in the General Assembly a month ago: “we must work for . . . a durable peace, the renunciation of all aggressive designs, and an end to policies which are inconsistent with peace.”¹ That is the overriding purpose; that is the prize, a durable peace. It cannot be won without justice and equal recognition of equal obligations on both sides. It cannot be won without a real sense of the utmost urgency.

44. I believe that there is an overwhelming support in the general membership of the United Nations for a fair and balanced resolution and for immediate action by a United Nations special representative. Indeed, I cannot remember a greater sense of common purpose, common impatience and general agreement amongst us. That can give us some hope and some confidence.

45. Surely we should not conclude our discussion tonight—so I earnestly suggest—without resolving together to move with all possible speed to take such positive, just and urgent action; and, I trust, to take it unanimously.

46. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, I would, of course, wish to associate myself with my colleagues in expressing admiration for the way in which you, as President of the Council, have already conducted the consultations on means of finding a peaceful solution to the Middle East problem.

47. I should also wish to express my happiness in seeing my old friend Ambassador Borch, with whom I have been associated in the past, and to say with what pleasure Canada looks forward to continuing its collaboration with Denmark in this Council.

48. The current outbreak of Arab-Israel hostilities in the Suez area points up, as the representative of the United Kingdom has just said, the precarious nature of the cease-fire which, as we all agreed on 6 June, was only a first

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1567th meeting, para. 91.*

step. If that first step is to be followed, as it should already have been, by further steps towards a restoration of peaceful conditions in the area, then I believe that all of us in this Council would agree that the cease-fire must be scrupulously respected by both sides and that all parties must desist from all military activities in the area.

49. There is more than enough inflammable material in the area without adding further fuel to the flames by acrimonious exchanges of charges and counter-charges and by prolonged debates. I shall therefore be very direct and very precise.

50. In the present circumstances the Canadian delegation very much hopes that the Council will adopt the following measures—not necessarily together, but urgently in a series.

51. First, we should call upon all parties to respect scrupulously the cease-fire and to cease and desist from all military activities in the area. Second, we should ask the Secretary-General for as full information as possible from General Odd Bull both as to the measures he has taken now under the terms of the consensus adopted by the Council on 10 July 1967² for the surveillance of the cease-fire in the area—I know that we have received several supplementary reports—and also as to what additional resources, if any, he may require to carry out his important and onerous task as effectively as possible under the consensus to which I referred. Third, immediate steps should be taken—as the delegation of Canada and, of course, also the delegations of India and the United Kingdom have advocated consistently since early June—to give the Secretary-General appropriate authorization to dispatch a special representative to the Middle East to start the process towards restoring peaceful conditions in the area. This indeed has been recognized as an urgent necessity by the Secretary-General himself, in paragraph 48 of the introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly.³

52. In mentioning this third measure, I fully recognize, as did the representative of the United Kingdom, the difficulties involved in agreeing on the framework of principles within which the efforts of the special representative should be made. But I am conscious of the extensive consultations which have already taken place on this matter and are still going on under your leadership, Mr. President. I cannot believe that it is beyond the capabilities of the members of the Council to reach agreement on such a reasonable proposal and one which would break the stalemate. A fair and balanced resolution, as my colleague from the United Kingdom called it, is what we need and I believe that there exists today a consensus in favour of such an approach as the next and essential step towards peace in the Middle East. I therefore commend this programme of constructive activity to the favourable consideration of my colleagues in the Council.

53. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The incident which has

occurred in the Suez area today, 24 October, could not fail to attract the attention of the Security Council, of the United Nations and of world opinion. This event has forcibly demonstrated the extent of the tension in the Middle East and the nature of the explosive situation which exists in that area as a result of the fact that the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States have not yet been liquidated. This new act of provocation by Israel's armed forces, of which the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony, has just given us a convincing account in his statement, is a most serious violation of the Security Council's decision calling for a cease-fire and the cessation of military activities. It is an act of defiance against the basic and generally recognized principles of international law, a defiance of legality and of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

54. It is hardly possible, at the present moment, to make a full assessment of all the consequences of the barbaric bombardment of the Suez area by Israel artillery. Even now, however, one thing is quite clear: irreparable damage has been done to that city. Many residential areas have been destroyed, a large number of peaceful citizens have been killed or maimed, industrial undertakings have been demolished and oil refineries have been set on fire. And, what is more serious still, this was not any kind of miscalculation or accident but a premeditated act of barbarism planned in advance and undertaken on orders from Tel-Aviv. The Israel occupation forces ignored the appeals of the United Nations observers in that area for an immediate cease-fire and continued the shelling for a long time until they had achieved their criminal objectives and carried out their monstrous design. The fact that it was the Israel aggressors who started the attack is confirmed in the report of 24 October by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization [S/7930/Add.44]; it states, in particular:

“(1) Observation post (OP) Mike at Port Tawfiq reported that Israel Defence Forces initiated artillery fire at 1231 hours GMT, 24 October, at oil refinery south-west of Port Suez.”

55. In the light of this, the counter-claim so hurriedly introduced by Israel has the appearance of a delayed reaction, a pitiful farce whose purpose is to try to deceive the Security Council and world opinion. Quasi-diplomatic moves of this nature are characteristic of the Israel representatives who, as members of the Council are well aware, have in the past often resorted to the customary procedural manoeuvre of the aggressor by seeking to shift responsibility for their crime on to the victim of the aggression. However, the facts provided by the United Nations observers in the Suez area are self-evident; they reveal the falsity of Tel-Aviv's absurd accusations.

56. Thus, Mr. President, as is rightly stressed in the letter dated 24 October from the representative of the United Arab Republic [S/8207] requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council, the Israel Government bears full responsibility for this new and serious act of aggression which, as we now see, goes far beyond what could be described as a mere violation of the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions. It is nothing other than the continua-

² Incorporated in the record of the 1366th meeting of the Council, para. 125.

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

tion of aggressive war against a State Member of the United Nations, the United Arab Republic. It is merely one link in the chain of many defiant attacks and provocations recently committed by Israel against the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries.

57. Only two days ago, Israel committed another act of provocation by sending one of its warships into the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic off Port Said. Warships of the United Arab Republic in Port Said were obliged to take measures, under the laws of a sovereign State, to defend themselves against that provocation, but that did not deter the aggressor. And the attempt by the Israel representative, who just now made every effort to divert the Security Council's attention from this latest aggressive act committed by Israel armed forces in the Suez area, and cynically tried to whitewash the provocative violation of the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic by an Israel destroyer—did not that attempt sound ironical? Whatever epithets or phraseology Mr. Rafael uses, however much he expatiates on his assertion that the warship was defenceless and was engaged on some peaceful routine mission immediately off the coast of the United Arab Republic, he will never be able to alter or distort the facts.

58. One point worthy of note, Mr. President, is that the Israel representative virtually evaded the main question: why did Israel carry out a barbarous artillery attack on the town of Suez? He did not explain to the Security Council by what right the Israel occupiers killed a large number of peaceful citizens in Suez and destroyed plants and factories. But it is precisely this which is the subject of discussion in the Security Council. However, the aggressor, it seems, has his own logic. He is following his own rules and considers it appropriate to act out a melodrama here in the Security Council.

59. We know that on 23 and 24 October unceasing threats against the United Arab Republic were heard from Tel-Aviv, and these culminated in a large-scale military attack on the town of Suez. According to Press reports, the Israel Minister of Defence, Moshe Dayan himself, in a recent statement, threatened that the Suez canal zone "was becoming the spark which might start a conflagration". These threats, as all the world can see, have now been carried out by the Israel militarists. All this forcibly demonstrates that there must be no delay in putting an end to Israel's unlawful occupation of the territory of Arab states, an occupation accomplished by open aggression in violation of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter.

60. As is known, the Soviet Government has issued frequent warnings to the effect that, in defiance of the will of the peoples and contrary to the interests of maintaining peace, the ruling circles of Israel and those who support them in the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western countries are playing a dangerous game and are incurring full responsibility for continuing the policy of aggression and provocation against the Arab States and peoples.

61. As long as the aggressor continues to occupy lands which have since time immemorial belonged to the Arab

peoples, as long as he puts forward territorial and other claims, as long as he persists in sabotaging United Nations decisions, in an outrageous manner, it will be impossible to remove tension and establish peace in the Middle East.

62. Is it not self-evident that, in conditions of ever-increasing tension, new complications are unavoidable? One cannot exclude the possibility that armed incidents provoked by Tel-Aviv along the Suez Canal, and on the Israel-Jordan and Israel-Syrian fronts, will escalate into a major military confrontation.

63. Recent events also compel the Security Council to be mindful of its responsibilities and to realize that it is essential to hasten a political settlement in the Middle East. The Security Council must do its duty forthwith in connexion with Israel's violation of its decisions, in connexion with the latest aggressive provocation by Israel.

64. The Soviet delegation considers that the United Arab Republic's request for an urgent meeting of the Security Council was fully justified. We firmly support this just demand; and we also consider that the Security Council has a duty to condemn unconditionally the aggressive acts committed by Israel in the Suez area. At the same time, Israel must unquestionably pay compensation for the damage caused to the United Arab Republic and the inhabitants of Suez as a result of Israel's barbaric bombing and artillery attack.

65. For the reasons given above, the Soviet delegation submits the following draft resolution for the Security Council's consideration:

"The Security Council,

"Having considered the communication of the representative of the United Arab Republic concerning a new act of aggression by Israel in the area of the city of Suez,

"Having considered also the information provided by the Secretary-General in document S/7930/Add.44 that the Israel forces began and continued an artillery barrage, ignoring the proposal by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine for an immediate cease-fire,

"Expressing grave concern that the said act of aggression has resulted in heavy losses among the peaceful population and in serious physical damage,

"Considering that the actions of the Israel armed forces in the area of the city of Suez constitute a gross violation of the Security Council resolutions of 6 June 1967 [233 (1967)] and of 7 June 1967 [234 (1967)] calling for a cease-fire and the cessation of military activities, as well as of other Security Council resolutions on that question,

"1. Strongly condemns Israel for the act of aggression committed by it in the area of the city of Suez;

"2. Demands that Israel compensate the United Arab Republic for the damage caused by that act;

"3. *Urgently calls upon* Israel strictly to observe the aforementioned resolutions of the Security Council concerning the cease-fire and the cessation of military activities." [S/8212.]

66. We appeal to the Security Council to act without delay and to take the necessary decision in accordance with the duties and the high responsibility assigned to it under the United Nations Charter.

67. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

68. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): I wish to thank the Security Council for giving me the privilege of participating in the present debate. Never before has the United Nations and the principles that it stands for faced such a challenge to its very existence as the crisis of which it is now seized. Never before has the factor of delay played a more decisive part in aggravating matters than it has done in the present Israel aggression. Nearly five months have passed since Israel occupied large parts of Arab territory by the use of force, and in spite of this flagrant breach of the principles of the Charter we are still where we were when Israel first invaded and occupied those territories. Many meetings of the Security Council, as well as meetings during the fifth emergency special session and the present twenty-second session of the General Assembly, have taken place, but so far nothing has been done to suppress aggression and remove its consequences. Does this really mean that, contrary to what the Members of the United Nations resolved under the Charter, the United Nations is now prepared, after twenty years' hard work and devotion, to abandon its principles and accept *fait accompli* situations? Or is it hoped that the time element may work a miracle and save the United Nations from taking a firm decision in the face of challenging pressures?

69. In this case the time factor has proved a most dangerous element. We only need to look at what has happened since 5 June, and especially at what has happened today. Israel has again considered that the use of force pays dividends and has proceeded to launch its wanton attacks on Arab territory and population. Today's vicious attack by Israel, an account of which has just been put before the Council by the representative of the United Arab Republic, is but one link in a chain of continued Israel aggression. This attack resulted in the extensive loss of the lives of innocent men, women and children. There has been almost total damage to the city of Suez and its inhabitants, to everything living and everything built. What is more, the Israelis have systematically shelled industrial installations, including petroleum refineries in Suez, and the Nasr plants for fertilizers and several other industrial complexes have been completely destroyed. All this is but an indication of Israel's hostile aims towards Arab lands, its people and Arab progress. The Arab civil population which fell victim to Israel fire should be well in the minds of representatives day and night and should remind them of the tragic, serious situation, of the turmoil resulting from the lack of decisive action by the United Nations.

70. In the occupied part of my country, Jordan, Israel forces, in utter disregard of international law, the United

Nations Charter and civilization, are responsible for the most hideous crimes, for which a parallel can hardly be found in modern history. Private property is being destroyed indiscriminately and the inhabitants are suffering at the hands of the Israelis the worst kind of treatment that any human being can endure. Human torture, looting, robbery, obliteration of Jordanian villages are the order of the day. Half of my country and half of our population are under Israel occupation and persecution.

71. Why should all this, and more than this, be allowed to continue? The answer is simple and clear. It is simply that the organs of the United Nations, notably the Security Council, are shrinking from the responsibility of taking a clear and effective stand. Many meetings have already taken place but have always ended in a complete deadlock. The underlying reason behind all this can clearly be found in the attitude of some major Powers, an attitude which only serves to encourage Israel to persist in its defiance.

72. In this regard, we are bound to ask: Why is it that the Council has not been able as yet to take effective measures in the grave situation prevailing in the Middle East? Why is it that so many meetings and private consultations have been held outside this chamber and outside this building, and ended nowhere? Why is it that so many ideas and proposals have been discussed and so many views exchanged, with no definite results? Why is it that the question has been shifting between the Security Council and the General Assembly and has been discussed in both, without either of these two main organs taking an effective decision? Again, the answer is clear. It lies in the trend, now evident, to subject the principles of what is right and just to political considerations alien to the merits of the real issue before the Council.

73. It will be most disappointing to those who wish to maintain a degree of confidence in this world Organization and a respect for international relations and friendship to find that, despite what has happened today, no clear pronouncement shall have been adopted in this Council strongly condemning Israel for its flagrant aggression of today and laying punitive measures against it. In this regard, allow me to acknowledge with appreciation the initiative taken by the representative of the Soviet Union in the draft resolution which he just read out.

74. Today's armed assault by Israel, which reveals the ugliest disregard on the part of Israel for the existence of the United Nations, should indeed serve to move the Council swiftly to the adoption of a decision ordering Israel to withdraw all its armed forces to the lines from which it started its major offensive on 5 June, and to do so without any further delay and with no conditions attached. Unless this basic requirement is strictly observed, there can be no hope for any progress in the direction of peace. Any approach which does not take this essential requirement into serious account will be a departure from the right course which can yield fruitful results.

75. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): Mr. President, may I welcome you to your seat in the Council, which you are already filling with great distinction. May I also associate myself with what many of my

colleagues have said concerning the representative of India, our good friend Mr. Parthasarathi.

76. The United States shares the universal sense of anxiety over the incidents which underlie this urgent meeting of the Security Council: the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Eilat* on 21 October, and the serious exchange of artillery fire that occurred today between the forces of Israel and the United Arab Republic. Our immediate concern is, of course, over the loss of lives, the destruction of property and the suffering which those incidents have caused. But we are also deeply concerned over the fact that the cease-fire decisions which the Council adopted last June should have been violated, with all the danger that such violations entail for the peace of the Middle East.

77. The first resolution which this Council adopted last June, resolution 233 (1967) of 6 June called upon all the Governments concerned "to take forthwith as a first step all measures for an immediate cease-fire and for a cessation of all military activities in the area". By adopting that resolution and the three subsequent ones which confirmed it [234 (1967), 235 (1967), 236 (1967)], the Council clearly recognized that if there was to be any change of progress towards peace in the Middle East, the first step must be a complete cease-fire, a complete cessation of acts of violence between the parties. That truth was unassailable and self-evident then and it remains so now.

78. The United States is ready to join with the Council in insisting upon this basic point. The United States is even prepared to go further and co-operate in any necessary step to strengthen the United Nations machinery in the area so that it may be fully equal to the task of supervising the all-encompassing cease-fire resolutions of the Council. We should give General Bull what he does not have and what he needs to implement the cease-fire, in man-power and in land, sea and air facilities.

79. An end to violence was imperative in June; it is imperative now. Again and again, as the records of the Council amply demonstrate, the experience in the area, including that of recent events, proves that violence breeds violence, that belligerency breeds belligerency and that acts of war breed acts of war.

80. This Council has the right to insist that all parties scrupulously observe the cease-fire and stop all military activities in violation of it. And this Council has the right and obligation to insist upon peace in the area—a just, durable and permanent peace.

81. Under the Security Council resolutions, as I have indicated, the cease-fire was to be the first step. This of course must be assured. But my delegation is ready, and has been ready for a long time, to take the next step. We have been ready to do so ever since the deliberations of the Security Council on the Middle East were interrupted in the middle of June 1967. That next step is what I referred to a moment ago, and that step is a step towards peace in the area.

82. The events of these last days underscore what we have all known for a long time: that what the Middle East needs

is not just a cease-fire, essential though that is, not just a fragile and oft-violated armistice, but new steps towards a durable peace. Real peace must be our aim, and nothing less than real peace is essential in the area. It should be more evident now than ever before that we must begin, and begin now, to move towards a just settlement of all the questions outstanding between the parties.

83. We must take action tonight, and my delegation believes that the appropriate action is clearly indicated. This Council should tonight reaffirm the cease-fire and demand scrupulous mutual adherence to it by all the parties, and this Council should condemn any and all violations of the cease-fire.

84. We have just witnessed a very familiar performance by our colleague Ambassador Fedorenko of the Soviet Union. With respect to it I would like merely to say this, that if there is anything which will not contribute to peace in the area or to progress by the Council it is a midnight re-run of that stale record.

85. The experience of this Council amply demonstrates that the Council will not take a one-sided view of the situation or adopt one-sided resolutions, but will deal even-handedly with the situation in the interest of stopping violence and moving towards peace in the area. To that end, I offer a draft resolution for the consideration of the Council which, with your permission, Mr. President, I should like to read out:

"The Security Council,

"Gravely concerned at the reports and complaints it has received of military hostilities in violation of the cease-fire between Israel and the United Arab Republic,

"Convinced that progress towards the establishment of a just and durable peace in the area requires mutual respect for the cease-fire, in accordance with resolutions of the Security Council and the agreements of the parties,

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

"2. Insists that the Member States concerned scrupulously respect the cease-fire as contained in resolutions 233 (1967), 234 (1967), 235 (1967) and 236 (1967), and the consensus of 10 July 1967 and co-operate fully with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the United Nations military observers in their tasks in connexion therewith;

"3. Calls on the Governments concerned to issue categorical instructions to all military forces to refrain from all firing as required by these resolutions."/S/8213./

I move this draft resolution, which I now ask be circulated.

86. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): At the outset, I wish to thank the representative of the United States for the very kind reference he made to me. The Security Council is meeting again tonight under the shadow of armed conflict in West Asia. We have before us the letters of the

Permanent Representatives of the United Arab Republic and Israel [S/8207 and S/8208]. We also have available to us information provided by the Secretary-General on reports submitted by UNTSO [S/7930/Add.44 and 45].

87. Even a cursory glance at the documents I have just cited makes clear the deliberateness of the attack mounted by Israel during the course of the day against the United Arab Republic. This fact is clear from the refusal of the Israel authorities to accept the proposal of UNTSO to effect a cease-fire beginning at 1330 hours GMT. The United Arab Republic, the report of UNTSO continues, accepted the proposal. The reply of the Israel authorities was one of equivocation and procrastination.

88. The deliberateness of the attack is also brought out by the immense damage done to the industrial installations, particularly oil refineries in the Suez area. The Council is entitled to assume that the equivocation and procrastination was for the purpose of completing the plan of destruction of industrial installations and inflicting other damage to civilian life and property.

89. There is a related aspect of the matter to which I should like to draw the attention of the Council. The practice of reprisals has been specifically prohibited on several occasions, the last one being as recently as 25 November 1966 in Security Council resolution 228 (1966). Several successive Security Council resolutions have condemned Israel military measures against its Arab neighbours. I need quote from only one of these resolutions, namely resolution 228 (1966) which reminded Israel of the impermissibility of reprisals. Paragraph 3 of that resolution read:

"Emphasizes to Israel that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that, if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts."

90. All these past resolutions that I have referred to show that the Security Council has made it very clear that the policy of retaliation adopted by Israel is impermissible. What is more, the latest action of Israel infringes the terms of the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in the month of June this year. I would remind the members of this Council that by its resolution 236 (1967) adopted on 12 June 1967 the Council specifically condemned any and all violations of the cease-fire. In the context of the clear prohibitions of the resolution I have just cited, Israel cannot justify its attack of today under any pretext.

91. The Council has also heard statements in regard to the naval incident of 21 October, in which the Israel destroyer *Eilat* was sunk. My delegation, amongst others, was and is seriously concerned at that incident. The representative of the United Arab Republic has stated in his letter dated 22 October 1967 [S/8205] to the President of the Security Council that the destroyer was speeding in United Arab Republic territorial waters. The representative of Israel, on the other hand, has stated that the vessel was outside the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic. The report of the Secretary-General on the naval incident

[S/7930/Add.43] provides no conclusive information on this aspect of the matter. Clearly there is need for further investigation to determine whether or not the destroyer was actually in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic or on the high seas at the time it was sunk.

92. Determination of this fact has great importance in the context of Security Council resolution 236 (1967) which specifically prohibited any forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire. My delegation, therefore, feels that an investigation of this incident, with all the circumstances attending it, should be ordered by the Secretary-General to enable the Council to come to a conclusion.

93. Having dealt with the specific items under discussion, I should like to emphasize the necessity for the Council to take further action to resolve the situation in West Asia. The continued occupation of vast Arab territories and the frequent clashes along the cease-fire positions are constant reminders of the grave situation prevailing in that region. The international community cannot ignore the existence of the threat to the peace resulting from this state of affairs. It is a matter of deep regret to us that in spite of numerous meetings of the Security Council and an emergency session of the General Assembly no progress has been registered in securing the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel and in bringing peace and security to the area.

94. During the general debate in the current session of the General Assembly, the leader of the Indian delegation stated: "We must all realize that failure to find a solution for the problems of West Asia would lead to even graver threats to peace."⁴ It is our firm conviction that the United Nations cannot even begin the process of finding lasting solutions to the serious problems in the Middle East unless we take some concrete steps first to reduce tensions in the area. For that reason my delegation stated at the 1352nd meeting of the Council on 9 June 1967 that, following its eminent practice, the Security Council should reinforce its call for a cease-fire and immediately order the withdrawal of all armed forces to the positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities. My delegation is more convinced than ever that unless the Security Council takes this first step of ordering the withdrawal of Israel forces to the positions they held on 4 June 1967 the Council will meet again and again to consider grave violations of the cease-fire. There can be no beginning to reduction of tensions in the area unless Israel forces first withdraw from the territories they have occupied.

95. During the course of this long and unhappy crisis in the Middle East, and more especially since the events of June 1967, it has become apparent to the world community that unless certain well-established and well-respected principles of international law and international practice come to be reiterated by this Council, with all the authority vested in it under the Charter, the journey from a state of war to a state of peace and tranquillity may not be easy, or even possible. In this, time is of the essence, and the earlier the Council can act the better. It is the responsibility of the Members of the Security Council to intensify their efforts with a view to securing the with-

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Plenary Meetings*, 1582nd meeting, para. 81.

drawal and finding of solutions of the grave problems of the area so that the present precarious cease-fire leads to a just and lasting peace.

96. Earlier tonight we heard the statement of, among others, the representative of the United Kingdom. I have great pleasure in agreeing with him that the Council should act urgently to deal with the serious problem of the area. What is more, I join my voice to his in saying that the resolution should be a fair and balanced one. In his turn, I hope he will agree with me that—a point which I have consistently urged for more than three months—the resolution should be based on certain fundamental guide-lines to be given to the special representative who, we agree should urgently proceed to the area.

97. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil): Mr. President, first of all let me convey to you the admiration of the Brazilian delegation for the manner in which you have presided over the consultations which have been taking place among the members of this Council. I should also like to greet the new representative of Denmark. The Danish delegation has played a very active and constructive part in the Council's deliberations, and I am sure that its new Chairman will follow the same path and give the same statesmanlike performance as his distinguished predecessor.

98. My delegation has learned with deep sorrow the news about the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Eilat* by Egyptian patrol boats and the attack on the Egyptian oil refineries and industrial installations near Suez by Israel armed forces. It is most regrettable that this military action should have taken place. It is imperative that the parties concerned act with restraint. It has been said time and again that a solution to the conflict in the Middle East cannot be achieved except by peaceful means, and these clashes cannot but postpone indefinitely the day when a lasting settlement will be reached.

99. Brazil has consistently maintained that the first step towards a solution of the problem in the Middle East is a strict observance of the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council. We cannot therefore condone any breach of decisions taken by this body with the full support of the entire international community. We urge the parties concerned to abide by those decisions.

100. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, may I first of all welcome you to the Security Council, both as representative of Japan and as President of the Security Council for this month, since this is the first time we are meeting in the Security Council. I should also like to welcome our colleague from Denmark who has just replaced his predecessor, now Minister for Foreign Affairs, a post in which he will certainly be able to render his country valuable service.

101. We have just heard with great surprise and disappointment of the events that have occurred today in the Middle East and especially in the area of Suez.

102. The events which have occurred today, 24 October, are not an isolated incident or accident of any kind. To any objective observer, they seem to be one of the links in a

chain of events premeditated and prepared for a very long time, the most significant of them being the Israel aggression of 5 June 1967. Having as a result of the aggression of 5 June occupied considerable portions of the territory of Arab States, which Israel has refused and still refuses to evacuate, the Israel extremists have been looking for pretexts and methods for strengthening their hold over these territories.

103. The occupation forces have committed a whole series of provocations which are designed to perpetuate the present state of affairs in that area. By this means, it seems, some Israel extremists are hoping that they can strengthen their territorial claims on the Arab States. Obviously it is hardly necessary to quote documents to show the existence of these territorial claims, which have been stated so often since the aggression of 5 June and were reaffirmed only a few days ago. These claims were repeated, for all to hear, by the same extremists; and, as you know, they have been echoed throughout the world by Israel propaganda.

104. The fact that Israel's attack on the town of Suez was premeditated is clear from the statement made here this evening by the Permanent Representative of Israel, who said that "the attack on the destroyer *Eilat* has placed in jeopardy the cease-fire obligations". What does this mean? Does it not mean that the attack on and the destruction of that ship—which was committing a provocation by entering the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic—was taken as a pretext for Israel's reprisals?

105. Events have been linked together in such a way that the destruction of the ship—an act within the rights of the party whose territorial waters were being violated—has been used to justify the provocation committed today. Furthermore, Israel's provocations have been described by the representative of the United Arab Republic, who told the Council of the provocative acts committed by the destroyer which sank two United Arab Republic vessels in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic itself. This is a point which must be stressed here and now. According to the information given by the Israel authorities to the Secretary-General's representative, this naval vessel was, as several speakers have already pointed out, ten miles from the coast. It was therefore in a place where it should not have been.

106. Of course, the Permanent Representative of Israel has tried, both in his statement today and previously in his letter to the President of the Security Council, to give the impression that the attack was provoked by the fact that United Arab Republic artillery opened fire. But we have already been informed here that Israel attacked the refineries long before lodging any complaint with the United Nations authorities on the spot.

107. Thus it was certainly Israel which began the attack, and Israel has just told us that during its attack on United Arab Republic forces it accidentally destroyed oil refineries, factories and other installations, and that the people living near these installations had suffered. It is clear, therefore, that Israel committed a premeditated attack on a populated town, on the industrial installations in the town, and on an area of the United Arab Republic

where there was a concentration of civilian population. Israel has, of course, tried to place responsibility on the troops and forces of the United Arab Republic. But the commander of the armed forces of the United Arab Republic must have known that Suez and the other towns were within range of Israel artillery and all the Israel armed forces. That means he would have risked having the population of those towns massacred. In order to launch such an attack, he would have had specifically to wish for the destruction of the Arab population. The Permanent Representative of Israel was really going too far in saying things like that. No responsible Government could take measures like that which would lead to the massacre of its own people by an enemy bent on destroying it.

108. Furthermore, what is significant here, as the Indian and other representatives have pointed out, is that when a cease-fire was proposed the Israel forces refused to agree to it, merely so that they could go on destroying the civilian population and destroying the industrial installations.

109. What does this mean? It means merely that Israel could not and did not want to stop because it had a plan which had to be carried out—just as it had a plan, you will remember, when the Security Council decided earlier to demand a cease-fire, and the cease-fire was not accepted until two days after the events set in motion by Israel, after it had achieved its military objectives in the Middle East between 5 and 8 June of this year.

110. As long as Israel continues to occupy Arab territory, its leaders will always be tempted to try to take advantage of the fact and to commit acts likely to create situations which will bring them territorial gains. The Security Council should therefore take the necessary measures to find a solution to the situation created in the Middle East by Israel's aggression of 5 June. Is it not significant that Israel's provocations of today have been committed at a time when efforts are being made in the United Nations to reach a solution? Is it not significant, Mr. President, that at the very moment when representatives are congratulating you on your efforts and your perseverance in continuing the discussions now being held in the hope of reaching a solution to this question, more and more provocations are being committed in order to undermine the efforts being made in this direction? Is this not a significant fact for world public opinion?

111. The Security Council should be particularly anxious to set about this task forthwith, since further incidents may be provoked by Israel. The Council should not content itself with hearing declarations from the Permanent Representative of Israel, who has told us in effect: "Israel is ready now, this evening if you wish, immediately, to meet the representatives of the United Arab Republic and the other Arab States in order to conclude peace". We have already heard this old refrain. Some countries at war are declaring all the time that they are ready to make peace. This sounds like Viet-Nam. People are saying all the time that they are ready for peace and all the time, under cover of these statements, they are escalating the war more and more. Does this not make you think that Israel is following the examples most easily available to it, particularly the

example of the Permanent Representative who is taking its side here in the Security Council?

112. In view of the situation in the Middle East, which is really very serious, the Security Council must take immediate measures and, as proposed by the Soviet Union in its draft resolution it must strongly condemn Israel's aggression in the area of the city of Suez. It should also demand that Israel pay compensation for the immense damage caused to the United Arab Republic by this further aggression. It should, of course, also urgently call upon Israel strictly to observe the aforementioned resolutions of the Security Council, as stated in the Soviet draft. The Canadian representative has also demanded that these resolutions be observed. Who is it then that is failing to observe them? It is those who have committed provocations, those who are violating the territorial waters of other States, and those who are making a show of force in the Middle East in order to threaten the Arab States. The Security Council should, of course, also take immediate steps to solve this conflict which continues to disturb the peace in that region and might lead to a war on a much larger scale which would have terrible consequences.

113. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria also wishes to state that the lenient attitude adopted by some delegations towards the aggression is out of place. In the face of aggression, there is only one stand to be taken—condemnation and the determination to bring it to an end; otherwise, it may have disastrous consequences. The Security Council should therefore take forthwith the necessary measures to put an end to the fighting which has just broken out and to solve the Middle East situation once and for all. It is only on these conditions that one can hope to see peace reign once more in this area and throughout the world.

114. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I am very glad and pleased to associate myself with my colleagues who have already congratulated you on your assumption of the office which you are discharging for the first time this evening. I am especially happy to see, as President, the representative of a country in which I spent several years and which I remember vividly and with gratitude. I should also like to extend a warm welcome to our colleague from Denmark.

115. I have no need to describe the feelings of my country, which has constantly advocated the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East, when it learned of the events which have once again caused a dangerous disturbance in that part of the world. I have listened with the greatest attention to the information given us by the representative of the United Arab Republic, information which was followed by comments from the Israel representative. I have also read very carefully the reports from General Odd Bull which have been circulated today.

116. I believe that, in view of the seriousness of the facts, an urgent meeting of the Security Council was essential, if not for maintaining peace—indeed, peace has not reigned in that part of the world for a long time—then at least in order to put an end to the fighting, this being the only way of restoring the peace which is so earnestly desired.

117. Whatever additional information may be supplied in order to enable us to assess the situation with greater certainty, the French delegation wishes to state here and now that it cannot but regret that there has once again been a resort to force and to measures that are bound to reopen the vicious circle of reprisals and counter-reprisals which cause grievous losses and serious economic damage.

118. Among the incidents of the last few days, the naval encounter which led to the sinking of a ship, accompanied unfortunately by the loss of human life, seems to have been primarily a military clash. However, the facts reported by General Odd Bull [S/7930/Add.44] and the destruction of the Suez refineries—representing 80 per cent of the United Arab Republic's capacity in this field—with casualties amounting to several dead and wounded among the town's civilian population, give this latest and regrettable event an especially disturbing character.

119. I do not wish to express any views this evening before I have more information at my disposal. I do not wish to express any definite views on the question of responsibility. I wish however to stress that the Council's first duty is to make sure that the cease-fire will in future be observed. This cease-fire must be complied with by both parties. The activities of General Odd Bull and his representatives must be effective and their orders and instructions must be carried out. This is an urgent and indispensable requirement. It is only on the basis of an effective cease-fire that it will be possible to tackle the wider task which has yet to be accomplished in this area, a task which now seems more urgent than ever since it is the only way of ensuring that the whole of this area can return to a normal existence and find the security for which my country so ardently appeals.

120. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): I should like to express my thanks for the generous words of appreciation that have been spoken with regard to my predecessor and for the kind words of welcome to myself.

121. It was indeed with the greatest regret and concern that we learned about the grave incidents and the breaching of the cease-fire decisions of this Council which have taken place recently. Not only have these serious incidents inflicted loss of human life, but they have proved once more the instability of the present arrangement.

122. Let me state clearly that my Government deplores and condemns any and all violations of the cease-fire. We urge, as others have done, indeed we insist on, full and complete respect for the cease-fire. I wish also to stress that my delegation is prepared to give positive consideration to any request from the Secretary-General for the strengthening of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. However, such steps, important and necessary as they are, have only a temporary character.

123. We must realize that the present situation highlights the continuing duty of the Security Council to pursue its efforts to pave the way for a just and durable peace in the area. For our part, we have actively participated in recent consultations with a view to giving expression, in a fair and balanced way, to the principles that should guide such a

settlement. This evening let me just assure you that we shall continue to do this.

124. Mr. KANTE (Mali) (*translated from French*): At a time when the members of the Council are taking positive steps to find a just solution to the Middle Eastern conflict, the United Arab Republic has again been the victim of barbarous aggression by Israel artillery which has destroyed more than 80 per cent of the industry of the United Arab Republic and has caused loss of human life in the Suez area. This aggression is a typical and deliberate defiance of the cease-fire resolutions adopted by this Council.

125. My delegation shares the fears of the delegations which have already deplored the precarious nature of the cease-fire and the state of belligerence and insecurity caused by Israel's territorial claims and also, I am bound to say, by the inhuman military occupation of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria.

126. On studying General Odd Bull's report [S/7930/Add.44], which cannot be accused of bias, we find that the Israel armed forces initiated artillery fire at 1231 hours GMT on 24 October at an oil refinery south-west of Port Suez. We also find that, while the United Arab Republic agreed to a cease-fire proposal at 1300 hours, the report mentions that Israel persistently refused to comply with the appeals for a cease-fire issued three times by the United Nations observers. A still more serious fact, noted at 1325 hours GMT, was that the senior Israel representative stated—and here I quote the actual words used by the United Nations Chief of Staff—that he had received a message from the Israel Defence Forces Headquarters that Israel would not agree to a cease-fire until 1530 hours GMT, that, is several hours after it had started the hostilities.

127. I am dwelling on this part of General Odd Bull's report because it clearly reveals a number of facts, as follows:

(1) That Israel has once again committed aggression;

(2) That the decision was taken at Tel-Aviv, and not at the theatre of operations by the Israel units stationed in the area where hostilities took place;

(3) That this aggression was perpetrated in accordance with a detailed plan indicating when hostilities were to begin and when they were to stop, since the order for the cease-fire which was fixed unilaterally by Israel—despite repeated injunctions from General Odd Bull—proves, if proof were necessary, that the plan had a clearly defined objective. The cease-fire did not come into effect until Israel's purposes had been accomplished.

128. This is a particularly serious fact. We are faced with a clear case of aggression. The fact is clearly described in an official report based on the statements of official United Nations observers operating in the area at the Security Council's request, in accordance with the June cease-fire resolutions and the agreed procedure for implementing them.

129. Our delegation, the delegation of Mali, has constantly reaffirmed that the Middle East situation will continue to

be particularly explosive, threatening the peace of the world, day after day, so long as Israel continues to occupy the Arab territories which its troops invaded in the days following 5 June 1967. Consequently, in the opinion of the delegation of Mali, the Council must condemn Israel's aggression of 24 October which is a flagrant violation of the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions. It must also call upon the parties concerned to observe the cease-fire strictly. Furthermore, it must express its regret at the destruction of a considerable proportion of the United Arab Republic's economic potential and must demand fair compensation.

130. In conclusion, my delegation strongly supports the resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which we regard as an equitable, fair and wise proposal.

131. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): I should like to associate myself and my delegation with those who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Mr. President, on your election to the high office of President of the Security Council. My association with you during the past weeks has enabled me to gain an insight into your intelligence and wisdom and, like my colleagues who spoke earlier, I express sincere admiration for and appreciation of the able manner in which you have been conducting our consultations during the past weeks. You may be assured of the full and faithful co-operation of the Ethiopian delegation in the important and urgent task which we are called upon to carry out together under your able and wise leadership. I should like also to welcome to our company in the Council the Ambassador from Denmark, to whom I renew my congratulations and good wishes.

132. The violations of the cease-fire which we are considering tonight are indeed very grave and it is most appropriate that we should have met in urgent session to consider these serious threats not only to the cease-fire arrangements agreed upon by the Council but also to the future of peace in that vital area. The Council should deplore all violations of its cease-fire decisions and should insist and demand that its decisions be respected unflinchingly by all the parties concerned. My delegation is anxious to ensure respect for the cease-fire decisions of the Council, and to strengthen the cease-fire machinery of the United Nations in the area. In this connexion, we shall of course give very careful consideration to all proposals that may be put before the Council and more particularly to those proposals that have already been presented tonight.

133. Moreover, my delegation considers it essential that the Council should ask the Secretary-General to instruct the chief United Nations Observer, General Bull, to present a full report on all the recent incidents in the area, with particular reference to the two serious incidents—the naval incident of last Saturday and the grave incident of today. My delegation is ready and anxious to join other members of the Security Council in considering all appropriate measures when the full report of the United Nations Observer is available to the Council.

134. As a number of members of the Council who have spoken before me tonight have pointed out, the cease-fire is

only the first step in the process of peace-building in the area of the Middle East. It is naturally a precarious first step—we all realize that—which calls for the maximum of restraint on the part of all the parties concerned. General Bull and his United Nations observers have done their very best in very trying circumstances to maintain the temporary arrangement for peace, and for that we should be most grateful to them. My delegation shares the feeling of disappointment expressed by many other delegations that the United Nations has not been able so far to make any headway in the urgent task of building permanent peace in the Middle East. Nevertheless, my delegation believes that when it comes to such a challenging responsibility as peace-building it is never too late to try again and again, ever prompted by the conviction that the cause of peace is too vital to be abandoned.

135. My delegation has been greatly encouraged to sense a common urge within the membership of the United Nations for action to be taken by the Security Council. That consensus in the general membership should encourage us to strive to take further steps which will change the present situation of dangerous stalemate to a state of just and durable peace. In that connexion I wish to associate myself with the useful suggestions made by my friend and colleague the permanent representative of the United Kingdom, suggestions which have been further emphasized and amplified by other members of the Council. We believe, like them, that the time is long overdue for the Security Council to authorize the Secretary-General to send a special representative to the area with a view to establishing contact with the governments concerned and in order to prepare the ground for the just and lasting peace which it is our intention to achieve. Such a representative would, of course, have to operate within the context of general and comprehensive guide-lines of principles which should be reaffirmed by the Council in the resolution authorizing the appointment of a representative.

136. Those were the preliminary observations I wished to make at this stage of our deliberations. I reserve my right to explain further my Government's position as may be necessary in the future.

137. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express my delegation's satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the Security Council in these hours which are so difficult for everyone. Your experience and objectivity, which are well known to me since I have collaborated with you in other United Nations work, are, I feel, a sure guarantee that we shall obtain fruitful results from our debates. I should also like to welcome the representative of Denmark to the Council.

138. I can hardly conceal the fact that my delegation has been disagreeably surprised by the events which the Council has been convened to consider this evening, particularly at a time when the members of the Security Council, under your expert guidance, were holding consultations which my delegation thought were most promising. In my delegation's view, the events we have before us this evening do undoubtedly place in jeopardy once again the unstable situation prevailing in the Middle East. The events, as

reported to us by the parties and by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, will have to be considered in detail by my delegation and my Government. Some of the elements and some of the information seem at first sight to provide evidence of serious acts whose recurrence we must at all costs try to prevent. They will be the subject of careful study, in order to determine the responsibilities of each of the parties, and we shall wait for further information before passing a final and definite judgement on the matter.

139. The military confrontation during the last few days, and particularly today's clash, obliges us once again to call for dynamic action on the part of the Security Council. I believe that we should press for a formula which would establish a clear-cut balance between the interests and obligations of the parties, as my delegation and a number of other Latin American delegations proposed in the Security Council and in the General Assembly during its fifth emergency special session. There must be established once and for all a constructive dialogue between the parties, because the non-existence of this kind of communication for peace obviously creates a gap between them which is becoming daily more and more conducive to violence.

140. Therefore the Argentine delegation, without disregarding the gravity of today's events, would like at this

moment to appeal to delegations to see whether it is possible to draft, within the next few days, a substantive resolution which would pave the way to a stable, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. If we do not do this, we shall clearly demonstrate to world public opinion, which places so much hope in us, that the Security Council has failed on this occasion to measure up to the critical needs of the times in which we live.

141. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no further speakers on my list for this evening. I should like to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to all my colleagues who have been kind enough to speak so flatteringly about me.

142. I have consulted my colleagues regarding the date and the time of our next meeting and I should like to suggest that we adjourn this meeting now and resume our discussion tomorrow morning at 11 a.m. If there is no objection, I take it that it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose on Wednesday, 25 October at 12.5 a.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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