



**SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1447th MEETING: 5 SEPTEMBER 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1447)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794)	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.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 5 September 1968, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. G. IGNATIEFF (Canada).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1447)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 1446th meeting I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic to participate, without vote, in the discussion.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its examination of the question before it. I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic.

3. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): In his intervention yesterday Mr. Tekoah stated: "Two Israeli soldiers were killed and the third was dragged across the canal. This is fully corroborated by General Bull's report." [1446th meeting, para. 12.]

4. I wonder on what basis the Israeli representative made such a categorical statement. General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of UNTSO, in the additional information submitted

to the Secretary-General on 4 September 1968, reached the following conclusion:

"During the inquiry of 27 August, the United Nations military observers asked to see the bodies of the two Israeli soldiers reported to have been killed during the incident, but they were told that the bodies had been removed from the area for burial that very day. The observers could not, therefore, verify that two Israeli soldiers had been killed." [S/7930/Add.76.]

Again, as I emphasized yesterday, in view of the conclusion of General Odd Bull I need not dwell at all on refuting the Israeli allegations.

5. Yesterday I stressed two points in my statement. First, my Government denies categorically any involvement of the United Arab Republic armed forces in the alleged incident on the east bank of the Suez Canal on 26 August 1968. Secondly, my Government continues scrupulously to observe the cease-fire in conformity with the Security Council resolutions. Today I restate this position with the hope of sparing the Council the need to listen to questions similar to the two posed yesterday.

6. The concern shown yesterday by Mr. Tekoah about the success of Mr. Jarring's mission is really surprising. It is puzzling, indeed, that the Israeli representative is raising this point when his authorities have, up till now, refused to accept and implement resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. How could they claim that they are co-operating with Mr. Jarring when they continue to refuse the basis for his mission? I shall refrain from further comment on it and just confine myself to quote official documents of the Security Council.

7. In a letter dated 19 March 1968 [S/8479], my Government declared the following: "The United Arab Republic on its part has informed Mr. Jarring of its readiness to implement the Security Council resolution adopted on 22 November 1967."

8. Again, on 9 May 1968, in a letter addressed to Mr. Jarring by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, my Government affirmed its acceptance of and readiness to implement the same resolution. That position we still maintain, and I am happy to declare, on behalf of my Government, that we shall continue to co-operate with Mr. Jarring with a view to finding a settlement in conformity with the aforementioned resolution.

9. Having reiterated my Government's position regarding the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, I

should like to add that it is high time that Israel should be called upon to abide by and implement that resolution.

10. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Since last week when we first heard news of the encounter on the Suez Canal, and since we read the reports of General Bull, and since we heard the statements of the representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic yesterday, we have all been endeavouring to form a judgement on what took place on the evening of 26 August 1968 and what action the Council should now take.

11. Let me say first that we warmly welcome the decision of the Israeli Government to bring this matter to the Council. We have throughout condemned violence and reprisal. We are convinced that the road of violence cannot lead to a peaceful and secure settlement. On the contrary, it can lead only to more violence and suffering and to more hate and hopelessness. So the decision of the Israeli Government to come to the Council is, we strongly believe, the right course.

12. In the matter before us we have the advantage of reports from General Bull. That is indeed an advantage. When over past months we have had to deal with violence elsewhere, we have had sometimes to attempt to sift the facts from the accounts of both sides without the benefit of impartial investigation and report. That has greatly increased our difficulties. But here we have reports, reports on which we can rely because we know that General Bull and the United Nations observers under his direction are fair and accurate and cautious in their reports. We have full confidence in General Bull and the devoted and experienced observers who work under his direction.

13. I go on from that to say that we must accept the finding that the patrol was mined and that physical evidence indicated that the patrol was ambushed, and I think it is right that we should deplore this event—indeed we should deplore and condemn any such acts of violence. We do so in accordance with the policy towards violence which we have consistently followed in this Council. At the same time it should be said that it was unfortunate in this instance that no report was made to the United Nations authorities until the morning after the event. There is no doubt that had an immediate report been made the evidence before us now would have been much more full and much more valuable to us.

14. On the other hand we cannot accept the contention of the United Arab Republic that it has neither knowledge nor responsibility in the matter. It is the clear and positive responsibility of the United Arab Republic to maintain the cease-fire which was required by the Council and accepted by all concerned. It is well that Ambassador Gohar of the United Arab Republic assured General Bull of the continued and unqualified adherence of the United Arab Republic to the cease-fire and to the agreed practical arrangements to give effect to it on the canal. That was a valuable and most welcome assurance. The intention of the United Arab Republic scrupulously to respect the cease-fire has been further confirmed by the representative of the United Arab Republic here this afternoon.

15. Moreover, we agreed that special concern must be directed to the soldier who was reported to be wounded. The representatives of the United Arab Republic have denied knowledge of him. But quite apart from all accusations and counter-accusations and all other issues involved, I trust that every effort will be made to satisfy the Council that if the soldier has indeed been wounded and is in Arab hands he will be given due treatment and promptly returned.

16. We have been called to the Council to deal with this one event, the attack on the Israeli patrol. It is perhaps well that we should today concentrate on that single encounter and make our conclusion on it known in a simple and clear resolution. We do not seek to widen the debate today. Nevertheless, we cannot consider this or any other manifestation of violence in the Middle East in isolation. We in the Council cannot be content to be mere referees in a bloody contest, still less passive observers of a drift to greater disasters. Every time that we meet to discuss the situation in the Middle East it is essential for us to remind ourselves of certain wider considerations. What are the factors which we must constantly remember and what are the aims which we must put top of our priorities?

17. First, in the Middle East issue, unlike other great unresolved problems of the world, we know in advance what the solution must be. We are agreed on the principles of a final settlement. We have unanimously approved them. Far from doubting or denying those principles we increasingly realize that on no other basis can peace be established.

18. Second, both sides have accepted those principles and purposes and openly so declared. We remember that on 1 May 1968 Mr. Tekoah in this Council assured us that his Government accepted the Security Council resolution [242 (1967)] of 22 November 1967. Arab declarations have been clear in their unreserved acceptance of the principles and purposes of the resolution. They have been today again confirmed by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

19. Third, we all know that there is no other salvation than that on which we agreed last November. The only alternative is that of prolonged conflict and escalating chaos leading to mounting, untold suffering.

20. Fourth, we realize too that violence of the kind we have repeatedly had to consider in the Council and which we consider again today cannot make any contribution to a settlement. On the contrary it can only prolong the agony and delay and jeopardize a just peace.

21. Fifth, it follows that what above all else we need to do is to concentrate on the substance of the principles and purposes to which we have all subscribed. We need to do so through the medium of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. How can the agreed principles and purposes be implemented without further delay and without further bloodshed and without further suffering?

22. It is well for all of us to remind ourselves today that the desperately urgent need is for the parties to devote their

effort not to scoring points in a barren debate, still less on the bitterness that follows bloodshed, but on a new, urgent effort to prepare practical proposals for a final and just settlement. That is the overriding need. It is the duty of the parties to co-operate with Mr. Gunnar Jarring to that end.

23. All of us can make a contribution by giving all possible support to Mr. Jarring. The time has come, so I suggest, to abandon dispute, to move on from discussion on procedure to achievement of a settlement, to give effect to the principles and purposes we have agreed together. That, I believe, is the only real and lasting answer to the violence and conflict of which we have yet another example before us in this Council today.

24. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to say that my delegation is happy fully to associate itself with the highly deserved tribute that you paid to the Ambassador of Brazil who presided with such distinction over our Council last month. I also wish, Mr. President, on your assumption of the Presidency, to assure you of our full trust in your leadership and to say that we are looking forward to co-operating wholeheartedly with you.

25. As to the matter under discussion, may I say that the views of my Government with respect to violations of the cease-fire have been stated over and over again. We deplore all violations. We regret the loss of life, the human suffering, and the material damage they almost invariably involve. We also, however, strongly deplore the repeated violations because they can only make progress towards peace more difficult.

26. It is indeed our considered opinion that all parties to the cease-fire have a mutual interest in living up to their undertaking to maintain and abide with the cease-fire, to avoid and to prevent all violations. It is their duty to assure that climate of calm that is best conducive to further the aims of our resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

27. It was with particular regret that my Government learned about the incident under discussion and acquainted itself with the report of the United Nations military observers. We particularly regret it also because that area has been relatively spared of the incidents of the nature now under discussion, to the credit of the parties concerned. Without going into the details of the report dated 29 August 1968 that General Bull has presented to us, a report that speaks for itself, I wish to recall its conclusion: namely, that the United Nations military observers have found that an Israeli patrol was mined and that "physical evidence indicated that the patrol was ambushed" [*S/7930/Add.74, para. 5*].

28. This delegation has welcomed the fact that the Israeli Government has chosen to bring this matter before the Security Council, and it is our hope that this debate and its outcome will help towards putting an end to the vicious circle of attack and counter-attack, thereby putting the Security Council in the centre, but at the same time also underlining the obligation on the parties to prevent all violations of the cease-fire. We must indeed insist that all violent acts, whatever form they take, by whatever force

they are carried out across the line, now be brought to an end.

29. The question of a missing soldier has been raised during our debate yesterday with force. General Bull's report has this to say: "On the down slope of the sand embankment near the canal edge the military observers saw some marks in the sand leading to the bollard. These marks could have been made by a body dragged in the sand" [*ibid.*]. It is our hope that all efforts will be exercised to explore to the full this human aspect with a view to obtaining a satisfactory solution.

30. Let me, in conclusion, restate our conviction that all efforts must now be concentrated on facilitating and assisting the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring. In a communiqué issued yesterday from the Nordic Foreign Ministers meeting in Stockholm, there was embodied an appeal from the Foreign Ministers of the five Nordic countries to the parties to the conflict to give their full co-operation in order to ensure that Mr. Jarring's mission leads to results conducive to peace. It is in this way only that they and we can best serve the cause of peace in the Middle East to the benefit of all the peoples in the area.

31. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Denmark for the remarks and good wishes he has addressed to the Chair.

32. Mr. BAIL (United States of America): Let me first join the other voices already heard in this Council to express the gratitude and admiration of my delegation for the skill, perception and sensitivity with which Ambassador de Araújo Castro, as President of the Council, directed the Council's affairs during his term. It was by no means an uneventful term. On the contrary, it was a time of trial and great difficulty for the Council, a time when the Council surely needed the wisdom and objectivity and authority of a strong and wise President, whom it was fortunate in having in the person of Ambassador de Araújo Castro.

33. What the Council is considering today is something that in a more perfect world it should not have to deal with at all. It is not a massive threat to the peace, but one more detestable act of killing involving only a handful of people. Without in any way undervaluing a single human life, one can still deplore the fact that the Council, which symbolizes and embodies the higher aspirations of mankind, should have to devote its time and deflect its energies to dealing not with the larger considerations of peace and war but only with incidents of the senseless and brutal violence which is one of the symptoms of conflict.

34. This is not the kind of situation that the Council can deal with very efficiently, for we are not a court of law nor are we equipped by ourselves to make findings of fact. In the case of the Middle East, the ascertaining of facts is the responsibility of General Bull and his mission. Yet the Council must act on what it has before it, and in the present case that can be summarized as follows. First, there is a clear statement by the Government of Israel describing an attack by a presumably well-trained force consisting of approximately thirty men, an attack that allegedly occurred

in an uninhabited area on the east bank of the Suez Canal. This force mined the track of an Israeli patrol and ambushed that patrol. As a result, two Israeli soldiers were killed and a third, dragged across the canal, has disappeared. Second, there is a quantity of physical evidence found by the United Nations military observers under General Bull that is consistent in every respect with the Israeli allegations. Third, there is a qualified denial by the representative of the Government of the United Arab Republic of the complicity of his Government in this incident. All he has said is that no United Arab Republic forces took part in the action and that the United Arab Republic authorities have no knowledge of the missing soldier.

35. We can only conclude that, while the proof is not complete and comprehensive, not conclusive by itself, the Council certainly has before it a more substantial volume of completely impartial evidence than it has had on certain previous occasions when it has not hesitated to pronounce its judgement.

36. Taking account of these three elements—the allegations of the Israeli Government, the substantial circumstantial support for those allegations provided by General Bull's investigation, and the limited denial by the Government of the United Arab Republic—given this volume of evidence, the Council is entirely justified, it seems to me, in accepting the Israeli statement, substantially confirmed by General Bull, while at the same time taking account of the unsupported, limited denial of the United Arab Republic.

37. I do not see how we can, under those circumstances accept the contention that the Israeli complaint is without foundation, or that the United Arab Republic has no responsibility for this incident. On the contrary, the evidence clearly points to the fact that this was a wholly unprovoked attack by a substantial number of armed men under circumstances where there is a compelling inference, if not of instigation or encouragement, at least of acquiescence by the Government of the United Arab Republic.

38. Three or four weeks ago, during discussions before the Security Council, allegations were made by the representative of Jordan, supported by representatives of other Arab States, that the Jordanian Government had no responsibility for acts of terror in those areas of the country occupied by Israeli forces. My Government refused at that time to accept that disclaimer of responsibility. On the contrary, it is elementary that every Government is responsible for the control of its own population. And that responsibility is not limited merely to the action of its official armed forces.

39. If this be the case for the west bank of the Jordan, which is a heavily populated area, it is far more the case for the east bank of the Suez Canal, which is a great empty space and where it is highly unlikely that any terrorist act could have occurred that did not originate from the other side of the canal, clearly within the responsibility of the Government of the United Arab Republic.

40. My Government, therefore, strongly deplores this incident and feels that the Government of the United Arab Republic should be held strictly accountable for observing

the requirements of the cease-fire which it asserts it continues to support. Moreover, I feel it incumbent on this Council to express its position unambiguously in an appropriate resolution. A few weeks ago, when faced with an air attack launched by the Government of Israel against Jordan, several of the Governments which addressed this Council admonished us that we should not be even-handed. They contended that since Israeli forces were still in control of Arab territories, we should condone any terrorist activities against Israel. This was not, however, what this Council contemplated when it established a cease-fire in June 1967, nor was it what it contemplated in adopting the resolution [242 (1967)] of 22 November 1967. What this Council did have in mind was that all parties should observe the cease-fire while at the same time seeking a permanent settlement of the conflict that could result in the retirement of the Israeli forces from occupied territories.

41. My Government must, therefore, insist that the Council treat the violations of the cease-fire even-handedly and not pursue a double standard that would call into question both our integrity and our objectivity, and that would erode that quality of fairness which is the quintessential spirit of the Charter for if we do not deal on a basis of impartiality, we will only inflame and exacerbate an already highly dangerous situation.

42. The Security Council has repeatedly taken a strong line, and quite properly, against acts of military reprisals; but if we persistently condemn acts of terror and violence against one side to a dispute while ignoring them against the other side, we shall not only promote terror but destroy the alternative to reprisal. We shall discourage resort to the Council and invite resort to force, and we shall, by our inaction and our lack of objectivity, our lack of impartiality, provide encouragement to that force. We face, therefore, a problem which is a test not merely of our fairness, but also of our realism and responsibility.

43. For what we are confronted with here is not merely an isolated act of violence, but a principle—a principle which, if we are to give credibility and effectiveness to the work of the Council, we can ignore only at our peril.

44. Meanwhile, we should seek an honourable disposition of this incident; and as we do so, let us not overlook the conditions that created it. For so long as the present unnatural situation persists in the Middle East, where there is neither peace nor war, no one can be happy or secure. There will continue to be mayhem, killing and kidnapping, if not open and systematic combat by regular armed forces, then terror and violence by stealth and surprise, ambush and trickery; in such outrageous incidents the innocent will perish along with the guilty.

45. During the life of the United Nations, disputes between the Arab States and Israel have occupied more time of the Council than any other set of problems. Since the General Armistice Agreements of 1949, about 165 meetings have been consumed by consideration of alleged violations of their provisions. And in a little more than a year, since the June 1967 war, the Council has devoted twenty-three meetings to the consideration of alleged violations of the cease-fire which was established at that

time. Most of these meetings have been held at the instance of Arab States, a few at the instance of Israel; in some cases, complaints and cross-complaints have been filed.

46. The sum total of all this is a sad, discouraging commentary on the inability of men and nations to live together at peace unless there is an adequate will to do so on both sides. That will, in the case of the nations and peoples of the Middle East, will clearly manifest itself only when both sides finally determine that they can no longer afford the exorbitant cost of sustained hatred and belligerence: cost in lives, cost in money, cost in economic development, cost in the achievement of their national purposes, and cost in the fulfilment of the promise of their gifted peoples. Then, and only then, will the nations on both sides of this quarrel face reality, break free from the self-created procedural shells in which they have encased themselves in order to avoid the hard and agonizing decisions of peace. Then and only then will they get on with the kind of negotiation and accommodation that is essential to permanent and lasting harmony in the area.

47. We are very fortunate in having as the representative of the Secretary-General Mr. Gunnar Jarring. We are very fortunate in having a man of such skill, such diligence, such dedication. I can only commend to both sides to this conflict that they utilize the instrumentality which has been provided in the person of Mr. Jarring to start that kind of dialogue, and continue it with great goodwill, which can lead in the long run to a peaceful solution to this extremely troublesome problem.

48. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council has been convened again for the umpteenth time—the twenty-third time according to the calculations of the United States representative, Ambassador Ball—in order to consider the situation in the Middle East. This time, however, the meeting of the Council has been called in unusual circumstances. The Council has been convened to consider a complaint by Israel against the United Arab Republic, in other words, to consider a complaint by Israel against a country against which it has itself committed armed aggression and whose territory it has seized a considerable portion of which it continues to hold by force and occupy with its troops.

49. Since Israel, on its own initiative, has come to the Security Council and decided to have recourse to the authority of this body, one might have expected that the representative of Israel would first of all inform the Council of his Government's intention to take account of the previous decisions of the Council which require that Israel cease acts of aggression against the Arab States and announce its agreement with the well-known resolution of the Security Council of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] regarding a political settlement in the Middle East, and that he would announce Israel's readiness to implement its provisions, including, of course, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. The Security Council has long been awaiting such an announcement and such actions on the part of the Government of Israel.

50. Unfortunately, the Security Council has not heard anything of the kind from the Israeli representative.

Instead, he has spoken at considerable length here about some incident which allegedly took place on 26 August on the territory of the United Arab Republic occupied by Israeli troops, and has attempted to lay the responsibility for the incident upon the United Arab Republic.

51. Naturally the question arises: why was it necessary for Israel to bring this pettifogging complaint against the United Arab Republic before the Security Council? There also arises a more general question: was it really proper to call a special meeting of the Security Council in this connexion? The groundlessness of the claims put forward by the Israeli representative and of the so-called charges against the United Arab Republic is quite obvious, and the Security Council cannot take them seriously. The supplemental information from General Bull is further confirmation of the lack of grounds for discussing this question.

52. The absurdity of Israel's "charges" against the United Arab Republic has been shown with the utmost clarity in the statements of the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony, and there is no need for us now to dwell in detail on the factual aspect of this matter. The fact alone that the report of the Secretary-General, submitted to the Council on the basis of information received from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations military observers, does not once mention the United Arab Republic as the side against which any claims could be made in connexion with this incident, shows that there are simply no grounds whatever for this so-called complaint of Israel against the United Arab Republic.

53. It suffices to point out the fact, which was also mentioned by Mr. El Kony in his statement yesterday, that the Israeli authorities did not request the Chief of Staff of the United Nations observer corps to investigate the incident till the following day. The question arises: what were those authorities busy with for so long a time? Perhaps they were making up their minds about the most convincing and lifelike way of passing off their own handiwork as an operation which they are now trying to ascribe to the United Arab Republic?

54. The following fact also cannot fail to give rise to grave doubts: the officer of the Israeli patrol, a second lieutenant, who, as stated in the report, was in the immediate vicinity of the site of this incident and who, according to the assertion of the Israeli side, was an eye-witness of it, calmly watched what was happening without attempting to give any assistance or support to his fellow-countrymen, the Israeli soldiers. Why did he not open fire against those who allegedly were making an attack on those soldiers? Who is this brave officer? Is he a coward, or a false witness specially prepared for this provocative venture?

55. Another even more striking fact which justifies the most serious doubts about the reliability and likelihood of the assertions of the Israeli side with regard to the so-called incident of 26 August is the additional information from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations military observers, contained in the Secretary-General's report, which was circulated yesterday as an official document of the Security Council. In that additional information, we find some very surprising things. It turns out that, during the investigation,

the Israeli side refused to give the United Nations observers an opportunity to see the bodies of the two Israeli soldiers who, according to the Israeli version, had allegedly been killed in the course of the incident. The report states: "the observers could not, therefore, verify that two Israeli soldiers had been killed" [S/7930/Add. 76].

56. Mr. Ball did not mention this in his statement here. He referred only to the first report. But what about the second report? He called this incident a "detestable act of killing". But perhaps there was not even any killing, since the bodies were not shown to the United Nations observers for inspection. How is this fact to be explained?

57. All these obvious facts, which are now generally known, give every justification for thinking that the Israeli "complaint" brought before the Security Council against the United Arab Republic is nothing more than a premeditated fabrication by means of which the Israeli leaders count on misleading world public opinion.

58. In his statement, the United Kingdom representative even called for the return of the vanished soldier. But why does he regard it as inconceivable that if there were no bodies, perhaps there was no third soldier either?

59. The whole history of the consideration in the United Nations of the question of Israeli aggression against the Arab countries shows that in Israel there are past masters of the art of distorting the facts. We need only remind the Council of the well-known fact that in June 1967, in launching a military attack, prepared and planned beforehand, against Arab countries—the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan—the Israeli side, in order to cover up this act of aggression, brought a "complaint" against the Arab countries before the Security Council, cynically asserting that it was the latter which had attacked Israel. The falsity and provocative character of that political manoeuvre were completely exposed at the time.

60. The Security Council is also aware that Israel's present "complaint" to the Security Council against the United Arab Republic was also preceded by considerable military preparations on the part of the Israeli military command, including the concentration of Israeli troops near areas of the cease-fire with Jordan. This was officially reported in recent letters of the Jordanian mission addressed to the President of the Security Council and circulated as official documents of the Council.

61. The additional information from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations military observers submitted to the Security Council in the Secretary-General's report compels one to reflect in earnest on all these so-called facts. A comparison of these facts, which are now known to the Security Council, gives rise to the following question: did not Israel devise this clumsy complaint against the United Arab Republic in order to carry out afterwards a routine military action against the Arab countries under the pretext of "retaliation"? The Security Council is well aware of the repeated acts of military aggression committed by Israel against Arab countries in recent months under the pretext of so-called "retaliation". For Israel, this has become a favourite pretext for the perpetration of ever-increasing

further acts of aggression against Arab countries and violations of cease-fire decisions.

62. The Security Council, as is well known, has repeatedly considered these violations by Israel, and in its decisions has condemned Israel as an aggressor for these military actions, committed under the pretext of retaliation. However, even if we assume for a moment that the incident of 26 August 1968 on the east bank of the Suez Canal occupied by Israeli troops was not a deliberate fabrication, but actually took place as a result of actions by the Arab freedom fighters, or the members of any resistance movement against the forces of occupation, then it may be asked: what has the United Arab Republic to do with this? How can the United Arab Republic bear responsibility for what is happening in a territory occupied and controlled by Israeli armed forces?

63. We certainly cannot agree with the statement here of the representative of the United States to the effect that the Arab countries are responsible for what happens in the territories occupied by Israeli armed forces. Hearing the interpretation of his statement, it was my understanding that he stressed the fact that the Arab countries bear responsibility for what is happening in the territories seized from the Arabs by the Israeli armed forces. We certainly cannot agree with that. All responsibility for those territories lies with those countries which have 'occupied other peoples' territories. If we were to proceed along the line suggested for the Security Council by the United States representative, we could go very far in that direction, and we would thereby be justifying further the constant acts of aggression on the part of Israel against the Arab countries.

64. By its seizure of Arab lands and by its terroristic policy against the Arab population in those territories, Israel is itself arousing the anger and hatred of this population. By holding on to the lands seized from the Arabs, by expelling and enslaving the Arab population, by taking homes and property from the indigenous inhabitants and by destroying with bulldozers entire residential quarters in the Arab towns and villages, the Israeli authorities cannot expect, in response to such actions, to obtain obedience and submission. No, in the seized Arab territories there is flaring up spontaneously and irresistibly the flame of a liberation struggle by the Arabs against the Israeli aggressors. This flame cannot be extinguished by any punitive measures, by any manoeuvres in the Security Council or by any support which anyone in this Council may give to those who resort to such manoeuvres.

65. All this should have been understood long ago by Israel and by its "doves" and "hawks"—by the "doves", if there are any in Tel-Aviv—and they should realize that the continuation by Israel of its aggressive policy towards the Arab countries is not only completely hopeless and can bring neither honour nor glory to Israel and its leaders, but, what is more, it is also fraught with the gravest and most dangerous consequences for the future destiny of the Israeli people itself.

66. Consequently, even if the incident of 26 August in the Arab territory occupied by Israeli troops were the handiwork of Arab national avengers, then even so, Israel neither had nor has any grounds for coming here to the Security

Council, levelling accusations at the United Arab Republic and taking up the Council's time. Even if this sort of action by Israel is a complaint, it is only against Israel's own adventurous policy, and cannot fail to be turned against Israel itself.

67. The Israeli representative in his statement yesterday dared even in the Security Council to make threats and lay down conditions and nearly gave the Security Council an ultimatum to the effect that some kind of decision should be taken in support of the aggressor's demands and that if not, Israel would look after its affairs itself. The Soviet delegation deems it necessary to draw the Security Council's attention to these threats on the part of the representative of Israel. The Israeli aggressors are obviously losing all sense of proportion if they think that they will be allowed to dictate their own conditions to the Security Council.

68. No one should have any doubt that the provocative attitude of Israel and the continuance of its aggressive policy towards the Arab States can only end in the most lamentable way for Israel. It will not be helped in this unseemly affair by those who sympathize with it and give it their patronage and support. It is common knowledge that the Israeli Government was counting upon such patronage and support when it launched its aggression against the Arab States. It is also counting upon them now in undertaking here in the Security Council its hypocritical and crafty manoeuvre.

69. This policy of patronage was reflected today also in the statements by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. It is precisely this policy and attitude of those who give their patronage and support to Israel, that makes it difficult to bring about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, and encourages the aggressor to commit further acts of aggression and to flout the decisions of the Security Council.

70. But the ruling circles in Israel should not take it for granted that such assistance and patronage can really guarantee Israel's impunity in carrying out its aggressive and expansionist aims and plans in the Middle East. They may make a sad miscalculation. All the peace-loving countries and peoples of the world, all those who cherish peace, international security, freedom and the independence of peoples are on the side of the Arab States and their peoples, who are defending their just cause, freedom and independence.

71. The Security Council would be wise not to give Israel and those who aid and abet it an opportunity to make use of the Council's authority for purposes which have nothing to do with the interests of the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. The Security Council must categorically reject the hypocritically contrived "complaint" of the aggressor against the victim of the aggression.

72. The attention of the Council should now be drawn to another genuinely important and urgent question, the implementation of the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967. The situation with regard to the implementation of that resolution cannot fail to arouse the legitimate alarm of all those who are sincerely interested in

the restoration of peace and in a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East. While the Arab States have clearly and definitely declared their readiness to accept and implement fully that resolution of the Security Council—and this has been confirmed again today in the statement by the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony—Israel stubbornly refuses to accept and implement that resolution. Thus the Government of Israel is in practice paralysing the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Jarring, the purpose of which is to promote the implementation of that Security Council resolution.

73. The responsibility for the situation which has arisen with regard to the implementation of that important Security Council resolution lies not only with the ruling circles of Israel but also with those Western countries by relying on whose patronage and support Israel continues to sabotage the implementation of the resolution, arrogantly flouts the will and decisions of the Security Council and defies the whole United Nations.

74. In this connexion, we cannot fail to note that Israel in point of fact takes, in regard to the United Nations and the implementation of its decisions, the same attitude as that taken by the racist régime of South Africa in regard to the liberation of the illegally occupied Territory of South West Africa, now known as Namibia in accordance with the decision of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. Accordingly, the Israel extremists and the South African racists, having occupied someone else's territory, take an identical attitude; both are flouting the decisions of the United Nations and the decisions of the Security Council, and are defying the whole organization.

75. The Soviet Union's position in regard to a settlement in the Middle East is well-known. It is not dictated by any contingent considerations but stems from a policy of principle in support of the Arab countries and peoples in their just and legitimate endeavour to liquidate the consequences of Israeli aggression by peaceful political means. The Security Council is well aware, as I have already pointed out, that the Arab States recognize the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and are ready to seek ways and means of achieving a political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of that resolution. Israel, for its part, still stubbornly refuses to implement that resolution and is deliberately putting forward demands, which are unrealistic in the present circumstances, for the purpose of covering up its policy of aggression and expansion and its reluctance to carry out the Security Council resolution.

76. Relying on the support of certain Western countries and primarily—it must be said straight out—on that of the United States of America, Israel is persisting in its negative and deliberately obstructive attitude. In fact, it is flouting the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It is attempting to strengthen its position in the territories it has occupied in the Middle East. By its provocative activities and its constant acts of military aggression against the Arab countries, Israel is continuing to aggravate the situation and to increase tension in the Middle East.

77. In these specific and obvious circumstances, the Soviet Union is fully determined together with other peace-loving States, to secure the cessation of Israeli aggression against the Arab States, to liquidate all its consequences and to bring about a political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and the return of the territories seized from the Arab States as a result of the 1967 aggression to their rightful owners.

78. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States to speak in the exercise of his right of reply.

79. Mr. BALL (United States of America): I wish to exercise my right of reply only to correct one misapprehension under which the Soviet representative appears to be labouring with regard to the position of the United States. He has suggested—and he indulged the presumption that it might be through a failure of precise interpretation—that what I was saying was that the United Arab Republic or any of the Arab States should be held responsible for events which took place on the territory which is presently being occupied by the Government of Israel, by the forces of Israel.

80. That was not at all what I was seeking to say, and I think that I should like the record to be quite clear on this. What I suggested was that it seemed only elementary to my Government that every government was responsible for events which resulted from the actions of its citizens which were mounted from its territory. When we considered the dispute which arose three or four weeks ago as a result of the act of reprisal taken by the Israeli Government against Jordan, I advanced the view at that time that to the extent that there were acts of terror mounted from Jordanian territory against occupied territory there was some responsibility for the Jordanian Government in that regard and that is precisely what I said in this case. In fact I said that the situation here was *a fortiori* the situation on the west bank of Jordan since that was a heavily populated area whereas in this case, the east bank of the Suez Canal—and I quote from my own statement today: “is a great empty space . . . where it is highly unlikely that any terrorist act could have occurred that did not originate from the other side of the canal” [see para. 39 above].

81. The statement of the Israeli Government and the evidence that is adduced by the efforts of General Bull which is completely consistent with—although it does not fully corroborate it in every detail—the statement of the Israeli Government, strongly suggest that this force came from the United Arab Republic and therefore that the United Arab Republic was in effect the launching pad for this attack. The point that I was making was that in those circumstances it was my view that the United Arab Republic had some responsibility for this type of attack.

82. In so far as concerns the other explanation which Ambassador Malik has put forward—that this was all a matter of invented evidence and that this was a pure concoction on the part of the Israeli Government—let me say that there is absolutely no evidence to support this whatever, that I do not believe it, but even more so I would not have imagined it.

83. To Ambassador Malik an explanation of this kind may seem not just a flight of fancy, as it seems to me. But everyone here tends to speak against the background and practices of his own Government, and he develops his own hypotheses and his own explanations, with the benefit of his own experience.

84. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

85. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, the parliamentary disabilities which encumber the Security Council in its actions on the Middle East are known. The world still waits in what is perhaps ever more hesitant hope to hear that the Security Council condemns the murder of Israelis and cannot countenance Arab violations of the cease-fire.

86. However, Egypt's reaction to the Israeli complaint before the Council has introduced an element which cannot be left unchallenged: derision of Israel's resort to the Security Council, ridicule of Israel's attempt to gain the Council's support in preventing Arab acts of aggression, mockery of Israel's dead and wounded, disparagement of Israel's rights under the cease-fire. Egypt has tried to turn facts into farce and comes to the Council in a frame of mind which borders on the irresponsible. The military attack on Israeli forces on 26 August is fiction, the United Arab Republic tells the Council. If it is not fiction, Egypt is not concerned with it; and in any event it is good to kill Israelis because they have succeeded in repelling Egyptian aggression and dislodging Egyptian armies from territories which served them as bases for aggression.

87. This is a highly cynical and irresponsible posture which cannot but raise the question of Egypt's attitude toward serious discussion in the Council of the need to avert the deterioration of the cease-fire.

88. In a responsible discussion, how can the fact that the United Nations military observers made an inquiry into the attack in daylight and not in the darkness of the night become reason for Egypt to throw aspersions on their findings? How can the fact that, in accordance with Jewish religious law, the bodies of the killed soldiers were not left lying in the desert be used as a motive to snicker at the pain of the bereaved? How can footprints leading from the canal to hastily dug positions on the canal's embankment, signs of a body dragged back to the canal, the professional military nature of the attack, be dismissed so lightly in half jest? How can the usual smokescreen of unknown raiders and saboteurs be put up again to justify violations of the cease-fire? Was not the cease-fire to terminate all military activities? Were not the arrangements of 27 July and 27 August 1967 [see S/8053/Add.1 and Add.2] to prohibit all movement of boats and all military activity on the canal?

89. It is regrettable that Egypt's attempt to prevent a serious, responsible consideration of the obligation to maintain the cease-fire has found support in one statement made in the Council today. It seems that it is necessary to recall that relations between Israel and the Arab States are now regulated by the cease-fire established by the Security Council. The cease-fire is not Israel's choice. Israel is prepared at any time to conclude peace with Egypt and to

establish secure and recognized boundaries. However, as long as Egypt refuses to abandon the Khartoum decision, as long as Egypt rejects peace with Israel, the cease-fire is the only basis for relations between the two countries. To pursue warfare, under whatever guise, whether by regular or irregular forces, whether by raid, terror or sabotage, is contrary to the cease-fire. Support for such warfare contributes to an international crime and those who give such support share responsibility for the lack of progress toward peace.

90. I listened in particular wonderment to the statement of the one representative whose views on what constitutes aggression and what does not, what is true and false, have been amply demonstrated in recent weeks. So also has his Government's attitude towards the rights of States and nations. The unholy alliance which his Government maintains with the Arab States under the banner of anti-Jewish hatred and anti-Israeli aggression has been a primary factor in the aggravation of the conflict in the Middle East. His comments about the evidence included in the report of General Bull reminds one of the statements made by his predecessor in the post, who used to claim to the horrified amusement of all that Israelis were blowing themselves up on mines, killing their own citizens and attacking their own villages. Those comments are a reflection only on those who make them.

91. The Soviet representative has resorted to the old tactic: when facts fail, you employ fantasy. Thus, in fact, the Soviet press has recently initiated a campaign, reflected in his statement, alleging Israeli preparations for military action. The world has not failed to notice that these reports began to appear in the Soviet press at a time when real, not fictional, military movements were taking place in another part of the world. Soviet allegations are as unfounded today as they were in the spring of 1967 when the Soviet Government ignored findings by United Nations observers that there were no Israeli troop concentrations and the Soviet Ambassador in Israel refused an invitation to confirm this by a personal visit to the areas in question. One cannot but wonder what is the purpose behind the Soviet allegations now.

92. Last year, as President Nasser later revealed, these allegations were the immediate cause for the warlike acts by the Egyptian Government in Tiran and Sinai.

93. Israel has turned to the Security Council with one purpose in mind: to find in it support for strengthening the fabric of the cease-fire established by the Security Council. We hope that we shall find this support and that a deterioration of the situation will thus be averted.

94. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

95. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have asked to speak in exercise of my right of reply to the United States representative.

96. In his statement he confirmed the long-established American practice of taking any Israeli statement at face

value. Hence he apparently paid no attention to the supplemental information which has now been made available to the Security Council and which was distributed as an official document yesterday. The references of the Israeli representative to religious rituals are unconvincing, since too much time elapsed between the moment when the incident occurred, according to the Israeli version, and the moment when that incident was reported to the United Nations observers. If the United Nations observers had been notified immediately, then there can be no doubt that they would have hastened to the spot where the incident occurred and would have been able to inspect the bodies before the Israeli side proceeded with the religious rituals. But apparently that did not enter into the plans of the Israeli side. Therefore, references to religious rituals are of no help here.

97. I should like once again to draw the attention of the United States representative to the official report from General Bull which shows that the United Nations observers were not allowed to inspect the bodies. If one takes on trust everything said by Israel, one must also take on trust what is contained in the documents, and not select only those documents which are convenient for the American side.

98. As for the remark of the Israeli representative to the effect that the Soviet press allegedly published fictions concerning Israel's military preparations, that does not correspond to the facts. Not the Soviet press, but official documents available to the Security Council confirm the fact that before the dispatch of the complaint against the United Arab Republic, Israel began to prepare a large-scale attack against Jordan.

99. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Security Council to document S/8787, dated 28 August 1968, which contains a letter to the President of the Security Council from Mr. El-Farra, the Permanent Representative of Jordan:

"On instructions from my Government, and further to my letter of 26 August 1968 [S/8773] in which I drew your attention to the deteriorating situation resulting from new Israeli grave violations of the cease-fire, I have the honour to advise you that information received by the Government of Jordan shows that Israel is now contemplating and preparing for a large-scale attack against Jordan."

This is an official document and I draw the Israeli representative's attention to it. This document was mentioned by the Soviet press. It was entitled to do so. Therefore the Israeli representative's assertion that the Soviet press invented something can only be regarded as a slander, which I emphatically repudiate. The Jordanian representative's letter states further:

"My Government conveyed this information to the Secretary-General through the United Nations machinery in the area. Today, His Excellency assured me that the information was relayed to Israel with an expression of concern and with the hope that nothing of this kind would take place."

"My Government would like to emphasize that the situation is still fraught with danger, especially since information about the Israeli contemplated attack against Jordan has been ascertained day after day without any Israeli pronouncement to the contrary."

100. That is a document with concrete facts. It was to the documents in question that the Soviet press referred. Thus the Soviet press did not invent anything.

101. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Israel in right of reply.

102. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I shall be very brief indeed. I was hoping that the Soviet representative, in his particular care for evidence and truth, would not limit himself to reading the Jordanian document, but would also refer to the Israeli letter dated 30 August 1968 sent in reply to the Jordanian letter. The Israeli letter, contained in document S/8793, states:

"I am instructed by my Government to reject the malicious allegations contained in the letter addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations on 28 August 1968 [S/8787].

"The unfounded story and the public emphasis given to it is doubtless designed to divert attention from the continued attacks from Jordanian territory across the cease-fire lines, carried out by regular and irregular armed forces. Particulars of these attacks are contained in recent

letters to you from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations.

"Such propaganda campaigns about alleged troop concentrations or imminent invasions heighten tension in the area, and are particularly disturbing in the light of past experience."

103. In the past I have already had occasion to suggest respectfully to the representative of the USSR not to rely at all times and entirely on Arab sources. I should like to repeat this very respectful advice to him today.

104. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. If no other representatives wish to take the floor at this stage, I should like to suggest to the members that we adjourn in order to give members of the Council a further opportunity to undertake consultations with one another on what should be done with regard to the matter now on the agenda.

105. As a result of informal discussions, I understand that there is general agreement that members should agree to hold themselves available to resume consideration of this item promptly in the light of those consultations. As I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.5 p.m.