



UN/SA COLLECTION  
**SECURITY COUNCIL**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1469<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 28 MARCH 1969

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1469) . . . . .	1
Tribute to the memory of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States of America . . . . .	1
Adoption of the Agenda . . . . .	4
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113) . . . . .	4
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114) . . . . .	4

## 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 SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 28 March 1969, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Károly CSATORDAY (Hungary).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1469)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113).
3. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114).

### Tribute to the memory of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States of America

1. The PRESIDENT: It is with deep sadness that we have learned of the death this morning of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the former President of the United States of America, an eminent world statesman and war-time leader whose gallant struggle for life has been followed by all with concern and admiration.

2. I should like to ask the members of the Council to rise with me and observe a minute of silence in tribute to his memory.

*The members of the Council stood and observed a minute's silence.*

3. The PRESIDENT: It is my intention, if the Council agrees, to send a telegram on its behalf to the Secretary of State of the United States expressing the Council's tribute to General Eisenhower and asking him to convey our condolences to the Government of the United States and to the family of the former President.

4. The text of the telegram reads as follows:

"Excellency,

"Have honour inform you that at meeting United Nations Security Council held this afternoon, members

paid tribute to the memory of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President and great war-time leader of the United States. On behalf of Security Council wish to extend deepest sympathy to the Government and people of the United States upon their great loss. Kindly convey expressions of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family. Highest consideration.

*(Signed)* Károly Csatorday  
President of the Security Council"

5. In the absence of objection, it is so decided and I shall proceed accordingly.

6. The PRESIDENT: I now call on our distinguished Secretary-General.

7. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: As soon as I received the sad news of the passing of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, I sent the following message to Mrs. Eisenhower:

"I have learned with deep sorrow of your husband's death and I extend to you my deep sympathy in your great loss.

"I first met President Eisenhower in Washington in July 1955, and my subsequent contacts with him strengthened the very high personal regard in which I had always held him. He was one of the great leaders of our times, both in war and in peace. I admired him particularly for his concern for the welfare of people everywhere in the world, for his moderation and for his wisdom. He was a strong and practical supporter of the United Nations, where he is remembered especially for his initiative in promoting international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"Please accept my condolences at the passing of this great man."

8. With your permission, Mr. President, I wish to elaborate on that message.

9. I have learned with profound sorrow of the death of President Eisenhower. President Eisenhower had a central and unique role in the history of our times, both in war and in peace. To his world renown as one of the great military leaders of World War II he added, in two terms as President of the United States, a new and glorious chapter as a statesman of peace.

10. Both in war and in peace Dwight Eisenhower showed a broad humanitarianism and a persistent desire for reason-

able and humane solutions of the world's problems. To put it in the simplest terms, he was a good man whose goodness was evident to all.

11. Throughout his two terms in the White House, President Eisenhower was a consistent and enlightened supporter of the United Nations. This support was expressed not only in statements and policies but also, as in 1956, in courageous support of action through the United Nations, and in an active personal interest which was manifested particularly in visits, both formal and informal, to the Headquarters of the United Nations.

12. Certainly President Eisenhower's most unique contribution to the work of the United Nations was the basic idea elaborated in his electrifying address to the General Assembly on 8 December 1953<sup>1</sup> in which he appealed for international action to harness the newly developing power of the atom for peaceful uses. This far-sighted proposal, coming as it did from the Head of State of a major atomic Power, gave the concept of international co-operation a new direction and dimension. Nor was it merely a high-minded proposal contained in a historic speech. The United Nations, by its action in following up President Eisenhower's initiative, embarked upon one of the most successful enterprises in its history. One of the highlights of this enterprise was the series of great international conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, at the first of which, in 1955, the nuclear scientists of the world met freely, for the first time since World War II, to exchange and discuss the mysteries of their craft. Another was the setting-up of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

13. In mourning the passing of President Eisenhower, I remember with inspiration his many achievements and his great influence for good in the world.

14. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): On behalf of my delegation, my Government and the entire French people, I should like to tell our United States colleague with what deep emotion my country shares the sorrow of the United States. It is at such times of trial that the friendship which has united France and the United States for two centuries shows itself in the most striking and sincere way. We mourn with the people of the United States the loss of their former President, the illustrious statesman, the great American who presided over the liberation of Western Europe and led our democracies to victory, our democracies united not only in the struggle and in the sacrifices but also in hope, and our democracies inspired and sustained by the pursuit of a common ideal.

15. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): When I express the grief of my delegation at the death of General Eisenhower, when I express the sympathy of my country with his family and with the sorrowing American people, we have a clear picture in our minds. We remember a great, good and simple man. We in Britain remember particularly the great soldier who, as Supreme Commander, launched the Allied forces from the West in the liberation of Europe from the Nazi grasp. The qualities of leadership and

diplomacy which marked his outstanding success as the leader of the Allied forces made him a natural choice for the highest post in his country. Having made his name in war, he is nevertheless remembered above all as a man of peace. He was a true and well-loved friend of my country. The British people will not forget "Ike".

16. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to add a few words to those spoken by you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Council at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting and to the contents of the telegram which you have sent.

17. The death today of General Dwight D. Eisenhower is a sad loss to his great country, the United States of America, and to all men who love freedom, peace and justice. His personality as a statesman and a soldier of universal stature is irrevocably linked to contemporary history, and, in particular, to the great victory which only two decades ago freed the world from the dangerous evil of nazism. All peoples of the world are indebted to him for his greatness and for all that he did.

18. At this hour of universal grief, and within the necessarily narrow limits of an improvised statement, it is not for me to eulogize him. All I shall say, therefore, is that we bow our heads in respectful memory of this great soldier and leader who has left us. On behalf of the people and Government of the Republic of Paraguay, we ask the delegation of the United States of America in this Council to accept this humble testimony of our most sincere feelings of sorrow.

19. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): On behalf of the delegation of Pakistan I join my colleagues in conveying our most profound sympathy to Mr. Yost and the members of the United States delegation on the passing away of that great American, General Dwight D. Eisenhower. We will cherish his memory not only as a distinguished soldier and architect of peace, but also as a great friend of Pakistan.

20. It would be impossible in a short statement to pay tribute to his manifold achievements. I shall confine myself to two personal recollections of his greatness and his unswerving dedication to principle.

21. In 1956, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Islamic Cultural Center in Washington, President Eisenhower looked at his largely Muslim audience and, departing from his written text, said that the United States was dedicated to freedom of worship and that, as its President, it was a great pleasure for him to see that right assured to the followers of the Islamic faith in the Capital of the United States. As he spoke these words, one could see the deeply felt satisfaction in his face.

22. On the second occasion, during the Suez crisis, when the United States took a courageous stand on principle, regardless of other considerations, he declared: "We cannot have one law for our opponents and another for our friends."

23. These two remarks speak volumes for Dwight D. Eisenhower as a man and a statesman. His life's work

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 470th meeting.

was done and he departs from the world full of years and honours. His deeds will continue to inspire many of his fellow men not only in the United States but throughout the world. In the words of the Koranic verse, which it is appropriate to recite on this sacred day of the Muslim calendar, the Ashura of Moharram,

“All things shall pass away;  
There will remain nought but the radiance of thy Lord.”

24. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): May I, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union to the United Nations, express our condolences on the occasion of the decease of an outstanding United States statesman and soldier, the former President of the United States, General Dwight D. Eisenhower?

25. During the Second World War, Dwight Eisenhower was well known and respected in the Soviet Union as a capable military leader who made a valuable contribution in commanding the troops which, together with armed forces of the Soviet Union and other freedom-loving countries, overthrew Hitlerite Germany, thus ridding Europe and the world of the Fascist plague and creating conditions for post-war peace and co-operation and for the creation of the United Nations.

26. In mankind's worst crisis, during the years when the Soviet Union and the United States fought together with other allied nations against Hitlerite aggression, General Eisenhower, as Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in the European theatre of the war, fully realized how important and essential it was to strengthen the ties between our countries and their armed forces in their common and historic struggle.

27. In the concluding stages of the war, before the capture of Berlin, the last stronghold of Fascist resistance, Eisenhower wrote to the Soviet Government about the great importance of unified planning both in the direction of efforts and in timing.

28. As President of the United States, Eisenhower showed statesmanlike wisdom in seeking to reduce international tension and to improve and develop relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. He took part in the 1955 Geneva Summit Conference of the heads of Governments of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France, a conference which I had the honour to attend and where I met President Eisenhower personally. Unfortunately subsequent events did not turn out as had been hoped, but we the people of the Soviet Union are by nature and experience optimists and realists, and we believe that, in this respect, future events will take the right course.

29. I would ask Mr. Yost to convey the condolences of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations to the Government and people of the United States and to the family and friends of the late General Eisenhower. I waive consecutive interpretation.

30. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): We were deeply moved to learn of the passing of General

Dwight D. Eisenhower, the former President of the United States.

31. On behalf of the delegation of Algeria, I ask the United States delegation to be good enough to convey to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family our most sincere condolences and our deepest sympathy.

32. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): It is with a most profound sense of grief and sorrow that we learned of the passing of General Eisenhower after a prolonged and painful illness.

33. In paying our respectful tribute to his memory on behalf of my Government, I associate myself with you Mr. President, and with the Secretary-General, as well as with those representatives who have conveyed condolences and sympathy to the American Government, the United States Mission here, the American people and to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family.

34. General Eisenhower was a great American. He was a soldier, a great Commander, a great President and a great leader of his people. He commanded the greatest army in history in defence of freedom and liberty and the right of every nation to live in peace and harmony. He will always be remembered by a grateful world as a great crusader—the great man of peace.

35. Mr. LIU (China): My delegation is profoundly saddened by the passing of the former President of the United States, General Dwight D. Eisenhower.

36. He will always be remembered as the great soldier who led the armed forces of the democracies to victory in the Second World War.

37. As the entire world now mourns the passing of this defender of peace and freedom, we of the Republic of China particularly feel the loss of a loyal friend whose memory will for ever be enshrined in the hearts of the Chinese people.

38. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to express its sorrow to the delegation of the United States on the passing of President Eisenhower, an illustrious soldier and statesman whom I had the honour to meet and talk to on several occasions. His death deprives us of an outstanding figure of our time, a man of great personality.

39. To the Government and people of the United States of America and to the family of President Eisenhower, my delegation extends its most heartfelt sympathy.

40. Mr. MORALES SUAREZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia shares the grief that the American nation is feeling today.

41. On behalf of the Government of Colombia I ask the representative of the United States of America to accept this posthumous tribute to the memory of General Eisenhower, who holds an outstanding place in contemporary history.

42. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): On behalf of the delegation of Finland I wish to extend to the United States delegation our profound condolences on the death of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a great American statesman and soldier who played such a central role not only in the Second World War but also in the shaping of the post-war world, and, above all, in the efforts towards international understanding and co-operation for world peace.

43. Mr. M'BENGUE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): We learned with great sorrow of the loss suffered by the Government and people of the United States in the passing of Dwight Eisenhower, a former President of the United States. On behalf of the Government and the entire people of Senegal, my delegation would like to pay a tribute to the memory of that eminent soldier and statesman, who fought resolutely to ensure the triumph of freedom on earth. On this occasion, my delegation wishes to express its deepest sympathy to the Government of the United States, to all the American people and to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family.

44. Mr. MUUKA (Zambia): I wish to extend the condolences of my delegation, my Government and the people of the Republic of Zambia on this occasion. We are deeply grieved by the passing of yet another great American statesman, former President Eisenhower. His valiant struggle during the last War was repeated again against death in his last months on earth. He was a great man, an intrepid fighter, but alas, man has yet not been able to thwart death when it strikes.

45. President Eisenhower was clearly one of America's greatest leaders both in times of war and in times of peace. His contribution to mankind indeed went far beyond the borders of the United States. He helped rid the world of the scourge of nazism. In paying tribute to this great statesman, let us dedicate ourselves to his ideals of peace and democracy.

46. I should like humbly to request the Ambassador of the United States to convey our condolences to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family, and to the Government and the people of the United States.

47. Mr. YOST (United States of America): For the United States delegation and for my country, permit me to express profound thanks to those who have just now spoken words of sympathy and tribute on learning the news of the death of former President Eisenhower. These tributes will be conveyed to Mrs. Eisenhower, and I know that she and her entire family will be particularly grateful for them.

48. As the Council may have heard, next Monday, 31 March has been declared a day of national mourning for the late President.

49. The name of Dwight D. Eisenhower holds a unique place of honour in the hearts of the American people. My countrymen will remember him as an outstanding leader in the Second World War, as a wise, magnanimous, warm human being, and—most of all—as a President who for eight years devoted himself unremittingly, in spite of every difficulty, to the cause of peace among nations.

50. Here in this Council, which exists to serve that same supreme cause, we of the American delegation are particularly moved by the words that have been spoken. They remind us that we Americans are not alone in our feelings about this illustrious compatriot and about the cause which he served; for the leader we mourn was a world figure, and our feelings about him are echoed and shared throughout the world.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

**Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)**

### The situation in the Middle East

**Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)**

51. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at previous meetings of the Security Council, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel and Saudi Arabia to take seats at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El-Farra (Jordan), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), and Mr. J. M. Barood (Saudi Arabia) took places at the Council table.*

52. Mr. de PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): This is the first time my delegation has spoken in the Security Council on the question of the Middle East. I do not, however, deem it necessary to refer to the general situation. Nevertheless, I think it useful to recall what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain said on 16 October 1968,<sup>2</sup>

“Spain, aware of certain realities of the situation which has come about in the Near East and anxious that no people should be denied its right to live, fervently desires that an end be put to a situation maintained by force of arms alone, that peace be restored, that justice be rendered to certain countries and, in short, that this crisis of immobility and impotence which is inflicting grave hardship upon great masses of people subjected to the hazards of war, expatriation and uncertainty, and which is threatening our Organization, be overcome.”

53. Today the Security Council is called upon to consider the complaint formulated by the representative of Jordan concerning the attacks by Israel aircraft on civilian centres in Jordan. Apart from the fact that these attacks constitute a violation of the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in its resolutions 233 (1967), 234 (1967) and 235 (1967), my delegation considers that this state of affairs cannot be

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 1697th meeting, para. 103.

allowed to continue, because it seriously jeopardizes peace and security, not only in that region but in the whole world. It is a direct consequence of two facts: firstly, the aggression of 5 June 1967 and the subsequent occupation of territory; secondly, the failure to comply with resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

54. Without prejudice to the fact that this resolution should be fully implemented, my delegation considers it obvious that the Charter of the United Nations in no way permits the occupation of territory by force.

55. The Security Council is now considering the attack by Israel jet aircraft, which destroyed rest homes and winter resorts in Ein Hazar. Places frequented by civilians have been attacked and bombed, and the roads leading to the villages in the vicinity of Es Salt have been machine-gunned. This violent attack left eighteen civilians dead and twenty-five wounded, three of them seriously.

56. We trust that the object of such action at this time is not to interfere with the efforts that are being made to find a solution. But the fact that these acts of violence, which are real violations of a whole series of resolutions, are taking place at this time cannot fail to arouse suspicion.

57. My delegation hopes that the attention of the Council will not be diverted by other events. We are the first to regret the casualties that occur on either side. The loss of human life is deplorable and intolerable. It is inadmissible that the occupation of territory by force should continue, for it is precisely in that territory that the repeated and continued incidents reported to the Council are taking place. In this connexion, my delegation wishes to refer to document S/9114, in which reference is made to "armed attacks, armed infiltration and acts of murder and violence by terrorist groups operating from Jordan territory..." etc. Attacks against whom? Against what territory? Or is it actually against Jordanian territory itself? Is it because Jordanian territory is occupied by Israel that it is now claimed as Israel's territory?

58. My delegation has always considered that if this grave conflict is to be settled, political solutions must be worked out; but in the face of so many denunciations by Israel of the attacks which it alleges are being committed by the Arab States, my delegation wonders whether Israel has failed to realize that all these acts could be avoided if Israel were to withdraw immediately from the territories which it occupies. Had this withdrawal already been carried out, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions, all those victims whom we mourn today would have been spared or, at least, the legal and procedural status of Israel before this Council would be far clearer. My delegation cannot understand why these acts of violence are periodically denounced before the Council, when it is within the power of the party which considers itself wronged—Israel—to settle the conflict. Do away with the root cause, that is to say, the occupation of the territories seized by force in violation of the Charter, and the effects will rapidly disappear. The remaining problems could then be taken up in a different context and with greater guarantees of success. My delegation believes that all the parties to this conflict have, or should have, a definite

interest in finding a solution. But it is not possible to apply the same criterion in judging those who accept the decisions of the Security Council and those who are prepared to accept only those decisions which suit them, disregarding the others.

59. I have said on other occasions that it is the United Nations itself that is on trial at this time. If the Council is prepared to allow its resolutions or the General Assembly resolutions to be flouted by Members of the Organization, we shall be in the sorry situation where this organ, which is entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, will not be discharging its own obligations, having failed in its most important task, and will therefore become useless.

60. When in a conflict such as the present one it is difficult to determine the origin of the passionate feelings that have inevitably been aroused, this Council has no alternative but to make a cool and objective study of the facts submitted to it. And today the concrete facts available to us show that a State Member of this Organization has repeatedly and violently attacked other Member States, accusing them of being responsible for isolated acts which are difficult to prove. Recently, the representative of Syria referred to the incidents which had caused fifteen deaths and an interminable list of wounded. Can the world of today accept that in such a situation a Member of the United Nations may decide on its own initiative, without previously complying with the obligations imposed upon it by the Charter, when it is entitled to attack another Member which has not taken direct action against it?

61. Yesterday the representative of Israel enumerated for us the alleged sites, scattered throughout the territory of Jordan, of *fedayeen* camps or bases. If what he said is true, it can only be assumed, in view of the magnitude of the problem, that these are not terrorists, as he calls them, but an entire people which, banished from its territory, deprived of its means of livelihood and repeatedly ill-treated, has come to the end of its patience and is reacting violently to the injustice it is suffering through the persecution of some and the abandonment and neglect of others.

62. In the view of my delegation, the most serious factor which has to be taken into account in this specific case is the time at which the aggression was committed. My delegation could in no circumstances condone an act of aggression, even if that act was presented as an act of reprisal, but although we could not condone it we could humanly understand a violent reaction, in proportion to the damage inflicted, when that reaction is provoked by the pressure, anger or sorrow of the moment. But what my delegation cannot even begin to understand is how, at a time when no act of violence has been committed, and when the four great Powers are seeking formulae that contain the promise of a brighter future, a completely disproportionate and cold-blooded military attack can be launched, using the most sophisticated modern weapons, against a centre of population in which, even if it harboured some *fedayeen*—a point which has not been proved—there were certainly many people who had nothing whatsoever to do with any act of violence and who paid indiscriminately

with their lives for the cold calculations of the military chiefs of staff.

63. Can it seriously be maintained that Israel was at that time in danger of being attacked by Jordan?

64. The problem of the Middle East is a complex and difficult one for which we cannot expect to find a solution overnight. Apart from the general problem, however, this Organization cannot permit one of its Members repeatedly and continuously to take justice into its own hands, launch real wars of aggression, occupy territories that do not belong to it, and use various means to expel from them thousands of human beings whose only crime is that they were born in the land in which their parents and grandparents have always lived.

65. In the specific case before us there can be no equating the attitudes of the two parties. This Organization is made up of States and it is solely the responsibility of States that we can contemplate and consider. The facts available to us are basically simple: a territory has been subjected to military occupation by a foreign country; acts of violence occur in that territory; the reaction of the occupying country against the occupied country is to accuse the latter of aggression. Anything that may be added to those basic facts will be purely subjective criteria.

66. In the light of those facts, the problem before us is also straightforward. Has it been proved that the State whose territory is partly occupied was responsible for the acts of violence committed against the occupation forces? In the view of my delegation, it has not. Can the State whose territory is occupied be considered even indirectly responsible for the acts of violence which its citizens commit in the occupied territories? Obviously not, since apart from the illegitimate occupation, that State does not exercise jurisdiction over the territories in which the events are taking place.

67. In the light of all these considerations, my delegation would emphasize the seriousness of the situation, the responsibility incumbent upon all of us at this time and the urgent need, independently of our efforts to find a general solution to the problem, for the Security Council to take such decisions as it considers most appropriate to try to prevent a State Member of this Organization from continuing to violate its resolutions and from committing aggression against neighbouring States.

68. Mr. M'BENGUE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): We have already had occasion in this Council to condemn the bombings of the towns of Irbid and Salt. Today again we learn with sadness that in the area of the town of Salt civilians have been victims of bombing attacks by Israel. We can only deeply deplore this act, which comes at the very time when active consultations are being held with a view to finding a solution to this painful problem. My Government urges that the weapons be silenced so that the efforts which are now under way may be successful, for this is in the interests of all the parties concerned in the Middle East. In particular, we condemn the bombing of civilians. We have said this here on several occasions, and we shall not cease to repeat it.

69. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Jordan.

70. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I want to interrupt the deliberations of the Council to state that we have received with deep sorrow the news of the passing away of General Dwight Eisenhower, former President of the United States. President Eisenhower was a noble and courageous soldier dedicated to the cause of peace and justice in the world. His name will always stand as a landmark not only in the history of the United States, but also in the history of mankind, in the common struggle against the forces of darkness and oppression in the world.

71. As an educator and as a great statesman and leader of one of the super-Powers of the world, his unprecedented popularity among the great American nation and the peoples of the world reflects the deep and inherent values that motivated his heart and his mind as a great leader, as a soldier and, above all, as a man dedicated to the cause of humanity at large. Indeed, the death of a great man who made history is the beginning of his life in history.

72. We offer our deepest condolences to Mrs. Eisenhower and family, to the American people and to the Government of the United States of America.

73. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): We have no hesitation in stating that, in our opinion, the continued violations of the cease-fire in the Middle East are detrimental to the cause of peace. The recent bombing of the civilian population of Jordan by the military forces of Israel undoubtedly constitutes a reprehensible act with which no State can associate itself. That attack forms part of the policy of reprisals, which runs counter to the mandates of the Charter.

74. Far from attempting to evade any responsibility, but on the contrary expressing our horror at the bombing of Es Salt, my delegation considers that it is essential to make every effort within our power to create, before another armed confrontation takes place, an atmosphere conducive to the peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

75. It goes without saying that we strongly condemn all violations of the cease-fire and all acts of terrorism, whatever their source. Today we mourn the death of eighteen Jordanian civilians, as in the past we have mourned the death of no small number of Israelis. Let me state, however, that in our opinion peace is not achieved through the mere act of mourning.

76. Often for fear of being unable to find more far-reaching solutions, the Security Council prefers the line of least resistance and gives lengthy consideration to cases that conclude with the adoption of a resolution which does nothing to prevent a repetition of the acts that have been condemned but, on the other hand, lamentably weakens the authority of the United Nations.

77. Today we have on our agenda once again the complex item of the Middle East, a question in which the United Nations has displayed more doggedness than effectiveness.

After adopting far-reaching resolutions and after hearing in the General Assembly and in this Council brilliant speeches of a fine literary quality, erudite dissertations, Dantean descriptions, and stark and objective accounts of the painful events which have occurred in the interminable and bloody strife between Arabs and Jews, we have been totally unable to change the situation for the better and we have not made the slightest progress towards the coveted goal of a stable peace.

78. Not infrequently, under the pressure of circumstances and the sorrow caused by tragedy, the Security Council has considered and judged specific cases that form part of a series of events which undoubtedly have a disruptive effect upon international peace. Of course, the Security Council has also examined the situation as a whole and has stated its views with the utmost clarity.

79. What I have just said underlines the fact that we are not in the process of establishing a criterion or considering the adoption of a policy calculated to create an atmosphere conducive to peace in the Middle East. That criterion and that policy are established in resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. As far as we know, no country has sought to invalidate those principles, but the fact remains that it has not yet proved possible to apply them. Naturally, we can be sure that, until the provisions of that resolution are fully implemented, the grave international crises that have occurred since 1947 in the bitter strife between Israel and its neighbours will continue.

80. Events have shown that United Nations action alone has not been sufficient to overcome the critical situation in the Middle East. Everything remains the same there and there is nothing to enable us to view the immediate future with optimism. So far nothing has come of the praiseworthy efforts of Mr. Jarring, who pursues the noble task of peace-making with apostolic zeal. It is an indisputable fact that, if the objectives of resolution 242 (1967) are to be achieved, there must be determined co-operation between Arabs and Jews. It is they who can best co-operate with the United Nations in order to eliminate international tension and to create an atmosphere of trust and security which would bring to an end the longest conflict of modern times.

81. We are grieved at the vain sacrifice of hundreds of innocent lives on both sides, and we realize with horror that the situation may grow worse and the conflict pursue its course over a pile of useless Security Council resolutions. The cease-fire violations, the acts of terrorism and the whole range of atrocities that are being committed under cover of the present abnormal state of affairs cannot be restrained by mere words. All the resources of the intelligent mind must be applied in order to bring about a definite step towards peace.

82. In view of the unquestionable influence which the four permanent members of the Security Council exercise over the countries of the Middle East, it might well be that joint action by the super-Powers would secure the active co-operation of Israel and its neighbours in removing all the elements which disturb the peace. The role to be played by the Arab States and the State of Israel in the stage which

will begin when formal contacts are established between the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, France and the United Kingdom will be of the greatest significance. We learned with the deepest satisfaction that, in the opinion of many of those participating in the meeting of the super-Powers, not only will there be no interference with Mr. Jarring's mission but on the contrary it will receive all the support that those Powers can give it.

83. We are concerned at the fact that in the discussions in the Security Council the representatives of the States which are parties to the conflict seek to persuade us that the right policy is that of reprisals, terrorist acts, invasion and resistance, and not a policy of progress along the road to peace. My delegation would prefer to hear from the lips of such distinguished and authoritative spokesmen for the policies of their peoples some statements in favour of the restoration of harmony among nations which, because of their proximity to one another, can prosper only in a climate of peace, trust and security.

84. In the Middle East situation, all events are undeniably interconnected. Resistance is connected with invasion; invasion with the state of belligerency; the state of belligerency with the refugee problem; the refugee problem with terrorism; terrorism with reprisals—and so we could go on with this sad, interminable succession of calamities.

85. In the opinion of my delegation, the points which were submitted by the Latin American group for consideration at the emergency session of the General Assembly in June 1967, and which later served as the basis of resolution 242 (1967) adopted by the Security Council on 22 November of that year, are still valid. We feel strongly that there must be a comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East which will take into account the tragic plight of the million refugees who wander aimlessly through the Arab countries. My delegation considers that this question should be granted the full importance that it warrants on both political and humanitarian grounds.

86. It is also essential that the Israel forces should be withdrawn from the Arab territories, for it is true that might confers no right. But it is no less true that Israel needs to channel its energies towards goals other than those of its long-standing battle to defend its existence as a State. Israel is fully entitled to demand that the pointless refusal to recognize its sovereignty and integrity should be brought to an end. In this regard, it is worth pointing out that, in the opinion of my delegation, the problems of the last twenty years in the Middle East have arisen, not from the creation of the State of Israel, but from the continued refusal to recognize it.

87. The 1967 war must not be repeated, and to that end it is essential that all the recommendations of resolution 242 (1967) should be carried out. That resolution placed the withdrawal of the Israel forces from the occupied territories and the ending of the state of belligerency between the States of the Middle East in one and the same category and affirmed the need to guarantee freedom of navigation through the international waterways of the area, to achieve a just solution to the refugee problem and to guarantee the territorial inviolability of the States concerned by establishing demilitarized zones between them.

88. I hope I may be forgiven for having gone beyond the specific case of the bombing of the town of Es Salt by the Israel air force, but my delegation certainly believes that, if there is to be any change in the present tense situation in the Middle East, it is absolutely essential to consider the situation as a whole without, of course, disregarding isolated incidents.

89. In keeping with our recognized spiritual independence and our will to serve the cause of peace, we again appeal fervently, as we did in June 1967, to our friends from Israel and the Arab countries to resolve to break the vicious circle of reprisals which are blocking the path to a peace that will suffer no postponement.

90. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

91. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The delegation of Israel joins all members of the Security Council in mourning the death of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States of America, Supreme Allied Commander-in-Chief in Western Europe in the Second World War, one of the planners and leaders in the liberation from the Nazi scourge, one of the architects of the victory of the freedom-loving peoples of the anti-fascist coalition twenty-four years ago.

92. As Supreme Allied Commander-in-Chief, General Eisenhower was one of the first of the senior Western military Commanders to see with his own eyes the outrages of the Nazi concentration camps. This left an indelible impression on him. When he was Commander-in-Chief in Germany in the years immediately following V-E Day and had direct responsibility for the hundreds and thousands of Jewish refugees victims of Nazi oppression, General Eisenhower displayed deep understanding and human compassion for a whole people which had been a victim of genocide, and profound sympathy for the aspiration of the survivors to achieve a life of freedom and independence in their own land. His momentous role in history and his life-long service to his people were crowned by the contribution which he made to his country in the eight years in which he was its President.

93. I ask the representative of the United States, Ambassador Yost, to convey our deep sympathies to the Government and people of the United States, to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family of the late President.

94. At this stage I should like to exercise my right of reply and say to the representative of Spain—who has made an ominous debut in the Council's deliberations on the Middle East situation—in the words of Confucius, "A flaw in a piece of white jade may be ground away but a word spoken amiss may not be called back."

95. There is world-wide recognition that Arab terror warfare is murder for the sake of murder, pursued in violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire. World opinion in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America has condemned it. United Nations jurisprudence has ruled it out as unacceptable. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has branded it before

and after the June 1967 hostilities. Resistance organizations and renowned humanitarians have expressed their repugnance for it. No attempt, as the one made this morning by two Arab representatives, to suggest that only European public opinion condemns Arab terror against Israel will hold ground.

96. Here are a few examples of African, Asian and Latin American opinion.

97. The *East African Standard* of Nairobi writes on 21 February 1969 about the policy of the Arab States:

"Just as they lost sympathy before the June war on account of the virulence of their propaganda, so now they [the Arab countries] are turning the uncommitted world against them by the unbridled activities of extremist Palestinian organizations."

98. The *Manila Bulletin* of 21 February writes:

"... Arab terrorist raids are not only senseless but condemnable for the uncivilized brand of aggression they represent and the hazards to world peace they pose."

99. And the *Bombay Indian Political* of 3 February wrote:

"Since its inception many years ago, Arab terror has been characterized by indiscriminate murder. Arab terror groups set out to fight Jewish civilian targets."

100. *La República* of Bogotá of 21 February stated:

"Our friendship towards all the Arab countries does not prevent us from condemning terrorism. On the contrary it makes us request that the United Nations should do something for those regions exposed to a war which now stems out of terrorism."

101. The Turkish newspaper *Tasvir* wrote on 29 December 1968:

"... commandos who threw hand grenades in Jerusalem on innocent civilians at a time when they were marketing with their wives and children, these commandos who killed children dismissed from school, innocent and defenceless people coming out of movies and buses, who raided airplanes, are no commandos at all, but mean terrorists."

102. The *Evening News* of Manila of 30 December 1968 had the following to say:

"For its refusal to consider the return of the conquered territories except in the context of an over-all peace settlement, the Israeli Government is accused of aggression. The plain, honest, unvarnished truth, however, is that those territories fell into the hands of Israel in the course of a war triggered by Arab aggression.

"The Arab States have never stopped warring on Israel. They have never ceased laying siege to the Jewish State. By their own definition, sedulously embroidered upon by communist propaganda and dialectics, the Arab States are

Simon pure. They are not guilty of acts of war. They do not commit aggression. They are innocent of wrongdoing.

“By the same infernal definition, the Israelis are guilty of acts of war and commit aggression when they defend themselves against barbaric and savage attempts at their annihilation. According to Nasser, his cohorts, and his communist masters, the Israelis commit an outrage when they outwit and outfight their mortal enemies.”

103. The *Ghana Times* of Accra wrote on 24 February 1969:

“... Of all the organizations that have ever laid claim to that name anywhere, these groups are the only ones whose declared purpose is to destroy a sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations.

“On the human level their aim is murder for its own sake... the terror units were set up as military instruments by different Arab Governments, in most cases to serve the national interests of one or the other Arab State. They represent the continued warfare of Arab States which consider their regular armies incapable of resuming the fight at this stage...”

“Arab terrorism is a danger to an atmosphere conducive to peace in the region and thus to peace itself.”

104. In the *Sunday Sketch* of Nigeria we read on 12 January 1969, in an article written by Mr. Aremu Shodeko, the following:

“The Israeli has a right to live as the Arab. Does the Koran—of which faith I am an adherent—preach extermination? ...

“Why the fight? Is the Arab trying to falsify history? Is he saying the Israeli is not entitled to the barren patch that he has now turned into an oasis of plenty? Is he saying that the Israeli never owned that part now made his own?”

105. There is no whitewashing of the Arab terror against Israel. There can be no attenuation of the responsibility of Governments from whose territory it is waged. In despair, and to shirk responsibility for it, Arab spokesmen try sometimes to draw a distinction between the responsibility of Arab Governments for terror operations and Israel's responsibility for actions undertaken by its regular forces. Such a distinction is juridically untenable. It has been rejected by all authorities on international law. It is contrary to all known definitions of aggression. It is also untenable in fact. The two decades of Arab war against Israel have clearly demonstrated that terror warfare is an instrument in the hands of Arab Governments, used by them or set aside at will.

106. The following will throw additional light on the direct involvement and responsibility of the Jordanian Government for terror warfare.

107. On 14 March 1969 the present Prime Minister of Jordan said: “Political means are not enough to defeat Israel. There is need to depend on the military effort.”

108. On 17 March, King Hussein was reported by the authoritative *Al-Ahram* to have stated: “The terror organizations should be reinforced by regular forces.”

109. The Beirut daily *En-Nahar* wrote on 2 March 1969: “King Hussein has suggested that soldiers and commanders of the Jordanian army would join the *fedayeen* organizations.”

110. Also on 2 March, the King declared: “Co-operation and co-ordination between the *fedayeen* activity—this is our main desire.”

111. Governments which openly pride themselves on their co-operation and co-ordination with terror organizations cannot be absolved of their responsibility for the nefarious activities of these organizations. The test of responsibility for terror attacks is not whether they are carried out by regular or irregular forces, but whether the Governments controlling the territory from which they emanate condone and assist such attacks or take measures to stop them.

112. Those who try to describe the Israeli action of 26 March as directed against civilians, ignore completely the factual situation known to all visitors to Jordan.

113. Eric Mosden, writing in the *East African Standard* of 19 March 1969 says:

“A few weeks ago I travelled the road from Amman to Jerash, Deraa and Damascus. The El Fatah training camps were pointed out to us by our driver from the road, some way out in the desert and not far from the refugee camps which are their inevitable recruiting ground.”

114. Alfred Friendly reports from Amman in the *Washington Post* of 18 February 1969, under the heading “Hussein yesterday receives commando chief—Royal approval of guerrilla raids indicated”.

“The announcement and the Press display”—he writes—“could hardly be read by the Jordanian public as other than a blessing or legitimization by Hussein of the commando movement in general and of El Fatah... in particular...”

115. In the *U.S. News and World Report* of 24 February 1969 we find an eye-witness report by John Low, from Amman, who writes:

“... To get an idea of how the commando movement is going about building itself up, I visited two Fatah training camps. The first camp, hidden in the hills south of Amman, trained recruits for a civilian reserve. The second camp I visited was where El Fatah ‘lion cubs’, learned guerrilla warfare.”

116. The *Chicago Sun Times* of 20 February 1969 states:

“... The Arab terrorist groups are not merely private organizations... In Jordan, for example, the terrorists are officially recognized as a para-military group and are quasi-official members of the Jordan army... By any measure the Arab terrorists are military arms of their respective Governments.”

117. The *Teheran Journal* of 17 March 1969, published an interview by Frank Maes in Amman with two Fatah political officers, referred to as "Ahmed" and "Khalidoun". In answer to the question: "On what terms are you with the Jordan Government?" Ahmed replied "There exists a very good understanding between them and us. This understanding is based on the agreement we made with King Hussein after the shooting of last November. I can assure you that very strong co-operation has developed between our men and the Jordanian army. . . . Jordan just happens to be a base for us. Money is far from being a problem. . . . We receive funds from all Arab Governments, they all support us."

118. The *Milwaukee Journal* of 27 February 1969 reports from Amman, writing from "somewhere in Jordan":

"The trip to the training camp started from Amman. The truck raced through several small villages north-west of Amman before turning off onto a dusty rock-strewn road. This took us deep into hilly country across two rushing streams. After about an hour we arrived at the camp.

"There are 250 recruits in this camp, one of several in Jordan. . . ."

119. In the *Canberra Times* of 8 March 1969, we find the following:

"From the moment one lands in Amman one is in the thick of the commando mystique. The *fedayeen* are everywhere, all dressed in seemingly identical camouflaged fatigues, almost all armed with rifles or sub-machine-guns or revolvers. Their training camps and bases are spread over the country."

120. Only one thing is omitted in the accounts of the terror bases and the roads which lead to them—the names of the camps. And these are not difficult to fill in for those who know Jordan. One of the names which appears repeatedly is Ein Hazar—the base disabled by Israel on 26 March.

121. One of the main difficulties in the search for peaceful settlement of the Israel-Arab conflict is that so many distortions, illusions, myths encumber the situation. Let us not strengthen them. Let us see the facts as they are. Let us not ignore truth; it is all too clear.

122. Mr. MUUKA (Zambia): After all the many speeches we have heard from those who have spoken before me, in particular after the many interventions of the representatives of Israel and Jordan, I intend to be brief and to confine my observations to what I consider the salient aspect of the problem before us.

123. Our agenda is short, but its brevity is unfortunately outweighed by the gravity of the issues at stake. The first substantive item is a specific one; that is the one dealing with an act of aggression, premeditated and deliberately executed by the regular forces of the Government of Israel against the people and territory of Jordan. Its victims, it has been made abundantly clear, have been unarmed and

innocent civilians who in no way threatened the security of the State of Israel.

124. The second item, which we are satisfied has been submitted by Israel as a matter of formality, is the general complaint by Israel against the activities of Palestinian guerrillas who, according to Israel, are carrying out these activities with the co-operation and assistance of the neighbouring Governments.

125. While we do not minimize the unfortunate misery and loss of life and property caused by the actions of the guerrillas, I am not too sure whether Israel would have at this point in time requested a meeting of the Security Council. There does not seem to me to have been any particular incident this time to have spurred Israel to call for a meeting. For that reason, and that reason alone, I will not enter into arguments for or against the role of the guerrillas in the aggravation of the Middle East situation in this debate. Suffice it for me to say that we deplore the use of violence of any kind in the settlement of disputes in international relations. We very much regret the loss of life and property in Israel. Unfortunately, Israel's own methods of resolving this problem do not seem to us to be conducive to peace.

126. By acquiring Jordanian territory as if it were *terra nullius*, Israel has weakened its case for self-defence; for in trying to defend its present borders, it is in fact interfering in alien—that is, Jordanian—territory.

127. With regard to specific requests by Jordan, we wish to associate ourselves with those who believe that the territory of a State is inviolable and may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, on any ground whatsoever; and that such territorial acquisitions obtained by force shall not be recognized.

128. There can be no world order if any country thinks it can, and does, with impunity attack indiscriminately the territory of another at will. That being the case, we cannot but condemn this act of premeditated aggression. We would strongly urge Israel to refrain from acts that would not only loose it some friends but that would also throw into disarray the efforts of the big Four. While those efforts are about to enter a critical stage, it is imperative that nothing liable to aggravate the situation should be allowed to mar even that small ray of sunshine.

129. The PRESIDENT: I wish now to address the Council as the representative of HUNGARY.

130. The Security Council is seized again of a complaint by Jordan against the latest manifestation of Israel's aggressive actions which took place on the twenty-sixth of this month in the neighbourhood of the city of Es Salt. The attack of civilian objectives by Israeli jet fighters, which took the lives of eighteen civilians and injured a number of them, contravenes all rules of international law. By ordering its warplanes to strike objectives in Jordan, the Government of Israel has once more seriously violated the sovereignty of Jordan, a Member of the United Nations. In so doing, following the military aggression against its Arab neigh-

hours in June 1967, Israel has again also broken the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council. It has further ignored the obligation of a Member State of the United Nations to come to the Security Council if it feels aggrieved. It is for this very reason that the Council has been compelled, repeatedly, to condemn Israel for violating the basic provisions of the Charter in attempting to place itself above the law of nations.

131. The representative of Israel has argued that these actions are justified because they are defensive in character and aimed at the maintenance of Israel's security. Those assertions are not corroborated by its actions. Furthermore, no provision of the Charter entitles a Member State to take the law into its own hands. Israel's occupation of large Arab territories resulting from its military attack on its neighbours cannot be invoked to demand the submission of the inhabitants of those territories to Israeli rule. The occupation of those territories is the fruit of an armed aggression, and it is precisely for this reason that the Security Council provided for the withdrawal of the occupation forces from those territories. The cease-fire is not there to help consolidate territorial conquests. It was put into effect to stop Israeli aggression and to curtail further territorial incursions of Israel into the neighbouring Arab countries. It is there to prepare the ground for the withdrawal of Israeli forces.

132. From all this it clearly follows that the cease-fire should in no way serve Israel's policy of annexations. History shows that, so long as there is occupation, there will be resistance.

133. For the sake of deeper arguments, one cannot fail to observe that the attacks of Israeli armed forces against Jordan and other Arab countries violate even the law of war, not just the law of peace. Even in wartime, no belligerent is entitled to attack civilian targets. It is even more repugnant to see a country not at war with its neighbour utilize weapons of mass destruction, such as rockets, and chemical weapons, like napalm. All this is contrary to the laws of war. No reference to the security or to the defense of the people of Israel can justify such practices. What higher law can be invoked in defending those horrible weapons? Are we to understand that in the name of the alleged insecurity of Israel all means are sacred, whereas the occupied peoples are forbidden even to further their right to live in their homeland?

134. Since such a doubt standard has been invoked again during the present discussion, I feel compelled to state: it is not Israel's security that is being threatened; it is the security of Jordan, of Syria, and of the United Arab Republic which is seriously endangered. So long as their territories are occupied by Israel, it is their security—and their security alone—which is in question. The security of Israel is affected by the policy of its Government, which, for certain short-term illusory advantages, is prepared to compromise all chances of peace with its neighbours. It would be high time for the Government of Israel to realize that the present militaristic stance in which it keeps the country, and the efforts to conquer territories, to produce more and more refugees from the population of those territories could in the long run seriously harm the interests of the people of Israel.

135. As I have said, the attacks regularly launched by Israeli armed forces against its Arab neighbours constitute a flagrant violation of the cease-fire and the Charter of the United Nations. But they are especially dangerous in character if viewed against the background of the present situation in the Middle East. All members of this Council are aware that the dangers inherent in that situation rightly engage the attention of our Organization and, more particularly, those members which by virtue of the Charter hold special responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. This concern has been translated into action paving the way for meaningful discussions among them, with a view to contributing to the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council of 22 November 1967.

136. It may have surprised some observers of the Middle East situation that the country which has always painted the apocalyptic picture of impending destruction of the State of Israel has lately done everything to portray as excessive the concern felt at the prospect of the renewal of the hostilities. The Government of Israel, through its authorized representatives, has been clearly attempting to stifle the initiative of the permanent members of our Council. Israeli Government leaders have repeatedly stated that the real danger comes from such a concerted action to establish peace in the area by implementing the resolution of the Security Council.

137. The latest attack against Jordan will certainly not be conducive to supporting Israel's contention that direct contacts between the States of the Middle East should accomplish what the present and forthcoming talks are intended to do. The continuing and even larger Israeli aggressive acts must convince everyone that more determined efforts are needed to reverse the present trend of Israeli militancy.

138. The Hungarian delegation, for its part, will lend its support to all conclusions which uphold the sovereignty of nations, the inviolability of the provisions of the Charter, and the validity of previous Council decisions applying those principles to the Middle East. Therefore, we cannot but resolutely condemn the latest Israeli attack on the territory of Jordan in general, and on the civilian objectives in particular. We shall support every initiative which will promote a political settlement in the Middle East by a full implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council as much as we condemn all illegal violations of it.

139. Now, as PRESIDENT, I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

140. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have a few words to say before I resume my participation in this debate.

141. We are all guests in this world. Today we are here, tomorrow we are gone. Each creature is like a grain of sand on the shore of eternity, like the ripple on the surface of the sea, the life of man is a short interval in interminable time without beginning and without end. From the invisible Creator or forces of nature we emanate and to the invisible Creator or nature we return. We humbly bow our heads before death, the death of the known and the death of the

unknown, for we are all one and equal in death and we attain ultimate peace when we are enfolded in the earth.

142. General Eisenhower has been released from his human suffering. Known as he is, he sought rest, like the unknown, and he has gained eternal peace. So may I be permitted to join those who preceded me in expressing the deep condolences of the Saudi Arabian Mission to the United Nations for the passing away of that illustrious General who distinguished himself as a man who fought against injustice in times of war and peace. He was particularly noted during the tenure of the Presidency not only as a man of high principles, as was mentioned by many here, but also as a staunch upholder of human rights. Above all, General Eisenhower should be remembered for his warm personality which was admirable for its simplicity and genuine modesty, notwithstanding his glorious achievements. He was never self-enamoured. Indeed, while possessing inherent dignity there was no doubt that General Eisenhower identified himself with the deep yearnings and aspirations of the common man. As such he will be sorely missed. But let us hope that his memory will influence the conduct of the living in all stations of life. May God rest his soul in peace. I beg my friend Ambassador Yost to convey the deep sympathy of my Mission to Mrs. Eisenhower, to the members of her family and to the American people.

143. I will now have to correct certain misconceptions which may be entertained here in this Council on account of the diatribes that we have heard time and again from Mr. Tekoah, and I must say to you all, including of course, Mr. Tekoah, that war is war. If there was mercy in any conflict which is called war, it would not be known as war. It is something deplorable that man should settle his differences by violence. It seems that we have not attained sufficient maturity as *homo sapiens*—and here *homo sapiens* is a misnomer—to try to separate the innocent from the guilty in the course of our conflicts. May I remind those of you who were old enough in the Second World War that civilians died by the millions in the name of freedom and liberation, and I refer to the victims of the victors and the defeated. Have we forgotten how Coventry was bombed by the Germans? And were those civilians in Coventry guilty? How can we forget Dresden which was not a military target but which was almost erased, Dresden one of the most beautiful cities of medieval Germany. Were those who were killed guilty?

144. How can we forget the 10 or 15 million Russian civilians who were killed in the Second World War? And by whom were they killed? Of course by the Germans, but by whom? Some German civilians were killed by the allies. We deplore the loss of human life and we do not earmark the victims as being either citizens of a righteous nation or those of an evil nation.

145. What do you think of what is going on in the Far East? In modern warfare planes soar to such heights, hoping that the targets will be military targets and they use so-called precision instruments. Bombs fall on areas, killing civilians, sometimes killing the soldiers of those who are trying to destroy the enemy themselves. Why did I mention all this? Because war is war. It is deplorable. Nobody can rationalize anything good coming out of war.

146. Having said this, I referred to the Zionists who were frenzied by a cause until it seized them and became a psychosis in the 1920s and more so in the latter part of the 1930s. So frenzied were they with their cause that they killed Count Bernadotte; they killed Lord Moyne; they hanged British Tommies from trees, they killed civilians—and I must say in fairness to them they themselves were in turn killed in Palestine. There was that psychosis, the psychosis of patriotism on the side of the Arabs and there was the psychosis of a Zionist cause. So it would be foolish to accuse and intimidate. War is war. This Organization was formed in order to prevent war, to do away with war. Has it done so? Not so far.

147. So it would be foolish, Mr. Tekoah, to begin to catalogue the civilians whose deaths we deplore, whether they be Jews or gentiles. But have you forgotten the Stern Gangs? Have you forgotten Deir Yassin, have you forgotten the Irgun Zvai Leumi, have you forgotten the Haganah, the atrocities committed which you probably, I am sure as a human being in your innermost heart, deplore? Whether they killed Arabs or Jews, they killed human beings because of their frenzy in that cause called Zionism, which selected the wrong location, Palestine, which had an indigenous population, a people with a personality.

148. There is no end to the process of listing the miseries and tribulations of war. You will get nowhere with that. I wish there was no war. Everyone of us committed to the United Nations is trying to find ways and means to prevent war. But unfortunately, the United Nations is following in the path of the League of Nations. The Covenant of the League of Nations was supposed to transcend all kinds of arrangements based on the balance of power and power politics. And what do we find now? We find Powers, large and small, holding caucuses in an attempt to determine the fate of a people without asking those people what they want, setting aside the principle of self-determination, as I have said, enunciated by President Wilson and elaborated here in the United Nations and enshrined in paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the United Nations Charter.

149. Always go back to the genesis to find why there is war in Palestine. It is because the Zionist movement uprooted a people, the indigenous people and you gentlemen here, through instructions from your Governments, are trying to patch a piece of cloth that is already worn out. Let us be frank with ourselves. You are talking about public opinion, world public opinion. Where is world public opinion? Where is the conscience of the world when the politicians in almost every State in the world can drive the people like sheep through the mass media of information by planting articles or by swaying editors, with very few exceptions? And I am not talking only of the Western press or of any press for that matter. I am talking of the press in general including that of the Arab world, because like every other press it is subjected to the stresses that are quite common in trying to present a cause, rightly or wrongly. It is like advertising. Propagating causes is like advertising. The media of information are media of advertising opinions and causes like these media advertise a bar of soap. They influence the subliminal part of the mind affecting the subconscious, collectively, so that people can be made to

behave in such a way as to be at the command and behest of those who pay for influencing them.

150. War is war. It is true that the Arab States are at war with Israel, not because Israel is Jewish but because it is an intrusion from Europe, just like the Crusaders were an intrusion from Europe, just like our brothers the Ottomans were for 400 years an intrusion into the Semitic world, which includes the Arab world. Zionism is a foreign element in the body politic and the body social of the Arab people.

151. But leave aside the Arab people. There happens to be a people called the indigenous people of Palestine. They number 1.5 million or 2 million—I do not have a census of that people. Does the representative of Israel and his leaders, if they examine their innermost conscience, expect the Arab Governments to crush those people because they state that they have been robbed of their homeland? As I have mentioned time and again, and shall continue to mention, the Arab people from Morocco to the confines of Iran down to the heart of the Sudan, are inflamed because of that—rightly or wrongly is beside the point—and any Arab Government that will stand in the face of the people unless all the Arab Governments become police States and crush the people, will be accountable to the Arab people, who will shoot them like birds more than they would the Israelis. Who among the Arab Governments would dare—leaving aside whether they would be willing—not to represent the sentiment of the people, and tell the Palestinian people to forget their land?

152. Until three years ago those Palestinian people had hopes that the countries contiguous to Israel would be able to find a solution. The countries contiguous to Israel failed. Why? Because they are not as technologically developed as the people from Israel who have come from Europe and who have been through the ghettos of Europe and who had to fight the Nazis and fight many battles to free themselves or their remnants. The people of the Arab world were emerging from under foreign rule after they had been under the yoke of European colonialism following World War I. And they were sold down the river by the Sykes-Picot-Sazonov Agreement. Sazonov was not mentioned after the Revolution—as the Russians got nothing out of that secret Agreement. Now the Russians are coming into the area because they are a big Power. So what?

153. In 1919, I was a boy of fourteen; but in the 1920s I was a young man. I am a contemporary of those days. During the Revolution, after the battle of Tannenberg, the Russians turned over a copy of the secret Sykes-Picot-Sazonov Agreement—to whom? To the Germans. And the Germans sent it to their allies, to Istanbul. And Jamal Pasha, the Commander of the Fourth Army, sent a copy of it through emissaries—because the Arabs were fighting the Turks in those days—to Sherif Hussein, in Mecca—Sherif Hussein, the great-grandfather of the present King Hussein of Jordan. And what happened? Jamal Pasha sent a rider—I knew Jamal Pasha as a boy; I remember him very well—he sent a rider with a copy that was turned over by the Russians to the Germans, saying: “Look, we are all Moslems here. Why are you fighting us? Those Europeans want to partition your lands amongst themselves, and to

seize even the Province of Cilicia, a part of Turkey.” Amongst the wisest and most mature were the French; they later withdrew from Cilicia. Syria and Lebanon were put under a French mandate; Palestine was put under a British mandate; so was Iraq. I remember, in the twenties, how we were all inflamed, and that was how Pan-Arabism began to surge in our hearts. How we were misled after the war—our fathers, if not we who were children—misled into believing that we would be free from any foreign yoke. We found ourselves under a new form of colonialism in disguise: mandatory Powers whose rule was not terminated until about ten or fifteen years ago. We had our presidents and our republics, we had our kings, but we had overriding mandatory Powers, even in Iraq. The Palestinian people had a sovereignty, they were an entity, they had a personality; and in 1919 they constituted 94 per cent of the population.

154. By what yardstick of justice, whether the Covenant of the League of Nations or the Charter of the United Nations, can it be said that this is a *fait accompli* because there was a vote taken on the partition of Palestine and, as I said, by pressure they got a majority of the votes? I remember Mr. Vishinsky—may God rest his soul in peace, in spite of the fact that he had no belief in a Supreme Being. “There is no compulsion in religion”, as the Koran says. Faith is elective. It was Mr. Vishinsky who drew our attention to what he called the “mechanical majority” in those days. The Zionists were very influential in the Western world and they brought about this sad situation—sad for themselves as well as for us.

155. But leave aside the Arab Governments for the time being. Three years ago, I began to say, those Palestinians woke up. They gave up; they said: “These Arab Governments—we cannot depend on them any more. What is wrong with them? We cannot depend on them.” And what did these Palestinians do? They began to organize.

156. The Palestinians have organized and they want to retrieve their homeland. What is wrong with that? The Zionists no longer tell us that God gave them Palestine. Now they say it is a *fait accompli*, that the United Nations voted for the partition of Palestine and declared Israel an independent State. That is their premise. I say their premise is invalid, in the light of self-determination, in the light of the termination of colonial rule everywhere. And I come here as someone who, as I said, has been seized of this question since 1920. We have tried to reason with them, talking through the Council, and they begin reciting the names of the civilians who had been killed in the market. Some of our colleagues here are beginning to shed tears over the market and airport incidents. We all shed tears for people who die—I mean those who were killed in the market or in some airport, or anywhere else. We all shed tears for people who die regardless of their religion or their ideology.

157. But I have received from one of my colleagues here a letter [S/9110], which was circulated on 25 March 1969 and though I do not wish to engage in the same sort of cataloguing of names, for the benefit of Mr. Tekoah and for the benefit of those who are shedding tears for the said victims—whether they are Jews or gentiles—I do want to read a few of the names listed here in the document before

me. I will be doing exactly what Mr. Tekoah has been doing, still I will read a few names—the names of children: Fouad Ahmad Saleh, four years old; Hayysam Mustafa Sarda, five years old; Leitaf Mustafa Sardar, eight years; Fatima Ahmad Jossoumah, eleven years; Rajae Ahmad Saleh, one and a half; Bassam Mustafa Sardar, fourteen. Fourteen years old—he might have become a fighter, let me tell you. I told you yesterday [1467th meeting] how the mothers in the Arab world, some Palestinian mothers, feel because their children are imbued with that spirit for liberating their country leaving behind them such notes as “We are going to fight those who usurped our homeland”. Do you think any mother here would want her child to be killed? Many mothers here do not want their children to be drafted even when they are twenty-five. Nobody wants war.

158. Shall we follow the alternative methods of reciting: Let us condemn the Israelis as well as the Arab States and the commandos; let us be even-handed? “Even-handed”—that is both Mr. Goldberg’s and Mr. Rostow’s term, “even-handed”. Even Mr. Scranton used it. And what does even-handedness mean? It means that you have a balance there, the two pans of a balance, and you put the rights of the Palestinians into one and the rights of the Israelis into the other, and you are the arbiter, you are the one to read the balance, whether singly like my good friend Mr. Yost, or in association with those who are called the “Big Powers”. But who are you, all of you not belonging to the area, to be the arbiters of our destiny? Good Lord—it took me forty-five years to try and jolt you into a consciousness of this tragedy. No, this is not the way to resolve the problem.

159. Yesterday Mr. Tekoah referred to *Mein Kampf*. Look how he distorts things by saying *Mein Kampf* has been translated into Arabic. I did not read it in Arabic, I read only parts of it and I got tired because it was foolish. In fact, I read *Mein Kampf* in English. And the taste of Power must have gone into the heads of the Zionists that I would not be surprised if they wielded their influence to have *Mein Kampf* removed from the Library of Congress. Shame—because that book was translated into Arabic, the Arabs are Nazis. Why should they be? I am not a Nazi. The Mufti is not a Nazi. I have known him for years, and he is no Nazi even though he sought refuge in Germany. Would you have wanted him to seek refuge with Mr. Truman, who gave you Palestine? If he had stayed behind in the Middle East, he would have been rounded up right away because, then, the mandatory Powers had the upper hand. They had spies who were Arabs too, just as there are spies that are Jews—or Zionists; I do not wish to say “Jews” because I have many friends who are Jews but who are not Zionists. Zionism is a political movement predicated on, and motivated by, a noble religion which is Judaism. You are secular, all of you, the people in charge of the Israeli Government today. As you all will remember, in the Middle Ages and also in Tsarist Russia, and also in the France of Richelieu, as my good friend the Ambassador of France will recall, all the secular persons in power in the world surrounded themselves by the clergy, so as to give themselves a halo of wisdom and sanctity. But now when religion has lost its grip on people, the secular persons in power surround themselves with pseudo-professors to rationalize their policies. Mr. Tekoah recites information

gathered from Jordan. By whom? By spies. That is the trouble. In one of the organs of the United Nations they are trying to define aggression, and they have been at it for years. How can you define aggression when the big Powers and the small Powers who ape them have a network of spies? What are the spies for? For self-defence, of course, they say, to see where the weakness is and to strike.

160. There is a situation in Palestine whereby the Palestinian people have been aroused. Whether we like it or not is beside the point. These Palestinians shall fight until doomsday, or until some Arab authorities kill them or are killed by them. But these authorities cannot do that because the Arab people will not let them kill the Palestinians. Anyway, these Palestinians have a blacklist already and they will shoot like birds any Arab who will oppose them. I am not giving away any secret; this is symptomatic of national movements that grip a people and drive them into a psychosis, making them behave abnormally—just as the Zionists are acting abnormally. But as I said, these Zionists too have a cause. Only the location is wrong and may be likened to an oasis surrounded by a nest of wasps; I should say, several nests. You can kill wasps and then you do not know where others come from. And this is how it is going to be; I forewarn you. I may not be alive; it will take years and years, as it took the Crusades, only less. In the time of the Crusades there were no atomic Powers, no great Powers with interest in the area. But suppose there is a miscalculation and the great Powers get at each other’s throats and there is an explosion; will the whole world come to an end because Israel, the Zionists, have power all over the world and they want to use it through their media of information, through their financial operations, through the influence they wield in the Western world—and if you do not watch out they may also be wielding it even in the Soviet Union. These Zionists have the mentality of Samson, even if it is legendary, to pull down the pillars with their hands and say: “At last this is the end”. The pillars of the future are not in the hands of the Zionists. These pillars are indeed the young men who are returning to the Arab countries, some of whom came to my office and said: “You, Baroody, should join the revolution.” I asked, “What revolution?”. They said: “Action to upset the old régimes in the Arab countries. These régimes are no longer good”. Gentlemen, the future is not mine nor yours, it does not even belong to the intermediate generation. The new generation includes those between the ages of eighteen and thirty—and I do not know whether they are working for good or for evil. Only the future will tell.

161. Not only in our region, but in the whole world, we witness the revolution of youth. They have lost confidence in our politicians, in our men of religion, because our men of religion and our politicians have not kept abreast of social progress, economic development and the technology to cope with all those changes that brought about the vicissitudes of more than two decades ago. And we come here and talk placidly. I want to try to infuse some life into the Security Council, into the United Nations, before I sever my service with this Organization to which I have dedicated twenty-three years of my life.

162. Will you, gentlemen, on instructions from your Governments, come here and work out plans without

consulting the people who are directly concerned, the people of Palestine? Once in a while you talk with our respective Governments through your ambassadors. But whatever you do the core of the question lies in the self-determination of the Palestinian people, whether we like it or not. I say all this whilst I deplore violence whether it be against Jews or gentiles. Hence I do not want to continue reading the names of the innocent Arabs who were murdered. For as I have already said: "War is war."

163. Now, of course, the Israelis have the upper hand; they have the technology; they have the know-how to use modern weapons. They are provided by one of the big Powers with the most sophisticated weapons and they know how to use them. The Arabs, as I said, are emerging. They may not know how to use advanced weapons now, so they have to do what the French did against the Nazis, what the Russians did by the scorched earth policy against the Nazis, what any person does who cannot fight in battle. War is the art of deception. You do not go and tell your foe or your enemy—as in the days of chivalry—that you are going to fight a battle with him. War is the art of deception. Do you mean to say that those Palestinians should send word, as was done in the days of chivalry—when it was the knights at arms who fought in contests while the kings watched and then the king of the victor received the fealty or loyalty of the defeated knight on the other side? Those days are gone. War, unfortunately, is the art of deception, and the weaker party, never had the chance to elect a government during the mandate while our friends the British finally got so tired that they threw the whole thing in the lap of the United Nations. And the United Nations unjustly partitioned Palestine, waiving the Charter aside. In contravention of the principle of self-determination, which was elaborated into a right, the Palestinian people were not consulted. They were driven out of their country. And now you all talk here, including the representatives of the four big Powers, about what should be done, through Mr. Jarring. But with whom? With the Arab countries contiguous with Israel that have a dispute with Israel. But what about the Palestinian people who are the core of the problem? They are dispersed in the whole Arab world, including Saudi Arabia. Do you think they will heed even His Majesty King Faisal who supports their human rights anyway having said to me time and again: "You are a member of the United Nations; you believe in human rights". Since the days of the Crusades, the Christians gave up the idea that Jerusalem should belong to any sect, but that it should belong to the indigenous people who are there, whether Moslems, Christians, or Jews. And if we go by democratic principles, there are only seventeen million Jews in the world and Jerusalem is as sacred to the Christians and to the Moslems, so why, on the basis of religion, should Jerusalem be occupied by the Jews? Seventeen million Jews and 600 million Moslems to a thousand million or more Christians.

164. Now, take Buddhism. It started in India, but it took root in China and the Far East. Should the Chinese, because they are preponderantly Buddhist, say to India: "We should go and occupy the place where Buddha lived and flourished and taught", which is in India. That would be foolish. Why? Because Buddha to them is more important than to the Indians whose religion is still preponderantly Hinduism

rather than Buddhism. Buddhism has flourished more in China, in Japan, in Burma and South-East Asia. The Chinese would never think of such a thing. They would venerate and they would be happy that India produced a reformer, a great sage, a teacher like Buddha. But those Europeans from Eastern Europe that are descended from the Chazars use their noble religion which sprang from our area as a motivation for their political end—and they claim to be more Jewish than our Jews or more Semitic than our Semites. They use the term "anti-Semitic"—but they are Chazars of Turko-Finish origin from the northern tier of Central Asia.

165. If there is a conscience in the world—and conscience is a social entity which is difficult to define sometimes; but leave aside the word "conscience"—if there are standards for justice, I do not see how we can all beat around the bush. We cannot do that. And who is maligned? The Soviet Union. We have no relations with the Soviet Union—do not think I am just trying to court the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union is a Member of the United Nations. If the Soviets say that it is unjust to treat the Palestinians thus, it is said "Oh, they are looking after their own interests". But what about the other Powers—are they not looking after their own interests—their oil interests, their strategic interests? So why should not the Soviet Union look after its interests? But I say to all the big Powers, "Leave us alone!" But they will not leave us alone. They meet here to see how they can solve the problem of the Palestinian people without consulting the Palestinian representatives of the Palestinian people.

166. If we go on like this, I tell you sadly that this Organization will fall if wars continue to be perpetrated still outside the pale of the United Nations. I say this with a heavy heart. I am sure a man like U Thant, who is dedicated not only actively but even formally by filling his post, would also be one of the saddest men like everyone who is dedicated to the United Nations. If we are going to rationalize our violence, our atrocities, our terrorism, war, and cast by the wayside the lofty principles of the Charter, especially those that concern self-determination, I tell you we shall be only a window dressing before the world, we shall be the laughing stock of the world. Justice is justice, in action and not in words, not by lip service.

167. With the permission of the President, I would say, let there be a new orientation to this problem, not only through the deliberations of the four big Powers but, I hope, by a change of heart on the part of the leaders of Israel. They would know that in the long run, if the world does not explode and come to an end, they will be assimilated like the remnants of those Crusaders who in northern Arabia are known as the Sulbiyyah tribe. This tribe is of English, French and all kinds of European origin. We Arabized them, or they got Arabized—I do not know. Thirty or forty years from now, national boundaries will disappear. We are living in the age of computers; passports will be punch cards probably; religion will have been reassessed with other moral values. I do not say that there will be a universal religion, but the code of ethics will be universal in all religions, or in all ethical ideologies, if I may use the terminology of some of our friends around this table, who do not believe in religion as such. There will be a

humanism. If there is not a humanism, mankind will come to an end. It would not have to come to an end were it not for the ingenuity of man for devising those diabolical weapons of mass destruction.

168. Mr. President, you remember your laudable work in the Political Committee about bacteriological warfare. I heard later that certain Powers have all kinds of biological weapons—I am not a physicist. But they also possess ultrasonic weapons which would kill all creatures including people and leave the buildings erect and intact. What kind of *homo sapiens* is man? I hope the war in the Far East will soon come to an end. There seem to be good auguries that it will. I hope that people will not war against one another again and that lip service will not be given to what Isaiah said seven centuries before Christ; we can see that saying carved in stone, facing the entrance of the United Nations.

169. But we have to work for peace, not in theory but in practice. If the Israelis want life, if they are really motivated by religious sentiment, let them live there, not under the banner of Israël, and perhaps not under an Arab flag, if the Arabs would want to live with them side by side—I mean the Arabs of Palestine. It is not for me to say, it is for them to decide. I hope they will both opt one day for a binational State.

170. The age of prophecy is gone, but through my analysis and having lived for so long with this question, I can foresee what will happen if these things do not come to pass. The only solution would be a sort of brotherhood between Jews and Palestinian Arabs. We have witnessed foreign intrusions before. We have absorbed many peoples. I do not think the Zionists can absorb us because they are the minority. There will always be contention and dissent if the Zionists continue to establish themselves by force, always on the alert about who might attack them from outside and knowing very well in their innermost heart that the Arab Governments cannot coerce the Palestinians or compel them not to fight. It is indeed a tragedy fighting to retrieve one's homeland. And what will happen? There will always be fighting; always dissension; always marauders, and, who knows, maybe the Arabs may one day feel strong enough to have another contest; and then the Zionists will try again, singly or with others, to do the same thing. Would that not be a human tragedy even without miscalculation and confrontation taking place between the big Powers? And would it not be a human tragedy that the Holy Land of Palestine which is associated with the three monotheistic religions of the world, should become the ground for interminable strife? Finally, it is the innocent who suffer.

171. This is the picture I am drawing for the future so that the Council may ponder on what it should do before it comes to any decision with regard to this incident, which is only a passing incident, and other incidents that Israel or Jordan may bring before the Council.

172. Finally, I want to be frank with the representative of Israel across the table and say that in the long run the Israelis who are living there will say, "Ah, how we wished we were brothers of the Arabs without putting an emphasis on a nationality that brought all this trouble and tribulation."

173. In the light of what I have said, may I, with your permission Mr. President, and with the permission of members of the Council, reserve my right to address myself to any draft resolution that may emerge from your deliberations or private consultations, hoping that members of this Council, whose responsibility it is to preserve world peace, will consult—not because Baroody spoke, but because I happen to be a man of the area who has been seized of this problem for forty-nine years. It is in the light of my humble experience that I speak of what is happening in the Middle East. I say this in an attempt to open your eyes to the entity of this Palestinian people, hoping that you will consider very carefully the steps you may take for the future.

174. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I have at this time only a very few words to add to what I said yesterday.

175. We have heard repeated statements by the representatives of the parties, each accusing the other of a long series of premeditated acts of violence, each seeking to justify acts of violence on its side as necessary measures of self-defence, reprisal or liberation. We can certainly share the indignation of both sides at the cruel and repeated loss of innocent civilian lives which both have suffered.

176. The United States, for its part, however, cannot accept as justified any of these acts of violence by either side, particularly when by their character—bombs in supermarkets, or rockets from the air—they are inevitably indiscriminating and all too likely to result in the slaughter of innocent women and children.

177. We therefore believe that the Council, on this occasion as on previous similar occasions, should conclude its deliberations by condemning the immediate act of violence which has been brought before us, as well as condemning all other acts of violence which continue so frequently and so recklessly to violate the cease-fire.

178. In so doing, we shall once again impress on all the parties this Council's conviction that all these acts of violence are prejudicial to the peace of the area and the security of its peoples. In so doing, we shall also, I believe, best preserve a spirit of impartiality and conciliation among us on the Council, which will be most conducive to the success of our efforts—efforts about to be renewed with fresh vigour—to bring about at last a peaceful settlement of this tragic conflict.

179. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers on my list for this afternoon.

180. As members of the Council are fully aware, consultations are going on privately on the manner in which consideration of this item should be concluded, and on the document that might be produced as a result thereof. Since the meeting has been called with urgency I urge all members who are participating in those consultations to utilize all available time to reach an acceptable arrangement for the document that might be presented to the Council. The President will be available to the members of the Council at all times in order to contribute his efforts to the attainment of the best possible results. In view of this

situation, after having had a private exchange of views with the members of the Council, I have scheduled a meeting for 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, Saturday.

181. Before adjourning this meeting, I call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

182. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to limit myself to a brief remark on the following matter. Hitherto the Security Council, in reviewing such a discussion on events of this kind, has had the courage to discern a difference and to draw a distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. The new element which has arisen in today's situation lies in the fact that it is important not only to keep this distinction in view but also to bear in mind that the new act of aggression has been committed at a time when many think that there is a possibility of achieving

some results which would lead towards a political and peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem.

183. Therefore, acts of this kind, no matter what their reason or what justification is claimed in this Council, cannot help to bring about favourable conditions for such commendable efforts; on the contrary, they can only hinder them.

184. On the usual understanding I waive consecutive interpretation.

185. The PRESIDENT: As there has been no objection to the proposal to hold a meeting tomorrow at 11 a.m., I shall consider that it concurs with the wishes of all members of the Council.

*The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.*

---

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Напишите справки об изданиях в нашем 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.

---

82030