



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1472nd MEETING: 1 APRIL 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1472)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
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)	1
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)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 1 April 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. P. KHATRI (Nepal).

Adoption of the agenda

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.

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)

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1472)

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).

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)

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: I apologize to the Council for the delay in starting this meeting. Many intensive consultations had to be carried out before it could begin.
2. Before the adoption of the agenda, I have a pleasant duty to fulfil. I am sure I voice the feelings of all members of the Council when I pay tribute to my predecessor, Ambassador Csatorday of Hungary, for the great wisdom, courtesy and impartiality with which he conducted the meetings and consultations of the Council during his Presidency. The Council's consideration of the item on the agenda would probably have been completed under his leadership but for the sad event of the death of General Eisenhower, the thirty-fourth President of our host country. I am personally very grateful to the representative of Hungary for his whole-hearted co-operation in considering the convenience of all members of the Council in connexion with this meeting.
3. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for the very kind words you have just spoken about me. I wish to assure you of my full and unreserved support and co-operation during your term of office. I am certain that your Presidency will be characterized by the wisdom, tenacity and distinction that have always been associated with your activities at the United Nations. Your eminent qualities, Mr. President, are firm guarantees for the successful work of the Security Council.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the 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. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took places at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the questions before it. Members have before them in document S/9120 the joint draft resolution submitted by three delegations: Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia.

6. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, in January of this year we had the privilege of welcoming Nepal as a member of the Security Council. Now, in April, we have the great pleasure of congratulating you most heartily on your assumption of the Presidency of this august body. In doing so, my pleasure is the greater because Nepal and Pakistan are bound together by the friendliest of relations and historical and cultural ties. Your country, Sir, has the proud distinction of having successfully maintained its national independence and territorial integrity against onslaughts in the colonial era, and has followed a policy of maintaining good relations with all the great Powers. We have no doubt that under your wise guidance the Council will discharge its responsibilities with notable success.

7. I should also like to pay a tribute once again to Ambassador Károly Csatorday of Hungary who presided over this Council's deliberations last month. Ambassador Csatorday has been a zealous guardian of the prerogatives of the Security Council and always took particular care

personally to keep the members of the Security Council informed of the consultations. His wisdom and ability enabled the Council to carry out its duties in a month that turned out to be quite eventful.

8. On behalf of the delegation of Senegal, Zambia and Pakistan, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution circulated on Saturday in document S/9120. It is not necessary for me to give an elaborate explanation of that draft resolution. This is so because the text introduces no elements beyond those which are contained in resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968) adopted by the Security Council last year. We cannot claim to have made a new departure. We do not seek to set up a new precedent. Indeed, this is the second time within the space of a few weeks that my delegation commends for adoption by the Security Council a text which does not fully accord with its own considered view of the requirements of the situation, but which represents a point of compromise.

9. Had we wished to propose a draft resolution on the basis of the firm convictions which I expressed on behalf of my delegation earlier in this debate [*1468th meeting*] and which are independently and forcefully held by many other Member States, it would have been an altogether different text. We would then have proposed that the Security Council follow the logic of its previous resolutions and take due account of Israel's failure to desist from its pre-planned military attacks on the territory of Jordan or of any other Arab State. That would have meant the Council considering here and now the more effective steps or measures of which a solemn warning was issued to Israel twice.

✓ 10. But, as we all know, the Security Council proceeds by way of accommodation and compromise. The present draft resolution is the result of prolonged consultations not only among the Asian-African members of the Security Council, but also with other permanent and non-permanent members. During those consultations the sponsors made every effort to accommodate the points of view of the permanent members concerned. The text represents the maximum extent to which such accommodations could be made.

11. We feel that the original text of the African-Asian draft resolution took more adequate note of the aggravation of the situation which has been caused by the repetition of the air attacks launched before by Israel. However, in the interest of agreement and mindful of the necessity of trying to prevent a division among the permanent members of the Security Council on the eve of the projected four-Power talks, the three sponsors went to great lengths in diluting the terms of the draft resolution that they would otherwise have done.

12. We regret that it has not been possible for us to present a text which would command unanimity and at the same time not compromise the basic principles or the balance of equity embodied in resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968) of the Security Council. While anxious to prevent any division among the members of the Council, we could not possibly discard the fact that the situation which is at present being considered by the Council has deteriorated beyond that which led to the adoption of the earlier resolution.

13. At the time the Security Council adopted resolution 248 (1968), it was confronted with one major attack. At the time it adopted resolution 256 (1968), it was confronted with at least two such attacks. Today, the Council is to take into account a series of these attacks, which it is sought to justify by a new aggressive doctrine of so-called active self-defence.

14. After those preliminary remarks, I shall now deal briefly with the various paragraphs of the draft resolution.

15. The third preambular paragraph merely reaffirms some earlier resolutions of the Security Council. In selecting the resolutions which are to be reaffirmed, as well as the choice of language to refer to their provisions, the sponsors have made important concessions to the viewpoint of one of the permanent members of the Security Council by including a reference to Security Council resolution 236 (1967). As far as we are concerned, we feel that it was necessary to recall only resolutions 248 (1968), 256 (1968) and 262 (1968), because those were the most pertinent to the present situation.

16. The fourth preambular paragraph also takes into account the anxiety of certain permanent members to maintain what they consider to be a balance. However, it was compellingly clear that we could not distribute equal emphasis between premeditated attacks launched by a Government and sporadic violent acts by a resistance movement directed against foreign military occupation.

17. The final preambular paragraph also represents a concession made to the viewpoint of some permanent members.

18. The two operative paragraphs speak for themselves. The first is entirely humanitarian. As regards the second, we have, I confess, with some reluctance, contented ourselves with the language of earlier resolutions.

19. In the interest of preserving the right climate on the eve of the four-Power talks, and despite the grave setback that has been caused by the actions and utterances of one party, I shall refrain from describing the acts which are the subject of condemnation in the present draft resolution. All we ask is that the Council should not totally abdicate its responsibility in the present situation and disregard the commitment it has made in the earlier resolutions. If the Council is not oblivious of its solemn commitments under the Charter, it cannot remain silent in the face of the situation brought to its attention. The least—the very least—that it can do is to adopt the draft resolution which is being proposed by the delegations of Senegal, Zambia and my own. I earnestly commend the draft resolution for adoption by the Security Council.

20. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan for the extremely generous words addressed to me. I know that the message of good wishes has in large measure been prompted by the happy relations of friendship existing between Pakistan and Nepal.

21. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Mr. President, allow me to express my great satisfaction in seeing you preside over our

proceedings during the current month of April. We count on your leadership and proved ability to guide us in the crucial debates that lie ahead.

22. The Zambian delegation joins you, Mr. President, and other representatives in expressing our great satisfaction to your predecessor, Ambassador Csatorday of Hungary, who showed indisputable competence during his memorable term of office. We also salute him for his courtesy, fairness and unparalleled linguistic ability.

23. The debate we have just resumed is neither new nor unprecedented. We are concerned again with renewed acts of violence and recrimination, attacks and counter-attacks, hopes and frustration. I am tempted to say that we are now running short of possible measures and even running short of vocabulary to describe the cycle of violence in this hypersensitive area.

24. It is not my intention at this stage in our debate on the Middle East crisis to saddle this august Council with facts and figures to dramatize the lachrymatory results of the air attacks on the civilian villages and rest homes in Jordan. We feel strongly that the tragedy before us needs cool heads, and whipped-up emotions are certainly not likely to be in the interests of peace in the area. Thus, while we mourn with the bereaved, while we bury our dead, let us face the future with determination, resolution and hope to ensure that neither side—and I repeat, neither side—should be visited by the ever-gathering tribulations of the past twenty years.

25. I should like to spell out our duty in this Council today. First, we should ensure that the distressed indigenous inhabitants of Palestine have their rights restored to them. They have suffered long enough and we must now positively respond to their cry for justice and equity. We should not forget that their sufferings are the legacy of this Council; for this very Council, by a decision of the permanent members, cannot absolve itself of the fact, whether we like it or not, that it was instrumental in the creation of the State of Israel. Our second duty, therefore, is to ensure that that territorial and political entity called Israel not only survives, but is allowed to exist in peace.

26. That brings us to the third imperative, which is the recognition and practical establishment of the true and not putative boundaries of all States in the area. In blunt terms, we must return to the boundaries which we all knew before 5 June 1967; for, inasmuch as we accept the fact that Israel does exist, a fact recognized by the United Nations and this Council, we also believe that no country has or should have the licence to acquire territory by the might of the sword—to use an anachronistic term at a time when bombing has taken the place of the sword.

27. We all know that it is not easy to achieve the three goals that I have outlined; and yet I believe that unless these three goals are attained there can be no peace in the area. It is therefore imperative for all of us that we should get to the root cause of the problem if such a disastrous prospect is to be avoided.

28. For those who have made sufficient efforts to try to help in finding a solution to the Middle East crisis, two considerations have always made themselves manifest: first, there is the fate of the Palestinian refugees and, second, there is the security of the State of Israel and all the States in the area.

29. In the course of this debate some members have made reference to the plight of the Palestinians. In particular, the very enlightened contribution of the representative of Saudi Arabia has helped to emphasize that aspect of the tragedy. While we may conclude this debate without the participation of the Palestinians themselves, I consider it absolutely vital that they should participate positively in efforts such as this to try to find a just and equitable solution.

30. The representative of Israel, on the other hand, has also pleaded again and again for the right of Israel to exist as a State. Indeed, at one stage the picture painted in this Council was so gloomy that it gave one the impression that the Israelis were seeing themselves as a persecuted people *contra mundum*. We shall have failed in our efforts if we do not regain the confidence of all the people in the area. We must not only strive, but also be seen to strive to be resolved that neither side is *contra mundum*. This Council must indicate in no uncertain terms that it is not interested in rhetorical callisthenics, but rather in the solution of the problem in the interests of all the people in the area.

31. Thus, to come back to the draft resolution before us, we should like to emphasize that we do not believe that might is necessarily right. As we said before, there can be no world order if any State believes that its military advantages should give it the licence to invade and attack with impunity the territory of another. We are not so naive as to believe, however, that there will be no friction between any group of States. Nevertheless, we believe equally that military force creates more problems than it attempts to resolve. This, I am afraid, is at the very core of the matter in hand.

32. We are all too familiar with the excuse in international affairs that when a country is beset with domestic problems, there is always a tendency to find solace in external ventures. However that might draw away the attention of the electorate from the diseased body politic, it is certainly not the answer to the problems that confront us. Our colleagues in Israel cannot, therefore, run away from the cardinal issue, which is the restitution of the rights of the Palestinians; nor can they expect us to support them in their expansionist policies.

33. When all this is said, we should like to reiterate the important point made by several delegations, namely, that whatever we do we should not do anything that is likely to jeopardize the commendable efforts of the Big Four in their search for peace in the Middle East crisis. We certainly deprecate some of the statements attributed to the leaders of some of the parties to the conflict which are destined to torpedo the efforts of the Big Four, especially those leaders the very recognition and indeed creation of whose States owe so much to the Big Four.

34. It is because of our desire for peace in the Middle East, our belief that territorial aggrandizement is not conducive

to peace in the area, and our concern for the welfare of the Palestinian refugees that we cannot but find Israel at fault for carrying out that unprovoked and premeditated savage attack on Jordan, which we strongly condemn. We should not be blinded by the awesome theory that there is a guerrilla fighter behind every bush in Jordan. For if we accept that premise, we cannot but come face to face with the next logical conclusion, namely, that every bush in Jordan must be scorched, thus bringing to naught all the efforts that we have made so far.

35. It is our hope, therefore, that the adoption of this draft resolution, which Mr. Shahi, the representative of Pakistan, has very ably presented on our behalf, will bring about the necessary restraint which is absolutely vital in the interests of all.

36. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zambia for the kind words which he addressed to me.

37. Mr. YOST (United States of America): Mr. President, I am happy to join my colleagues in welcoming you to the Presidency of the Council. It will be a great satisfaction to us to work under your wise leadership and we look forward to your Presidency.

38. I have asked for the floor to speak briefly in explanation of the vote which we shall be casting upon the draft resolution before us.

39. The United States delegation would certainly have wished to vote for a draft resolution condemning the Israeli air attack of 26 March. As we have repeatedly said, we condemn all violations of the cease-fire. We particularly and most strongly condemn air attacks, where, whatever the object of the attack may be, innocent lives are almost certain to be sacrificed.

40. We do not think attacks of this kind, which are bound to be indiscriminate in their effects, if not in their intent, can in any way be justified by describing them as "active defence". We consider them to be in the highest degree counter-productive even from this point of view. Not only do they almost inevitably result, as I have said, in the slaughter of innocent people but, in so doing, they aggravate even further bitter and uncompromising feelings toward Israel in the countries suffering those losses. The Israeli Government has just called once again for "the advancement of negotiations between the Arab States and Israel for the establishment of a true peace in the Middle East". We do not believe that it is itself "advancing" such negotiations by a policy of "active defence", that is, of necessarily indiscriminate air attacks on the people with whom it wishes to negotiate.

41. We therefore most firmly condemn these attacks and call upon Israel, in the interest of all the efforts toward peace which are being made within the framework of this Council, to cease such attacks forthwith.

42. On the other hand, as I have said in earlier statements, we consider it would be both unjust and unrealistic to treat these air attacks in isolation. There can be no question that they are provoked by equally indiscriminating attacks on

innocent Israeli civilians in markets, in schools, in cinemas, in commercial aircraft. We condemn such attacks equally and just as strongly and call upon those in a position to do so to take all action possible to bring them to an end. The fact that one set of attacks is carried out by regular and the other by irregular forces is no consolation to the innocent victims, their relatives and their compatriots. Death is just as final and as shocking whether it comes from a bomb in a supermarket or from a bomb from the air. Nor is it justified by the fact that those who planted it are resisting occupation, any more than the air attacks are justified because their authors are seeking recognition of their national existence and a stable peace.

43. Because the draft resolution before us concentrates in its operative paragraphs exclusively on one kind of violence and ignores the other kind of violence which provokes it, we find the draft resolution unbalanced, unrealistic and unlikely to move the parties to the conflict toward a peaceful solution.

44. The preamble observes that "numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire have occurred", but the operative paragraphs deal only with one particular type of violation and overlook all others. Had the sponsors of the draft resolution been willing to add a simple operative paragraph condemning or deploring all violations of the cease-fire, we should have been able to support it. As it now stands we cannot. We reiterate, however, that our abstention should not be interpreted in any sense as condoning the kind of violence which the draft resolution condemns, any more than we condone any other kinds of violence in the area or any violations whatsoever of this Council's cease-fire resolutions.

45. Finally, let me once again most earnestly urge all the parties to this conflict to co-operate sincerely and effectively with Ambassador Jarring and with all others who are working for peace in the Middle East, and at long last to act in the spirit of conciliation and compromise which is required from all sides if the peacemakers are to succeed.

46. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

47. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): My delegation would wish to associate itself with the tributes already paid to the retiring President, Ambassador Csatorday, and in particular for the brisk efficiency with which he carried through the business of the Council.

48. My delegation would also, Sir, wish to offer a particularly warm welcome to you as President of the Council. My countrymen have admired your countrymen for a very long time and we have had a very close comradeship which I hope will be continued now between our two sovereign States in the search for peace and a better world.

49. Mr. President, my delegation condemns the brutal attack on Salt. My delegation particularly dislikes the manner and method of the attack. Indiscriminate bombing from the air is particularly repugnant to my delegation. My delegation would therefore wish to mark this clearly by voting for a strong condemnatory resolution.

50. But, as I said in my speech on 28 March [1468th meeting], we believe that all actions, outside and inside the Council, should now be judged by whether or not they forward peace. Consequently my delegation in considering the present resolution bears two things in mind.

51. First, the deep need to maintain the unanimity of the Council which has hardly been broken on cease-fire resolutions since 1967, and which is more important at this juncture than ever before.

52. Secondly, the need for the Council to make some minimum acknowledgement of the over-all situation throughout the area in the context of which it is the duty of the Council to consider individual incidents.

53. My delegation would be greatly saddened by any untimely split in the Council which would damage the authority of the Council in this dangerous area, and can hardly help the search for peace. Whose responsibility is this split? Is it really necessary? My delegation would be prepared to vote for the draft resolution, as it stands, that is to say overwhelmingly concerned with the incident before us and condemning it in the most forthright language, if there could have been added a very short and simple paragraph deploring all violations of the cease-fire.

54. We in the Council spend hours in semantic battles haggling ingeniously over every comma and every possible nuance. But I can say that in the opinion of my delegation such a paragraph would do no more than state the obvious duty of the Council. The outside world as a whole will surely scratch its head as to why the Council cannot at this delicate and important stage, in the most general terms and without any specific reference to either side, recognize the general state of violence that undeniably exists and deplore all violations of the cease-fire resolution which the Council itself has passed—and this is the course of a draft resolution overwhelmingly concerned with the incident at Salt and condemning it in the strongest terms. I cannot really see that this simple obvious addition in any way compromises principles or disturbs the balance of equity.

55. I therefore make a most sincere appeal to the sponsors to bear in mind the wider and longer-term responsibility of this Council, the vital search for peace, and not disturb the unanimity of the Council, I greatly regret that failing such an addition my delegation will not be able to support the draft resolution.

56. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the generous words he addressed to me. I wish to assure him that those sentiments of friendship are reciprocated.

57. I call on the representative of Jordan.

58. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): It is indeed a pleasure for my delegation to see you, Mr. President, presiding over our deliberations. Knowing your statesmanship and wisdom, I feel certain that the deliberations of the Council during this month will be fruitful and most helpful.

59. In December 1968, in the wake of the Israeli attack against the International Airport of Beirut, the Security

Council held an emergency meeting [1460th to 1462nd meetings] and unanimously condemned Israel "for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions" [resolution 262 (1968)]. The Security Council issued a solemn warning that, should Israeli attacks be repeated, it would proceed to consider applying more effective measures "to give effect to its decisions".

60. You may recall that, prior to requesting this emergency session, we had reported to the Council continued air attacks against civilian targets and Jordanian citizens in the East Bank. In our opening statement [1466th meeting] we gave a detailed description of the numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire. The attack of 26 March on Ein Hazar left no room for doubt that those air attacks have become a routine operation and will continue indefinitely unless checked by this Council. We have already shown that these are not acts of reprisal, but a vicious and cunning device designed to crush the people's will to resist Israeli aggression.

61. In bringing our complaint before the Security Council we were expecting that this body would this time in fact adopt "more effective measures" to prevent repetition. In our complaint [S/9113]¹ and in our opening statement we referred to equally serious attacks against civilian centres and people. Some of those air strikes were carried out in the vicinity of Amman, the capital of Jordan.

62. In the light of this background it seemed clear that the only way open to the Security Council to prevent further attacks against Jordan lay in the application of Chapter VII of the Charter. However, the view was expressed that there was a need to preserve the unanimity of the Security Council, since a serious public split now, just as the Big Four are entering upon an important new stage of the joint search for peace, would bring a set-back. Much as we should like to ensure the most favourable climate for the proposed Big Four discussions, we do not fully subscribe to this view. However, in a spirit of compromise, we have not insisted on our legitimate request for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in which we saw the only deterrent to the continued Israeli aggression.

63. We welcome the initiative that led to the agreement of the Big Four to hold discussions on the Middle East. The success of the big Powers, however, will depend on their determination to uphold the basic principles of justice in their search for a Middle East settlement. Since armed aggression constitutes an obstacle to the success of those talks, its complete elimination should be the first objective.

64. We have grave doubts that the draft resolution now before you would lead to this result. I am sure that all members of the Security Council already know that the Israeli Government has decided in advance to reject the plan for a meeting of the Big Four. Reporting from Israel in *The New York Times* of yesterday, 31 March, James Feron said:

"Israel today formally rejected in advance any Big Four recommendation on the Middle East that conflicts with her vital interests, rights and security."

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1969, pages 142-143.*

He continued:

"In a statement issued after a Cabinet meeting, the Government [of Israel] said that it specifically opposed 'any settlement and any procedure that is not agreed upon by the Governments concerned'."

65. What the Israeli statement in effect is saying is: "Either a settlement on Israeli terms, or continued warfare". They are opposed to peace, and opposed to any outside effort for peace, either by the Security Council or by the Big Four. They are even opposed to procedure here.

66. Before I conclude I should like to answer two points raised by Mr. Tekoah in order to keep the record straight.

67. In my statement before the Security Council last Saturday [1470th meeting], I referred to the old British martial laws applied by Israel in the occupied territories. I emphasized the fact that both the former and the present Israeli Ministers of Justice declared them unjust. The former Minister called them "laws which no respected citizen should abide by". The present Minister of Justice described them as "laws that do not exist in any civilized country; even Nazi Germany did not have such laws". Those laws were condemned by many Israelis and were also deplored by many Jewish lawyers in Palestine prior to the creation of Israel.

68. Mr. Tekoah did not explain why this harsh legislation should be applied for bulldozing villages and destroying 250 houses on the mere suspicion of the presence there of resistance individuals. He did not explain the arbitrary arrests, the torture, the terrorism, the imprisonment without trial, the persecution of the Church and clergymen, such as the Anglican Reverend Elia Khouri, the blowing-up of houses, the wholesale attacks on people suspected of being responsible for acts of resistance, the annexation of territories, the curfews and other acts of persecution on the basis of those inhuman laws.

69. In an attempt to evade an answer to all these questions Mr. Tekoah said to the Council [1470th meeting, para. 72] that I had forgotten to mention a decisive fact in this picture, namely, that those laws are also Jordanian laws applicable in the West Bank and were therefore applied by Israel in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law. This statement made by Mr. Tekoah constitutes another malicious distortion by the Israeli representative. It is a deliberate Israel lie. The truth, of the matter is that we do not have one legislation in Jordan for the East Bank and another one for the West Bank. We have one legislation for the whole country and it does not have the remotest connexion with or similarity to the old British Mandatory emergency laws which prevailed prior to the partition of Palestine. The Mandatory Laws were revoked a day after the end of the British Mandate, that is, on 16 May 1948, and I refer Mr. Tekoah to Law No. 20, published in the *Official Gazette* of 1948. The official records show this as a fact and Mr. Tekoah has to look for other pretexts to justify the crimes now being committed in the West Bank of Jordan.

70. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the prisoner Tamimi, who, according to the information received, was murdered by the

Israeli authorities in prison. He said that the medical examination has refuted the allegations I had voiced in this Council. If Mr. Tekoah's statement is true, why did they not permit the Red Cross doctor to examine the body of Mr. Tamimi? We requested that. The Israelis have firmly refused an examination by an Arab doctor in the West Bank of Jordan or by any Red Cross physician. Indeed, this explains why Israel has so far refused to grant admission to the Secretary-General's representative to go to the area and report to the Security Council on the charges made by my delegation. Such an investigation would be in conformity with the decision of the Security Council that was adopted unanimously.

71. This and other humanitarian decisions, according to Mr. Tekoah, do not make a constructive contribution to a solution of the Middle East crisis? Even when they are unanimously adopted by this body they are still considered one-sided resolutions by the Israeli authorities. It is clear therefore that only what meets with Israel's approval and only what is in line with Israeli interests, as the Israelis see it, is accepted by Israel.

72. In his statement here Mr. Tekoah described the reaction of the people in the occupied parts of Jordan to Israeli oppression as "terrorism". It may be of interest to recall that at the very same time when Mr. Tekoah was emphasizing to the Council that Arab terrorists operate from outside the occupied territories, officials in Israel were stating—and this is reported in *The New York Times* of Sunday—that the resistance takes place both from within and from without the occupied territories.

73. This brings me to the statement we heard a little while ago from our United States colleague. In a previous meeting [1467th meeting] he referred to the supermarket bomb and the cafeteria bomb. Today we heard him referring to bombs in schools, cinemas and supermarkets within the area occupied by Israel and also within the area occupied by Israel prior to 5 June. I have not seen any piece of evidence, any iota of evidence, showing that the bombs that exploded, whether in a cinema or a cafeteria or a supermarket, were planted by the Jordanian authorities or by individuals coming from Jordan.

74. I see official statements by Israel saying that 250 houses were destroyed because they belonged to those people suspected—suspected—of having planted the bombs. Israel itself, on mere suspicion, destroys 250 houses and admits it in an official statement. *The New York Times* of Sunday, 30 March 1969, states: "An Israeli military official estimated last week that the occupation authorities had destroyed more than 250 homes of suspected"—on mere suspicion—"terrorists since the 1967 war."

75. How can the Council, faithful to its Charter, to the authority vested in it, come and impute to Jordan what even the Israelis could not impute to Jordan? Even if the United States tells us that it is so, I do not think that the Council in its wisdom would accept the United States statement. There is no evidence before the Council. The Council goes by evidence, not by hearsay statements. As I said, the evidence shows that there is resistance from within. We cannot cite bombs in supermarkets or any other

bombs unless we have evidence that they were planted by X, for whose acts Jordan can be responsible.

76. I said and I say again today that this resistance will continue, that we have no control over it, and that we have no apology to make to the United States or to the Israelis for these legitimate acts. Defending one's homeland is certainly a defensive right enshrined in the Charter and endorsed by the very jurisprudence of the United Nations, and if all the people of Jordan decide to rise—and we have one people in the West Bank and in the East Bank, one people having one Constitution, enjoying the same right—to repel the Israel aggression, that is their legitimate right: it is their legitimate God-given human right.

77. In March 1938, Streicher, one of the Nazi leaders, said, "We are approaching wonderful times—a greater Germany without Jews". Today, the Zionist leaders are inspired by the same destructive thinking. They arrogantly speak of and work for a greater Israel without Arabs. Are the Arabs in this case entitled to resist this Nazi-like design? This is the question that should be considered by the Security Council. We welcome a debate of that very question in this very Security Council.

78. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Jordan for the kind words he has addressed to me.

79. I call now on the representative of Israel.

80. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, my delegation takes this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for the coming month. We hold you and your great country in the highest esteem and look forward to your wise guidance of the Security Council's work.

81. I should also like to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Hungary, for the way in which he conducted our deliberations in the Council last month.

82. The representative of Jordan insists on continuing a discussion of the nature of British Mandatory laws. If he has any complaints about the nature of those laws, I think he should address them to the United Kingdom.

83. As for the laws applied by Israel on the West Bank in security measures against agents of terror warfare, they are Jordanian laws which include emergency regulations inherited by Israel and by Jordan from the time when legislation was of British origin.

84. The representative of Jordan tries to rebut the well-known fact that terror warfare is organized by Arab Governments and conducted from Arab territory by marauders armed, trained and supplied by the Arab Governments. I would suggest that he refer to the communiqués issued by the Amman headquarters of El-Fatah and other terror organizations which have no inhibitions at all about taking credit for the murder of Israeli civilians in schools, supermarkets and cinemas.

85. Two fundamental premises have become clear in the course of our present debate. First, as long as the Jordanian

Government glamorizes, as its representative did today, murder for the sake of murder, and initiates, organizes and supports terror warfare against Israel, it must be considered responsible for a continual and dangerous violation of international law and for a crime against humanity of the utmost gravity. Israel will hold the Jordanian Government responsible for that crime. And second, nothing that has been said or submitted here by the representative of Jordan could alter or affect in the least the nature of the Ein Hazar base, disabled in the Israeli action on 26 March, as an encampment of the terror organizations; nor has anything been said or submitted here that alters or affects the nefarious purpose for which the Ein Hazar base served.

86. I should like to quote from an eye-witness account of one who visited the area several weeks ago and reported on his conversations with the marauders and their commanders. I am reading from the *Daily Mail* of 14 June 1969. An Arab commando leader told reporter Bernard Jordan: "They are going up-country tomorrow. They have simple orders: 'Kill Jews'. No, we don't care whether the dead are civilians or soldiers, just as long as they are Jews." Then, in the same eye-witness report we find that commando leader recorded as remarking, when listening to a radio report on a terror raid against Israel: "Only two Jews killed tonight. Disappointing. Never mind—another two Jewish families will be mourning."

87. This is what the Jordanian delegation and its supporters would like the Security Council to condone.

88. The one-sided draft resolution before the Council; its perversion of the nature of Israel's defence action on 26 March 1969; its blatant misrepresentation of the action's targets; its disregard for continuing Arab aggression; its distortion of even the contents of previous Security Council resolutions—all these can only batter even more the already badly battered virtues of truth and equity.

89. As I read the text of the draft resolution I cannot help remembering the ancient Hebrew story of the man whose execution was ordered because of a false charge brought against him. As he was being led out to be executed, he saw his wife weeping. He turned to her and asked, "Why do you weep?", and she replied, "Why should I not weep, seeing that they are putting you to death although you have done no wrong". The man replied, "Do you then prefer that they should execute me because I have done wrong?"

90. Thus it is with the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council, except for one thing: Israel does not have the slightest intention of allowing itself to be executed.

91. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representatives of Israel for the kind words he has spoken with respect to me.

92. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to associate the Soviet Union with the congratulations and kind words addressed to you on your assumption of the eminent and honoured post of President of the Security Council. We wish to express our great satisfaction at this, first of all because we see the President's chair occupied by the representative of a friendly country; secondly because

we have already welcomed and wish to welcome again your first appearance in the Security Council; and thirdly we regard you and those of your colleagues who have swelled the ranks of the Security Council since the twenty-third session of the General Assembly as a transfusion of new blood into the Council, to promote our joint work for the maintenance and strengthening of peace and international security.

93. We wish you every success in your forthcoming noble work as President of the Security Council, and we hope that the month of your Presidency will be peaceful, after we have concluded our consideration of this unpleasant question with which we are now obliged to deal and which has arisen as the result of a fresh act of aggression perpetrated by Israel against Jordan.

94. My introductory remarks would be incomplete if I were to omit any mention of your predecessor. I too should like to associate myself with the good wishes addressed to your predecessor 'Comrade Csatorday, the Permanent Representative of Hungary. I should like to express our great satisfaction at his excellent and capable guidance of the deliberations while he held the post of President of the Security Council, his diligence, his great erudition and his thorough knowledge of international problems. I should also like to associate myself with the statement of the representative of Pakistan, the distinguished Ambassador Shahj, to the effect that you, Comrade Csatorday, as President of the Security Council, strictly adhered to the Charter and concerned yourself with the rights, obligations and competence conferred by it upon the Security Council. I should also like to point out once again that the period of your Presidency of the Council coincided with an important national event in your country, the celebration of a great historical jubilee, the fiftieth anniversary of the Hungarian People's Republic.

95. Another unique circumstance should not be passed over in silence. I do not think that in all its history the Security Council has ever had a President who conducted the Council's meetings in all the official languages of the United Nations. This is a singular event, which was even mentioned recently in one of the United States newspapers, which, as we all know, are not particularly inclined to make favourable references to the representatives of socialist States. We therefore feel compelled to mention this unusual event and to wish you good health and great success in your noble work.

96. Mr. President, the Council is in fact taking stock of its debate on the question raised by the Government of Jordan and by its official representative Ambassador El-Farra, its debate on the question of a fresh act of aggression by Israel against an Arab country, Jordan.

97. What are the main conclusions we can draw? All the members of the Security Council have unanimously censured these acts of Israel. Every one has referred to the inadmissibility of a repetition of acts of this kind. The majority, in any case, have also drawn attention to the very important new fact that such acts by the ruling circles of Israel cannot be regarded otherwise than as their determination to undermine all efforts directed towards a peaceful

political settlement in the Near East and towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 of 22 November 1967.

98. The representative of Jordan cited in his statement today a United States newspaper which as a rule publishes extremely pro-Israel information in its pages. Apparently, therefore, what it reports about official statements by Israel does correspond to the facts. The extract from this newspaper's reports cited by the representative of Jordan refers to a report that the ruling circles of Israel are already declaring that they will pay no attention to the views of those who are sincerely striving for a peaceful political settlement in the Near East. This is highly symptomatic and should put us on our guard.

99. The main conclusion to be drawn from the Security Council's discussion of this item on its agenda is that none of the members of the Security Council has attempted to justify the policy pursued by Israel, which is a policy of aggression against its neighbouring States. This is the most important conclusion. Let us hope that the most reasonable elements among the ruling circles of Israel will themselves draw the appropriate conclusion from this discussion and its results.

100. At the the same time, in taking stock of this discussion our conclusions would be incomplete if we failed to take note of what I would call the melancholy fact that certain members of the Security Council have obviously tried to lump together or, as the English say, "to put in the same boat" questions which are intrinsically completely different. They have tried to introduce into the Security Council's debate and to reflect in its resolution a question which is entirely different from the one on the Council's agenda. In actual fact, both in practice and in theory, the problem before the Security Council is that of the struggle of the Arab peoples for national liberation, the expansion and intensification of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, the peoples of the Arab world, who have been fighting and are continuing to fight against foreign domination and foreign occupation, and are waging a war of liberation against foreign invaders who have occupied their territory and have, if only temporarily, enslaved their population.

101. We have heard statements here urging that, in discussing this question, the same yardstick should be used for the aggressor and for the victim of aggression. We wish to express our firm conviction that the Security Council will not follow that course.

102. We are bound to point out that the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council for consideration are the representatives of three new sovereign States on the two continents, Asia and Africa, which have suffered most from colonial domination, from the yoke of colonialism and imperialism.

103. The post-war development of national liberation movements and national revolutions has been crowned with brilliant success: about 70 new States have appeared on the map of the world and nearly all, if not quite all, of them are now represented at the United Nations and a considerable

number of them in the Security Council. This is one of the most outstanding results of the Second World War and of the heroic struggle which the Soviet peoples, together with the peoples of the other allied and united nations, waged against Hitler's *Wehrmacht*, against the design of the German Fascists to enslave the whole world and establish the domination of the German Reich over it for a thousand years.

104. Imperialism and colonialism have tried to counteract and hinder this noble struggle of national liberation movements and national liberation revolution. But they have proved powerless, for the national liberation revolution is an irreversible process and no forces can stand in its way. Even if they try to hinder the process, their efforts are bound to be in vain.

105. Israel, by the will of fate and by the will of those who are supporting and protecting it, has in fact become a tool against the Arab world in the hands of those who are trying to hinder this natural process of national liberation revolutions in the Near East. But this attempt also has no prospect of success.

106. The fact that, on the eve of the beginning of genuine efforts to reach a peaceful political settlement, the Security Council is obliged to examine such a grave new act of aggression is both symptomatic and extremely deplorable. I have no doubt that the Governments of the Arab countries, their distinguished representatives here and all those who sincerely wish for a peaceful settlement in the Near East would have greatly preferred this question not to be before the Security Council today. (The representative of Jordan is looking my way and seems to agree with me.)

107. The atmosphere would have been more favourable for beginning serious efforts towards a peaceful settlement in the Near East; but unfortunately this does not depend on the Arab countries or on the Arab representatives. In committing its act of aggression, Israel was apparently pursuing quite different aims. Its policy does not seem to include any serious intention to co-operate wholeheartedly with all those who really wish for a peaceful settlement in the Near East and are striving to achieve it. This is the only explanation of a new act of aggression at this particular time.

108. Israel has resorted to air raids. This is the blind vengeance of desperation. And no one in the whole world, no more than anyone in the Security Council at this meeting, can justify this vicious, blind vengeance of Israel against the Arab world, against the people of Jordan and against those victims whose sufferings we can now see from the photographs circulated by the Jordan delegation among the members of the Security Council [S/9121].

109. Some doubts have been expressed here lest the adoption of the draft resolution, sponsored, as I have already said, by the representative of the three countries of the African and Asian continents, might have an unfavourable effect on negotiations for a settlement in the Near East. We cannot share those doubts or agree with them. The adoption of this draft resolution can only arouse regret that it is so weak and that in the actual circumstances, in actual

present-day conditions, we need a stronger resolution against those who are undermining international peace, complicating the international situation and aggravating tension by their aggressive actions. But insofar as the Arab countries and the sponsors consider this resolution to be the necessary minimum which must be adopted at this meeting of the Security Council the Soviet delegation intends to support it.

110. It has been asserted here that the adoption of the resolution might introduce a "split". A split between whom? I am firmly convinced that the adoption of this resolution will be yet another serious and stringent warning to those who are trying to put spokes in the wheel and to undermine praiseworthy efforts directed towards the peaceful settlement of the Near Eastern question. With whom can there be a split? With those who are conducting a policy of aggression. But, as they say, God grant and may it please Allah that there should always be a split between the Security Council and any aggressor. This is a salutary, constructive split, a split in the interests of peace and security, in the interests of strengthening the United Nations and in strict conformity with the United Nations Charter, for the Security Council was established under the Charter to serve as the principal guardian of international peace and security. And if as the result of the adoption of this resolution a split occurs between on the one hand, the advocates of peace, the opponents of aggression and the Security Council, and those who prefer a policy of undermining genuine efforts towards a peaceful political settlement of the Near Eastern problem, such a split is not dangerous: on the contrary, such a split will be constructive. If those politicians and military leaders of Israel who continue to pursue a policy of aggression, reprisals and military pressure have even a modicum of good sense, they will understand that a policy of aggression does not pay, that the Security Council, the United Nations and world public opinion are against that policy, and that the peoples of the world are in favour of having the problem of the Near East settled by peaceful, political means not by force. If this conclusion is drawn by all those concerned, the adoption of this draft resolution by the Security Council will be a constructive step and there will be no need for any fear of a split.

111. The voting on this resolution will show who stands where and who is in favour of what. That is the logic of the discussion of this highly important political problem in the Security Council. The results of the vote will show who is really and sincerely in favour of the peaceful settlement of the problem of the Near East, and who is in favour of seeking ways and means of dissimulating and condoning the policy of aggression, the policy of undermining honest efforts towards the peaceful settlement of the problem of the Near East. I also believe that the result of today's vote will be valuable for world public opinion. The whole picture will become clearer on the eve of certain events.

112. In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to another consideration. There has been a dispute here between the representatives of Jordan and of Israel concerning what is happening in the occupied territories. The representative of Jordan referred to specific facts reported in *The New York Times* concerning the deliberate destruc-

tion of houses belonging to the Arab population by the Israel armed forces for so-called "preventive reasons". This amounts to preventive vengeance against the Arab population, a vengeance in advance.

113. The distinguished representative of Saudi Arabia has often repeated that a considerable proportion of Israel's population consists of emigrants from Eastern European countries. But I can assure you, Mr. Baroody, that the methods that are being used by the Israel troops are Hitlerite methods. In my native land, the Ukraine, the Hitlerites destroyed thousands of villages and settlements for preventive reasons, to clear the ground and to make it easier to see whether the partisans were advancing against the aggressors and invaders.

114. Apparently this is the policy that the Israel troops also are following if they have taken the course of preventive destruction of houses belonging to the Arab population in the occupied territories. The representative of Israel denies this. But there is a way of finding out the truth. In this connexion I should like to recall General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII). This resolution draws attention to the telegram dispatched by the Commission on Human Rights on 8 March 1968, calling upon "... the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of the Arab civilian population in areas occupied by Israel ...".

115. In this resolution the General Assembly, an international forum in which 126 delegations of States Members of that Organization take part, calls upon the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of the Arab civilian population inhabiting areas occupied by Israel "... and to respect and implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 ...". The Assembly further decided: "... to establish a Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of

the Occupied Territories, composed of three Member States ...".

116. Therein lies our possibility of settling the present dispute. Let the representative of Israel officially declare here that the Government of Israel agrees, in accordance with this resolution and in the implementation of it, to receive the Special Committee composed of the representatives of three States, who will be appointed by the President of the General Assembly to investigate the situation in the occupied territories.

117. This resolution has not yet been implemented. We have no detailed information about the reasons why it has not been implemented, but it is said that the Government of Israel does not wish to admit such a committee to the territory occupied by Israel armed forces.

118. In view of the dispute which arose between the representatives of Jordan and of Israel at this meeting, it would seem essential to clarify this question also. If the representative of Israel were to declare officially here that his Government does not object to receiving the Special Committee for the investigation of the situation in the occupied Arab territories, we could assume that such a committee could be set up quickly and could take the appropriate steps.

119. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the friendly and sympathetic words addressed to the President.

120. A number of other representatives wish to express their views before the vote. Due to the lateness of the hour, and on the basis of informal consultations, I propose that we should adjourn this meeting and meet again at 3.30 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.