



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1473**<sup>rd</sup> MEETING: 1 APRIL 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1473) .....	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-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 1 April 1969, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. P. B. KHATRI (Nepal).

*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/1473)

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).

### 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)**

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken previously 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. Barakat (Saudi Arabia) took places at the Council table.*

2. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Since I presented the draft resolution [S/9120]<sup>1</sup> on behalf of Senegal, Zambia and Pakistan this morning, my delegation, together with the delegations of Senegal and Zambia, has held further intensive consultations with certain other delegations with a view to moving towards unanimity, if possible. It is a matter of regret that, despite the best efforts of all concerned, including certain permanent members of the Security Council, it has not been possible to reach that goal. However, in deference to the views of one delegation, the three sponsors have revised their original draft resolution, and the revised text has been distributed to members of the Security Council. I shall content myself with drawing attention to the changes that have been made to the original text.

3. In the third preambular paragraph of the original version [S/9120] the word "Reaffirming" has been deleted and has been replaced by "Recalling". Also, the words, "calling for respect . . ." right down to the words "the cease-fire resolutions" have been deleted, so that this third preambular paragraph now reads: "Recalling resolution 236 (1967)."

4. In the operative part, paragraph 1, which "deplores the loss of civilian life and damage to property," is to be renumbered paragraph 2; operative paragraph 2 is to be renumbered 3, and the following paragraph is to be inserted as operative paragraph 1: "Reaffirms resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968)".

<sup>1</sup> The text of the joint draft resolution of Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1466,

"Having heard the statements made before the Council,

"Reaffirming resolution 236 (1967) calling for respect for the cease-fire and resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968), condemning the air attacks by Israel on the Jordanian territory in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions,

"Observing that numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire have occurred,

"Viewing with deep concern that the recent air attacks on Jordanian villages and other populated areas were of a pre-planned nature, in violation of resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968),

"Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation which endangers peace and security in the area,

"1. Deplores the loss of civilian life and damage to property;

"2. Condemns the recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and warns once again that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would have to meet to consider further more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure repetition of such attacks."

5. These revisions have been made, as I stated earlier, in order to accommodate to a wider extent certain views that were expressed to the three sponsors in the consultations that have been going on this afternoon.

6. The PRESIDENT: The President takes note of the fact that the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the co-sponsors, has introduced some revisions to the draft resolution contained in document S/9120. A new text, as revised, has been circulated provisionally in document S/9120/Rev.1.

7. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, please accept my heartiest congratulations on being honoured today with the responsibility of presiding over this Council. The Presidency remains in good hands. I assure you that you will always find my delegation ready to give you all the co-operation you may need in the fulfilment of your high office.

8. At the same time I should like to express my delegation's appreciation to Ambassador Csatorday, our President for March, for the efficient work he has accomplished with so much skill and devotion.

9. I understand that the Council will shortly take a decision on the revised draft resolution submitted by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia [S/9120/Rev.1]. On this understanding and with the Council's permission, I should like to explain the vote which my delegation will cast.

10. In my statement at the Council's 1470th meeting on the morning of Saturday, 29 March, I indicated my delegation's attitude to the grave question now being considered by the Council. On that occasion I said:

"We deeply regret the loss of lives, whether Arab or Israel, and our feeling of grief is great and sincere. We are distressed at the material losses, all the more because the sufferer, Jordan, is a developing country which for that very reason has an essentially weak economic infrastructure." [1470th meeting, para. 36.]

I went on to say:

"We have never been, nor are we now, prepared to condone the violent incidents and other serious violations of the cease-fire, and we do not believe that the members of the Council or the Council as a whole are prepared to do so. We do not accept the doctrine of the right of reprisal whereby a State can presumably arrogate to itself the right to carry out military operations of the kind now being considered by the Council in the territory of the other State.

"We deplore all those incidents, but at the same time we distinguish between the two types of action because their nature is essentially different." [1470th meeting, para. 37.]

11. In keeping with the spirit of that statement, my delegation understands and sympathizes with the substance of the revised draft resolution submitted by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia, on which the Council is about to take

a decision. Of course, its text largely reproduces the text of earlier resolutions 248 and 256 of 1968 which, as I said, we supported. At the same time, however, we are bound to point out that the revised draft fails to reproduce certain parts of those two resolutions which in our opinion should be included. I refer to the absence of direct and unequivocal references to all the violent incidents which have been committed in violation of the cease-fire, and the failure to reproduce the Council's opinion of them expressed on earlier occasions.

12. For the rest, we all know that in the discharge of his duties a representative expresses his Government's views. I regret that I have been unable to communicate with my Government in order to inform it of the revised text of the draft resolution and obtain relevant instructions. Therefore, not because of what the draft resolution contains but because of what it does not, my delegation will have no other alternative but to abstain when it is put to the vote.

13. I should like to conclude this brief statement with two comments. The first is to express our gratitude to those who have participated in the negotiations that have taken place with a view to finding a formula acceptable to all and our regret that those determined efforts have failed. The second comment is to voice the hope that the results of the forthcoming vote will not adversely affect the talks to be held on the Middle East question between four permanent members of the Council, which, according to an unofficial announcement, will begin in the next few days.

14. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Paraguay for his kind words.

15. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, let me say first of all how pleased my delegation and I are to see you in the Chair. Your country and mine are linked by bonds of especially cordial friendship. Moreover, we are familiar with your qualities, which have been particularly evident since you became our colleague in the Security Council. The friendship between our two countries is based to a large extent on the deep admiration which all my countrymen feel for your country's culture, which in its thousands of years has produced some magnificent works of art.

16. The way in which your predecessor presided over the Security Council came as no surprise to us. We were all aware of his quite exceptional command of foreign languages, and of his wide experience in the Security Council and the United Nations. In other words, the truly masterly fashion in which he presided over our debates fully accorded with our expectations, and we express our thanks to him.

17. I should just like to say a word about the vote which is soon to be taken. We wish it had been possible to draft a resolution which would have commanded the unanimous support of the members of the Council and to which in particular the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France would have agreed. Unfortunately, however, efforts towards that end, in which my delegation took an active part, have unhappily failed to yield all the desired results. In my statement of 28 March [1468th

meeting/ I said that the bombing of the village of Ein Hazar and similar air raids deserved the severest condemnation. I also said that we demanded strict observation of the cease-fire and should condemn all violations of it.

18. Since agreement has not been reached on a text which would have received unanimous support, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft before us.

19. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for the generous words he has spoken about me personally and about my country.

20. I now call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

21. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Allow me, Mr. President, to associate myself with the laudatory remarks addressed to your predecessor in the Presidency of the Council, Ambassador Csatorday, which remarks are fully merited. Ambassador Csatorday is indeed proficient in several languages, as Ambassador Malik reminded us this morning; but it is his intelligence and perspicacity that have really enamoured many of his colleagues in the United Nations, including myself. But above all, he is a humanitarian of the highest order. To the honour of his country and to his own credit, in the First Committee he has initiated action time and again, by way of draft resolutions, in order to ban bacteriological and chemical warfare, a type of warfare which, unfortunately, is still being waged nowadays, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention banning the use of poison gas and other allied diabolical weapons.

22. Regarding yourself, Mr. President, I should like to say that a general turned statesman is always to be welcomed, even more so in the twentieth century. This is in the best tradition of Lao-Tse, who lived five centuries before Christ not very far from your beautiful country. You, Sir, must be dedicated to peace, so dedicated to peace that it is to the honour of His Majesty your King and of your Government that they have chosen you to represent Nepal in your post at the United Nations, the purposes and principles of which will one day, we hope, be half as lofty as the majestic mountains that tower over Nepal and as pure as the eternal snows that cap those mountains.

23. Before addressing myself to the draft resolution, which, as we have learned from the statement of our colleague from Pakistan, has recently been amended, I should like to say that Israel has, time and again, served notice, through declarations made by its Foreign Minister and subsequently by the lady who has assumed the Premiership, that Israel refuses any solution worked out by the major Powers which does not envisage direct negotiations leading to ultimate peace in the form of treaties with the three Arab States, the territories of which Israel has usurped. Furthermore, Israel insists that the question of Jerusalem is not negotiable; in other words, Jerusalem must remain a part of Israel. Time and again this has been mentioned. Also, frontiers should be rectified in favour of Israel's security.

24. In their innermost hearts the Israeli authorities, as well as the leaders of Governments that support them, realize

—or they should realize by this time—that no Arab Government has the right to accede to what I might call Israel's *Diktat*. With all due respect to the endeavours of the major Powers to bring about peace in Palestine, any solution that does not accede to the wishes of Israel that I have just mentioned regarding Jerusalem and the occupied territories will be foredoomed.

25. What does Israel expect the Arab Governments to do, to crush the Palestinians residing in their respective countries? What about those bombs that allegedly were planted in the supermarket in Jerusalem, in the university on Mt. Scopus, I believe, and in other places? Who planted those bombs? Did the Jordanian Government send secret agents to do that? No; nobody knows better than Israel that it was Palestinians—frustrated Palestinians—who did that. Does Mr. Tekoah for a moment believe that those Palestinians informed the Jordanian Government, or any Arab Government, of their plans? I believe he should know by this time that the Palestinians have emerged as an independent force in the area. Of course, the sympathies of the Arab people in Jordan, in Egypt, in Syria, as far away as Morocco—everywhere—are with the Palestinian fighters whom Mr. Tekoah calls terrorists.

26. Now we come to the crux of the question, to the draft resolution that has been submitted, to which I will address myself in a few moments. But before I do that I must reiterate what my brother from Jordan said this morning, quoting from *The New York Times*, which is pro-Israel, to say the least. And it is natural that it should be pro-Israel. However, I will not go into that, into why it is. You all know. The representative of Jordan mentioned this morning that resistance took place, according to *The New York Times*, both from within and from without the occupied territories. Should the Jordanian Government be made responsible for those Palestinians who are fighting to retrieve their homeland? And have we not decided in this Council time and again that reprisals should not be permissible? Whom does Mr. Tekoah think he is fooling when he states that as long as there are guerrillas Israel will arrogate itself a free hand to crush those fighters wherever they may be?

27. We heard the representative of Zambia say this morning that Israel might imagine that somewhere behind every bush there is a Palestinian. There are Palestinians in the United States. Maybe they are conspiring here. We do not know. They do not tell me whether they are. Why does not Israel convert its El Al airplanes into bombers and find out? Maybe the Palestinians are lurking in Queens or in Brooklyn, because there are many Palestinians here. Israel only fights Jordan, which cannot send an air armada the way you are doing, Mr. Tekoah. Jordan cannot send an air armada to Israel. What chivalry, after you have occupied half of Jordan, to take it upon yourself to chastise a people who have encroached on no one. They never did so even before the country was known as Jordan.

28. Inasmuch as I do not like to take issue with a magnanimous representative, none other than Ambassador Yost, whom it was my privilege to have known for many years and who is familiar with the area, having served his country in Syria and elsewhere in the Middle East, I take

the liberty of drawing his attention to what he said this morning and of pointing out how it will be interpreted all over the Arab world. I think it is my duty as an Arab to draw the attention of that great country, the United States, to the repercussions that its policy regarding the Middle East will have all over the area—from Morocco to the confines of Iran, down to the heart of Africa in the Sudan. I shall paraphrase the words of Ambassador Yost in order not to repeat his whole speech. Ambassador Yost said, in explanation of his vote, that he would have wished to vote for the draft resolution condemning the Israeli air attack. I then expected to find the word “but” or “however”, and it came. However, Ambassador Yost continued, the air attacks could not be considered in isolation. He wished to condemn also the attacks on schools and marketplaces and call upon those in a position to do so to end such attacks.

29. There is no one in a position to do so, I may say. It is the Palestinian people. If the United States Government would like to initiate contact with the Palestinian representatives—and they may not represent all the people—that is its privilege to do so. Jordan, or any other Arab country for that matter, has no authority over the Palestinian people. And let us assume that it is in the interests of the Governments to stop them, the Governments would fall down because the sentiment of the people all over the Arab world, with no exception, is with the Palestinian people. Therefore, there is that possibility if the United States, as a big Power, wants to explore it—and this applies also to the Soviet Union, because it is another great Power and it is in the area, whether some like it or not. Let them find out through their emissaries what can be done with the Palestinian people. We, the Arab Governments, have no right to tell the Palestinian people not to organize to retrieve their homeland. We cannot arrogate that right to ourselves.

30. Again, I must mention that the Arab Governments are not prepared to endanger themselves with respect to their own people in their respective countries by telling the Palestinian people to “stop fighting the Israelis because you are making it hot for us”. Let us assume that some Arab Governments—and this is only an assumption—by setting up a military government should try to crush the Palestinians inside their countries. What would happen? Revolution, anarchy, riots. Maybe this is what Mr. Tekoah and his leaders want to see. They they would be able to consolidate what they have taken.

31. So no matter how you look at that question, there is no solution, whether by way of resolutions or by way of all the caucuses which the four major Powers have had or will have in the future, unless the Palestinian people are satisfied. For a long time they were inside the bottle with a heavy seal. This reminds me of one of the Arabian tales: the seal of the bottle is broken and the genie is out of the bottle. Try to put the genie back into the bottle, any one of you. We cannot—the Arab Governments cannot and will not. Let us see whether the four Powers will be able to put the genie back into the bottle. These Arabian tales and fables are very illustrative of what is obtaining nowadays in our area.

32. Mr. Yost, as the representative of the United States, condemns all violations of the cease-fire, and he particularly

condemns the air attacks which led to the indiscriminate deaths in Jordan. However, those attacks, he reminds us, should not be considered in isolation and he calls upon those in a position to do so to end such attacks. We are in no position to stop those attacks. That is the truth, my dear friend. We Arab Governments are in no position to do that, not even Saudi Arabia, which is far from the arena of fighting.

33. But it is very curious, because we have mutual interests with the United States. Maybe their interests with Israel tip the scale in favour of Israel. With regard to all of the Arab countries that have interests, if we put those interests in one pan of the scale and the United States puts its interests with Israel in the other pan, we will find that our pan is up in the air. What has happened since Mr. Wiggins was here as the representative of the United States, and before him Mr. Goldberg—or rather Mr. Ball? Mr. Goldberg would never have condemned Israel at any price.

34. I want to refer the representative of the United States to two resolutions, namely resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968 and resolution 256 (1968) of 16 August 1968, adopted by the Council and condemning the military attacks launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. This was in the 24 March resolution. And then, in the 16 August resolution it condemned “the further military attacks launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter . . .”.

35. What has changed since then? From the Arab point of view that is a retrogressive step taken by the United States in so far as the latest aggression of Israel in Jordan is concerned. That is a retrogression. I do not blame Mr. Tekoah for taking a cynical attitude about all this business here in the Council. I do not blame him whatsoever. He knows that one of the major Powers will not condemn Israel, as it had done in two previous resolutions, namely in the resolutions I cited.

36. Let us for a moment see how the voting is going in the Council. It is very significant. Who submits the draft resolution of today? An Asian country represented on the Council and two African countries. Who opposes that same draft resolution? Not all the Western countries, but the protagonist of the Western countries, we all must admit, is the United States of America. Are the Africans and the Asians wrong in considering that Israel is an intrusion which has caused an abscess, like a foreign matter in the body politic and body social of the Middle East?

37. Now we come to another great country, a major country. I do not think the word “great” is correct; I believe that only our Creator or the forces of nature are great. We are all humble. We should be. The Soviet Union is a major country. Why is it that the Soviet Union sees the Arab point of view here—the African and Asian view? Oh, they are playing politics with the Africans and the Asians, it might be said, and not only in this matter. There is the question of Rhodesia and the question of South Africa and other questions. We are told that the Soviet Union is fishing in troubled waters. Whose waters? Our waters. Who is muddying our waters in the Eastern Mediterranean basin?

Those European Zionists. Forget that they are Zionists—those Europeans who came into our area. It is not the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is not muddying the Eastern Mediterranean basin.

38. Now, regardless of the interests that the great Powers have—and, no doubt, the Soviet Union has certain interests in the area; after all, the Middle East is nearer to the Soviet Union than the United States or, for that matter, the United Kingdom. Leaving ideologies aside, the Soviet Union is a major Power and, for reasons of its own, it is concerning itself with the area. Now, I am beginning to believe that the Soviet Union has a better understanding of our area because it is an Asian country aside from being a European country also. Let us remember that! It is also an Asian country. It understands us perhaps better than our friends across the seas in the United States or the United Kingdom, or at least it is trying to understand us.

39. Mr. Yost mentioned this morning—and I am paraphrasing what he said—that if the intrusions, the guerrilla warfare, were taken into consideration in the draft resolution, then the United States would be in a better position to vote. There is this question of equation, of even-handedness, this new usage by the United States which is now gaining currency in the United Nations as if the destiny of people can be weighed in the scales.

40. This reminds me of a tale that comes from the desert, since Mr. Tekoah cites proverbs. I would call them Semitic proverbs; they are not Zionist proverbs. The attitude of the United States reminds me of the bedouin who had a camel which he loved very much. Not because it was a beast of burden, but because he could use its milk—it was a she camel—and he could use its wool for his garb. People get fond of their animals, as the Arabs get fond of their horses which are like members of the family, and so are camels. That camel got sick, so sick that the bedouin was afraid that it would die. So he took a vow and said: “Oh, God, if you spare my camel, to show you that I am not using it for my own purpose only, I will sell it for a rial”—which is, let us say, a dollar. God so willed that the camel regained its health, and the bedouin, the cameltier, was in a dither. What to do now? After all, he thought he would be losing his camel; what should he do with it? So he went to one of those “clever guys”, as the Americans would call them, and he said: “Get me out of this fix.” So he told him what to do. He said: “Take the camel to the market place and say that you will sell it for a dollar.” So he took the camel to the market place and began to shout: “My camel for a dollar.” Of course, there were many who came and examined the camel and found that it was healthy and in good condition and there was a clamour to buy the camel. So he said: “I won’t sell it except with a tom cat” which he produced from a bag and tied to the tail of the camel. And they said: “All right, we will buy it with the tom cat.” He said: “The camel goes for one dollar and the tom cat for \$999.00, and I don’t sell them except together.”

41. Mr. Yost wants to put a tom cat into this draft resolution. He will vote for it if the tom cat is tied to the tail of the camel. Although there was no tom cat with the previous resolutions, the United States delegation—I believe it was Mr. Ball—voted for the condemnation. This is a

reversal of the position of the United States, I am sorry to say.

42. Well, I do not blame Mr. Tekoah for his cynical attitude. I watched here—we have been sitting here since 3.30—how everybody went to Mr. Tekoah instead of Mr. Tekoah going to the big Powers. Would this formula, this comma, this new wording please him? Nothing pleases him. Why should it in view of what appeared in *The New York Times* of this morning! Some no doubt Jewish organization, or one with Zionist leanings gave a peer of the British Empire, or rather of the United Kingdom, none other than C. P. Snow, an honorary degree yesterday. He is a lord; he is supposed to be a Liberal. Here they have this picture in *The New York Times* of today, stating that “C. P. Snow says Jews’ success could be genetic superiority.” The article reads: “C. P. Snow, the British author and physicist, said yesterday that he was prepared to believe that Jews are genetically superior to other people.”

43. Why should such statements not go to Mr. Tekoah’s head and to Israel’s head? I know that the noble lord is a physicist. Since when was he a genetician? He must be a phony. A physicist is a physicist. Since when was he an anthropologist? This must have pleased the Zionist organization which conferred on Lord Snow an honorary degree. It says here, according to the *The New York Times* of 1 April 1969 (page 37):

“Lord Snow, who was awarded an honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters at the ceremonies last night, discussed the content of his speech during a news conference earlier in the day.”

“One would like to know more about the Jewish gene-pool, he said in his speech.”

44. And then he says here in a Founders’ Day address at the New York School of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, at 40 West 68th Street, that: “The record is remarkable, and quite outside any sort of statistical probabilities.”

45. When the correspondents asked him what about the Negro—it seems that there is a certain self-styled genetician in California who said that the Negro has a low intelligence—he did not dare to say anything about the Negro. C. P. Snow, his lordship, dodged the issue. At the news conference he declined to discuss the Negro or the theory of a leading educational psychologist, Arthur Jensen of the University of California, Berkeley, who has maintained that intelligence is largely hereditary and cannot be altered significantly by environment.

46. I do not know whether Rosenberg or the racists of Hitler’s day could have gone further than Mr. Snow, just because he received a strip of paper, an honorary degree.

47. Of course, many of the Jews are intelligent because they had a challenge; they were a minority. Usually minorities have a challenge. And they have done well, and more glory to the individuals who work to excel, whether they be Jews or gentiles. The Parsees in India were a minority; that is why many of the Parsees are successful.

But Mr. Snow, his lordship, wants to remind us that the Jews are a superior race. What next? The chosen people of God. What a discriminator God must be! This shows the power of Zionism. If they do not brainwash the scholars, they give them an honorary degree to be on their side. What a shame!

48. But do not let me give the impression that I am casting a slur against the British. The British have been known throughout their history for independent personalities amongst them; and here a couple of legislators, Members of Parliament, have made a study recently which appeared in *The New York Times*. I should say in *The Times* of London: *The New York Times* would not publish it. I have this article thanks to my colleague from Kuwait who gave me a transcript of what these two members of Parliament said. I believe I should equate—to be even-handed—what Lord Snow said on the one hand with the two legislators, members of Parliament. They are Dennis Walters and Ian Gilmour who recently published an article in *The Times* of London of 1 February 1969 entitled “Last Peace Chance in Middle East”. I quote:

“Their thesis was that President Johnson failed to see that ‘unswerving support for Israel not only sabotaged Western influence in the Arab World, but by weakening the moderates in Israel made an accommodation with the Arabs far less likely’; and they stressed that a new approach and a new initiative towards the Palestine Problem by President Nixon was required urgently if there was to be any hope of a negotiated settlement, and that unless there was a radical change in the US policy, war would inevitably come again, with consequent further immense damage to Western interests in the Arab World.”

They are pragmatic Members of the British Parliament. And here they go on to say:

“The deplorable conditions under which the Palestinians live in refugee camps in exile or under Israeli occupation, are such that they feel they have little else to lose but their lives, and these they are prepared to sacrifice.”

These are not my words, Sir, these are the words of two Members of Parliament who went to the Middle East and made a study of this situation. They go on to say:

“The Guerrilla movement, which has begun to gain such momentum, recognizes no frontiers; thus, the authors of the article reasoned that an acceptable settlement is imperative now, with Israel realizing that ‘whatever her frontiers, she can only be secure if she is accepted by the Arabs, and she will only be accepted if she comes to terms with the Palestinians’.”

This is not Baroody speaking. They are two Members of the British Parliament who made a first-hand study of the situation and they tell us what they think.

49. We have been accustomed to hearing Mr. Tekoah quote from many newspapers and magazines. I am not going to prolong my statement by using all the material

that I have before me. Recently a very well-studied article appeared in the French press. It appeared in *Le Nouvel Observateur* in Paris and was by Jean Daniel who visited Gaza, Palestine, so-called Israel, the occupied territories and adjacent territories. Here he tells us something very significant to show that the Jewish youth in Israel is awakening. This is from Mr. Daniel’s article:

“There were Jewish students—the students who invited me to talk with them not only let me say what I thought, even though it upset some of them; they themselves denounced anti-Arabism, expansionism, and the desperate falling-back on America as an ally with a vigour that I wish I could communicate here.”

They must have used some very strong words which the author does not want to mention. I repeat: “they themselves denounced anti-Arabism, expansionism and the desperate falling-back on America as an ally.”

50. We do not want America to be our ally. We do not want the Soviet Union to be our ally. We do not want France to be our ally. We do not want the United Kingdom to be our ally. All we are asking is justice, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, for the Palestinian people—who happen to be Arab. But even if they were not Arabs, being our neighbours we would still ask that justice be done unto them. This is all we are asking here. Is that unreasonable? We do not want to destroy the Jews. The Jews came and destroyed the Palestinians. We never thought of destroying anybody in recent times. Maybe we had wars at the height of our empire—and our empire fell when it became decadent like other empires fell when they became decadent. But we are Arab peoples. We want to live at peace with Jew and gentile. And here Mr. Tekoah comes and says, “They are destroying my people.” Who is destroying whom? Those eastern European Zionists and central European Zionists came to destroy the Palestinian people; otherwise there would be no trouble.

51. Look at the noble spirit of one of the Palestinian freedom fighters, none other than the chief of one of the organizations called El Fatah. I think his declaration should be in the records of the Security Council. I am taking it from that article by that liberal Jew, Jean Daniel, from whom I have been quoting, who visited Israel and the Arab lands quite recently—and, as I mentioned, his article appeared in *Le Nouvel Observateur* in France. This is a translation. I am quoting the words of Yasir Arafat so that you may know the noble spirit of those freedom fighters:

“We say to the meeting of the big Powers: let them decide what they wish. The Palestine people have made their own decision, and this springs from the gun. This concept is the only one which the world understands, be it in Asia, Latin America or Africa—imperialism understands only this language.”

“We call for the establishment of an Arab Palestinian State in which there would be justice, freedom and equality for anyone who wants to live in it, whether Moslem, Christian or Jew. There would be no place for malice or fanaticism”—no place for malice or fanaticism.



icism—"in that Arab State which would be established by the Palestinian revolution."

Now, this is a Palestinian talking: no malice or fanaticism; and with Jew living by the side of the Arab, whether he be Christian or Moslem.

52. King Faisal, the King of Saudi Arabia, is a man who is very circumspect and does not talk very much. Perhaps that is why he appointed me to the United Nations here, to make up for his reticence. It is good to have a little humorous relief from the tragedy. To go back to Shakespeare, with the exception of Macbeth, we find humorous relief in the three tragedies of Hamlet, King Lear and Othello. Macbeth gives one a headache because it has no humorous relief. Even the laughter I hear here is at my expense. I don't mind.

53. Not very long ago, at a banquet given by His Majesty King Faisal in Mecca for notable pilgrims on Dhul Hijah 6, 1388 Al-Higra—which corresponds to 23 February 1969—His Majesty was very explicit—and I shall be happy to send to members of the Council, and especially to the major Powers, copies of that speech, which has been translated into English. Incidentally, this year we have had 370,000 pilgrims, from the four corners of the earth, who visited Mecca. I must say, there were many thousands from the Soviet Union, which is always maligned for suppressing religion. If the Government does not want to believe, that is its privilege. In the Koran we have a verse which says: "*La ikraha f'id-din*"—"There is no compulsion in religion." I think, in a way, without knowing it, the Russians are Moslems—even the Soviets—because if anybody wants to go to El Haj, they let him go. There are many Russian Moslems.

54. His Majesty King Faisal, in addressing that convocation of El Haj, the pilgrimage of Mecca, said the following:

"I do not have, dear brothers, to explain what goes on at the Third Holy Mosque and the First Qiblah of Islam"—in Jerusalem—"from violation of the sanctities to the abuse of dignity and morality. They"—meaning the Zionists—"have gone too far by committing immoral acts and disgraceful deeds inside the walls of the Mosque and in the places of worship . . .

"Dear brothers, what are we waiting for? Shall we wait for the world conscience to do anything? Where is the conscience that can see, hear and feel such atrocities and contempts committed openly in front of everybody? The conscience has not been aroused or even showed any regret towards such crimes and violations. If they are not ashamed before God, at least they should be ashamed before mankind. In spite of all this, we notice that the aggressors receive support on many occasions for their tyranny and offences.

"Dear brothers,"—he was addressing all Moslems, from the four corners of the earth—"Jerusalem appeals to you to rescue it from this tribulation . . .

"Dear Moslem brothers . . . I invoke God that He may help me to die as a martyr . . . for the sake of Allah.

"...I cannot imagine our holy shrines being abused" with our "sanctities.

"I do not want to talk about something else . . . All others matters are secondary in contrast with the defence of our creed, holy shrines, freedom and dignity . . .

"... We hope that by the grace of God we will meet again next year after the traces of the treacherous aggression are eliminated, the Holy Places are liberated and our brothers the citizens of our dear Palestine are free once more in their own country . . .".

Those are the words of His Majesty King Faisal to the world Moslem community.

55. The West may think that the world Moslem community now is weak. They do not have atomic bombs; they do not have the technology of warfare. But certain Western Powers are sowing the seeds of hatred, perhaps unwittingly, and there shall be a collision again between the West and East—this time a collision which indeed may lead to the blowing up of the whole world, because it is within the power of Israel to start a third world war. Having permeated the Governments and legislative bodies of many Western countries, they wield power and think that our area is their own preserve.

56. The hour is late. If I have spoken so long it is to remind the members of the Council that this is very serious business indeed. I need hardly refer you to the document circulated by my colleague from Jordan yesterday, which has pictures of the victims of the last assault by Israel on my country. I do not want to point out any particular picture. These pictures are more eloquent than words, and I am sure my colleague from Jordan, and every Arab, would deplore the inhumanity of man to man, even if the victims happened, in reverse, to be Jews.

57. We are not in the area to kill the Jews; we have protected them throughout our history. It is this European intrusion into our midst that is causing all the trouble, and ironically it is supported by certain Europeans and a projection of European civilization, or the lack of it, by one of the two most powerful States in the world, the United States, with whom we have always had friendly relations, with whom we have mutual interests. We are indeed confused as to why the United States and its supporters should encourage an alien people in our midst to cause all this trouble and tribulation. We hope that it will be guided in its own wisdom to advise Israel that if it wants peace it should live at peace with the Palestinians under a Palestinian flag which would have under it Jew and Palestinian, regardless of religion, living like brothers side by side.

58. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for his over-generous compliments.

59. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel.

60. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is with regret that I ask for the floor at this hour in order to exercise my right of reply. The representative of the USSR, however, has left me no

choice. Slanderous and malevolent as was the statement made this morning by the Soviet representative, it had one virtue. It left no doubt at all about the Soviet Union's destructive policy on the Middle East situation. To glorify the murder of Jews and to try to justify and thereby encourage such murder by assimilating Jews to Nazis is a gory demonstration of the role the USSR is playing and apparently intends to play in respect of the Israel-Arab conflict. World opinion rejects with utter disgust Arab terror warfare against the men, women and children of Israel. The Soviet Union approves of it.

61. World opinion, associations of anti-Nazi freedom fighters, leading humanitarians, even certain communist parties, condemn with indignation all comparison between Arab terror organizations and anti-Nazi freedom fighters. The Soviet Union hails these terror organizations and the Soviet representative is even ready to call on the name of Allah in his support for this criminal method of aggression. Let the world have no doubt what the Soviet Union thus supports. It supports bombs in civilian buses, explosives in supermarkets, dynamite charges in university cafeterias, mines in school courtyards. It supports a movement whose proclaimed objective is the destruction of Israel, the annihilation of its people, the torpedoing of all efforts to establish peace between Israel and the Arab States. Yasir Arafat, the El Fatah leader, described on 5 June 1968 as his organization's objective the liquidation of Israeli existence.

62. The Soviet position was expressed without any embellishment in a recent article that appeared in *Pravda* on 27 February 1969, defending the terrorist attack on an Israeli civil passenger aircraft at the Zurich airport. The entire civilized world had expressed its horror at this wanton attack against innocent men, women and children in a neutral country. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had called it a dastardly and criminal act which Governments and peoples, regardless of their political views, must condemn. Instead of heeding the Secretary-General's call to all Governments to take all possible measures to prevent any repetition of those acts, the Soviet Union glamorizes them and in fact calls for more. It is this Power that claims for itself the right to give advice on Israel's vital interests, on Israel's quest for peace and security. It is this Power that expects the world to consider it as a contributor to understanding, to justice and to peace in the Middle East. Surely there is a limit to credulity and illogic.

63. Only four days ago on 27 March 1969, the organ of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union, *Listy*, published an editorial in which it expressed deep understanding for the situation Israel finds itself in confronting as it does continuous Arab aggression. It said that Israel must make sure that the Arabs do not succeed in their designs against Israel. Israel must win, said *Listy*, to avoid a super-pogrom by the Arabs. The Arabs do not take prisoners, it continued, and the Israelis have nowhere to retreat. The writer of the editorial who had visited Israel declared:

"Almost every second person to whom I spoke carried on his arm the brand mark of a German concentration camp. Others have lost their father or mother. It may be well to remind you that Jews have been systematically

murdered over the last 2,000 years. The Jews do not want war but if it is imposed on them they must not fail to win. Think of this during the next few days, at least for a moment."

the Czech editorial concludes. Perhaps the representative of the Soviet Union as well will think of this in the next few days.

64. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

65. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Israel representative's reaction to my statement seems to show that I have scored a hit. Meanwhile, the question is quite clear. The growth of popular resistance in the Arab territories seized by Israel results from the invaders' continuing occupation of those territories and the outrages they have committed.

66. After the troops have been withdrawn and a political settlement achieved, this question will automatically disappear from the agenda. In my opinion it would be as well if the Israeli representative took note of this elementary truth, pondered over it in the next few days, and replied to the Security Council whether Israel is in favour of a peaceful political settlement, of refraining from the preventive destruction of populated areas and dwellings in the Arab States. I drew this parallel because I, my family and my people suffered the destruction of our homes and dwellings by an enemy invader and this method is a Hitlerite method, and whether you like it or not, no impassioned oratory here can dispute that fact. It is confirmed by *The New York Times*, and the Jordan representative also spoke of this today.

67. Do you really think that this policy can win the respect of the world, the Security Council and the United Nations? Do you really think this policy is conducive to a peaceful settlement in the Near East? Of course not. That is what you should ponder over in the next few days, Mr. Tekoah.

68. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to associate itself with those many representatives of the various States members of the Security Council who have welcomed you with such pleasure and sympathy as President of the Council for this month.

69. I should also like to express on behalf of my delegation our sincere congratulations and thanks to your predecessor Ambassador Csatorday, who truly discharged his duties in the best possible manner.

70. I do not propose to make any extensive statement today on the Middle East question, because I expressed my Government's views on the subject last week [*1469th meeting*]. Today, also in accordance with instructions from my chancellor, I am to confine myself to the item under discussion. I must deplore that the efforts made by various delegations, including Colombia's, have failed to produce a general agreement in the Security Council concerning the draft resolution which should bring this debate to a normal conclusion.

71. Nevertheless, it is well for us to point out that we have failed to agree, not because anyone has refused to condemn the reprehensible attack by the Israel Air Force on the civil population of Jordan, but because the sponsors of the draft resolution before us considered it impossible to agree to the inclusion in the operative part of their draft of a new paragraph deploring all the other violations of the cease-fire.

72. It is not that we want to make any capricious references to non-existent violations, because the draft resolution of Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia recognizes in its preamble that "numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire have occurred".

73. We ourselves cannot understand why the sponsors of the draft resolution should refuse to include in the operative part of their text a new paragraph deploring the many violations which both they and we know have occurred in the Middle East.

74. For the Colombian delegation that is a fundamental point, for we consider that the Security Council is bound to condemn all violations, wherever they originate. To adopt any other course might give the absurd impression that the Security Council, by its silence, encourages certain threats to peace.

75. There may still be time for the representatives of Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia to reconsider their rejection of our suggestion and enable the resolution to be adopted unanimously. It should not be forgotten that the need to preserve the unity of the Security Council was never greater than now.

76. My delegation would have to abstain in the vote if the sponsors insisted on retaining the present wording of the draft resolution. Of course we deplore the absence of the general agreement which, in the honourable company of many other delegations, we have desired and sought. If the unity of the Security Council on this important question is broken, we shall be able to say that the breach occurred not because of any intransigence of ours despite our obvious readiness to compromise.

77. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Mr. President, I am happy to join those who have already welcomed you as President of the Security Council. My delegation welcomes you as the representative of a country which, though far from ours, is not so far away at all in its general outlook on international relations.

78. I also would like to join in paying tribute to last month's President, Ambassador Csatorday of Hungary, who conducted the business of the Council with his customary skill and courtesy.

79. In my statement of 28 March [1468th meeting], I said that in the view of my delegation the Security Council cannot accept as valid any argument put forward to justify unilateral military action that constitutes a breach of the cease-fire established in the Middle East. It follows that we believe that the Council must condemn the recent attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages in violation of the

cease-fire resolutions. We condemn these attacks all the more emphatically as it appears that the Israeli planes struck down unarmed civilians.

80. I also said in my previous statement that the Israeli attack cannot be considered in isolation. It must be examined in the context of continuous violence prevailing in the Middle East. The draft resolution submitted by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia in its original form recognized this in that it contained the observation that numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire occurred.

81. My delegation believed all along that having made that observation, the Council should not fail to condemn all violent incidents that have taken place in violation of the cease-fire, as has been done in past resolutions unanimously adopted by the Council, for instance, in resolution 236 (1967), which is recalled in the draft resolution before us and which condemns any and all violations of the cease-fire.

82. In the consultations that preceded this meeting, my delegation made some suggestions, as did several other delegations, to make the draft take account of that basic point. The sponsors gave those suggestions full and sympathetic consideration, and I wish to express to them our appreciation. The revisions introduced by the representative of Pakistan go a long way towards meeting the basic point raised by my delegation. By reaffirming in its first operative paragraph, resolution 248 (1968), the Council will implicitly deplore all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire.

83. I realize that this revision is not likely to satisfy all the members of the Council. This is regrettable, for failure to reach unanimity cannot but weaken the impact of Council pronouncements on the course of events in the area. This failure is all the more regrettable at this moment in view of the forthcoming four-Power talks on the question of the Middle East.

84. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Finland for his kind words.

85. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Mr. President, first of all I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to all those representatives who commented in a very friendly and all-too-generous way on my activities as President of the Security Council during the month of March. In serving this august body I tried to use the available means to promote understanding and to enhance the implementation of the lofty principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. And that will be my guideline in the future too.

86. The debate that has taken place in the Security Council, at the initiative of Jordan, regarding the Israeli air attack of 26 March on civilian objectives in Jordan has confirmed our conviction that the attack was a premeditated and deliberate violation of the cease-fire.

87. The representative of Israel in his interventions has only underlined that his country is determined to act in complete disregard of earlier Council resolutions and the

provisions of the Charter. It would have been difficult for him not to do so. In fact, as it has been reported in the American press, the Defence Minister of Israel did not hesitate to reaffirm that Israel will continue its air attacks against Jordanian territory. Seldom has aggression been so openly elevated to the rank of official Government policy.

88. The Council thus has no alternative but to reaffirm its earlier decisions and condemn this latest manifestation of Israeli belligerency.

89. There is no doubt in our mind that Council actions would now be called for, in view of the dangers inherent in these attacks and of the repeated refusal of Israel to abide by the decisions of the Council. It is, however, common knowledge that certain members of the Council are still reluctant to face up to their responsibilities in this regard, and for that reason the sponsors of the draft resolution now before us have been constrained to abandon envisaging such actions at this point. Although the text thereby has lost some of its effectiveness, it still contains condemnation of the Israeli air attack entailing the loss of eighteen civilian lives, injuries to others and considerable loss of property.

90. It is for that reason that my delegation has decided to cast its vote in favour of the draft resolution.

91. We have also been motivated in our decision by the conviction that the Council must be on record to disapprove the conduct of the Government of Israel at a time when that Government does everything to torpedo useful initiatives in the service of a political settlement in the Middle East. The Council must certainly show that it does not approve the attempts of Israel to use its territorial conquests in the wake of its aggressive war as a lever to impose capitulation terms on the victims of its aggression. The Council must also reject the plans of Israel to utilize its military might to attain its conquests in the expectation of the imposed settlement it obviously seeks in violation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

92. The PRESIDENT: There are no further representatives who have indicated a wish to speak before the vote, and as no other representative wishes to take the floor at this stage the Council will now proceed to vote on the three-Power draft resolution [S/9120/Rev.1].

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Algeria, China, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Colombia, Paraguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>2</sup> See resolution 265 (1969).

93. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom who has asked to be allowed to explain his vote after the vote.

94. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, my delegation is greatly saddened by what seems to us to have been an unnecessary division in the vote of this Council. Our unanimity has been breached over what seem to us comparatively reconcilable points. We seemed to have got so close to agreement that the final breakdown is doubly disappointing.

95. My delegation sincerely wished to vote for the draft resolution with the general wording of which I have twice declared our agreement. The one condition on which our vote was predicated seemed to us, in the light of the actual situation in the Middle East, a condition based on practical and reasonable grounds.

96. The resolution itself observes that numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire have occurred. All we asked was the logical consequence of this observation—that is to say, one short sentence, somewhere in the resolution which deplored all violations of that cease-fire resolution which the Council itself had passed. The condition was not met, and because of this omission, and not because of any wording in the resolution itself, we had reluctantly to abstain.

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

98. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The resolution adopted by the Security Council is one-sided. It is inequitable. It ignores basic established facts. It is therefore no contribution to ensuring tranquillity or to the advance of peace in the area. Arab terror organizations try to kill not only civilian Israelis, but also the cease-fire, and they undermine the prospects of peace in the Middle East. The identification of Arab Governments with terror warfare is contrary to the cease-fire, the 22 November 1967 resolution of the Security Council, and the United Nations Charter.

99. The resolution's disregard for this fact is incomprehensible. The reaffirmation of resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968), which declared that grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that all violent incidents and other violations of the cease-fire should be prevented, is inadequate. The pursuance of Arab terror warfare endangers the peace-making efforts. It must be condemned with full force. We note with appreciation the position of those members of the Security Council who called for such condemnation and refused to give support to the resolution.

100. Israel's policy will remain based on readiness to conduct negotiations with each one of the neighbouring States for the purpose of concluding peace treaties; co-operation with Ambassador Jarring, within the framework of the 22 November 1967 resolution; observance of the cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity; self-defence against armed attacks.

101. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Jordan.

102. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): We are grateful to all members of the Security Council who gave full consideration to the numerous premeditated Israeli violations of the cease-fire which my delegation enumerated both in its complaint and its opening statement.

103. The outgoing President, Ambassador Csatorday, deserves our respect and admiration. His wisdom, statesmanship, ability and impartiality were clearly manifested during the first phase of our deliberations. To him we offer our gratitude and respect.

104. We are grateful to the Council members for condemning in clear terms and in an unambiguous manner the most recent premeditated air attack launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions. In the resolution just adopted, the Council warns once again that if such attacks were to be repeated it would meet to consider further effective steps, as envisaged in the Charter, to ensure against repetition of such attacks. We hope that this will be the last warning given to Israel.

105. We are grateful to the Council for rejecting the Israeli allegations and the so-called counter-complaint, which were intended to confuse the issue. The Israeli representative failed to convince the Council that resistance and the fight against foreign occupiers amount to terrorism. All members of the Council called on the Israelis to avoid indiscriminate attacks against civilian centres and all other violations of the cease-fire resolutions. The Council rejected the use of force.

106. Members emphasized that brutal force was used against innocent civilians near Es-Salt, on 26 March, in a clear breach of the cease-fire. They referred to previous cease-fire violations, which were mentioned time and again in every statement made by my delegation. They all referred with regret to nineteen civilian citizens of Jordan killed by the Israeli attack and to the twenty-five injured. They cited the fact that the targets hit were essentially civilian habitations.

107. We are grateful to all members who voted for this resolution. They emphasized the fact that these Israeli attacks spread the ravages of war and destruction in a country which had already suffered cruelly.

108. It is true that the Security Council condemnation fell short of our expectations, but whether the Council will reiterate this again in the future depends on how far Israeli aggression will be accommodated. We have just heard Mr. Tekoah, one second after the adoption of the resolution, describe the resolution as one-sided. When it is adopted unanimously, it is one-sided—like the one of last August and the one of last March, both of which I am glad to see incorporated in the first paragraph of the resolution just adopted. Those two resolutions were called one-sided? The one just adopted by 11 votes is also called one-sided? The one on Jerusalem with 99 votes is one-sided? The one on the humanitarian aspect of the problem adopted by all members of the Council was called one-sided. It is one-sided because the thinking is one-sided. It is a one-track mind. It is a thinking which calls for change of behaviour, change of

mind and heart. To think that the whole world is wrong and only Israel is right certainly indicates something wrong. It is certainly something that calls for reconsideration of the attitude, of the thinking, of the Israelis. If it is a question of the gentile always being wrong and the Israeli always being right, then I can understand why the Israelis should have a veto on every stand taken by the Security Council, then I can understand why Mrs. Meir, the Prime Minister, would come and tell the whole world "We should debate the debates of the Security Council" and that the Security Council itself and the United Nations in general should be debated in the Knesset. Israeli arrogance should have a limit, and only the Council can set that limit, and only the Big Four can seriously look at the roots of the problem and reach a just solution. But to keep the door open for the arrogance of Israel to call every single action taken by this highest organ of the United Nations "one-sided" is unfortunate, to say the least. It does not show hope for peace, real peace based on justice.

109. I think that this attitude—not our insisting on having a fair resolution reflecting the reality of the situation—or this arrogance of Israel should cause the Big Four to ponder on what they should do, and not try to have an even-handed resolution on a clear-cut case of aggression. I would be unfair to my people, to the memory of the dead, if I were to compromise their rights for the sake of so-called even-handedness.

110. I know the hour is late, and there is no need for me to continue. I shall merely say one final thing on this question.

111. I think that if we want a real peace, the way to peace is there. For the Israelis to have peace, they must honour their past obligations, their past commitments, given to this high organ of the United Nations. Before seeking new commitments let them abide by the old commitments; then they will show that they are for peace. But so far, their behaviour has been one of war, and they have been receiving some accommodation from friends of Israel.

112. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Israel.

113. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): It is odd to hear the representative of Jordan questioning the one-sidedness of a resolution that is one-sided. One-sidedness is determined by the contents of a resolution, not by the number of votes that support it. It is particularly odd for a representative of an Arab country to question the right to declare this resolution one-sided, for there is an ancient Arab proverb, of which the representative of Jordan is undoubtedly aware. And the proverb says: He who has the truth is in the majority, even though he be one.

114. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Jordan has the floor.

115. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I was always under the impression that when Members join the United Nations they abide by the rule of the majority. I do not think that the whole Security Council is out of step but it is Mr. Tekoah. I think that when Israel joined the United

Nations it did undertake to abide by the Charter, by the rules of procedure, by the will of the United Nations as determined by the majority, whether a two-thirds or a simple majority. But for Mr. Tekoah to tell the Council, just after a decision has been taken by 11 votes, "This is not binding, it is one-sided, as I"—Mr. Tekoah—"see it", is wrong. The Security Council is saying that it is a resolution reflecting what is needed. If the Council, in its wisdom, found it right to adopt this resolution, the resolution is binding.

116. Mr. Tekoah turned to another proverb. It will be recalled that when we presented our complaint, Mr. Tekoah told me that there was an Arab proverb saying, "You stay in your house and I will stay in mine." I have tried to find out where his house is. In which part of the Arab area is his house? Is it all the occupied territories? I have never

received an answer. Is it the United Nations plan? I received no answer. The other area occupied in 1948? No answer. Sinai included? I received no answer. Gaza? The Golan Heights? The West Bank? Or the East Bank?

117. And now we have another proverb. I think that the proverb which he never answered should be rephrased according to the philosophy of Israel. It should not say: "You stay in your house and I will stay in mine." It should be rephrased to say: "You stay in your house; I will stay in your house also until you get out." That is what they are doing.

118. The PRESIDENT: This concludes the Council's consideration of the question before it.

*The meeting rose at 8.10 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.

---