



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1402nd MEETING: 21 MARCH 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1402)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 21 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8484);	
(b) Letter dated 21 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8486)	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 SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 21 March 1968, at 4. p.m.

President: Mr. Ousmane Socé DIOP (Senegal).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1402)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 21 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8484);
 - (b) Letter dated 21 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8486).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 21 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8484);
- (b) Letter dated 21 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8486)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at the 1401st meeting, I invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and Morocco to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that when one of them wishes to speak, he will be invited to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic), Mr. A. Pachachi (Iraq) and Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco) took the places reserved for them.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have also received a letter dated 21 March [S/8491] from the representative of Syria, in which he asks to be invited to participate, without vote, in the Council's debate on the item now before it. If I hear no objection, I shall invite the representative of Syria to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that

when he wishes to speak, he will be invited to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) took the place reserved for him.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Council will now resume consideration of the item before it.

4. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): My Government views with great concern the disturbing events which have led to this Council meeting. There has been further violence in the Middle East, an area overburdened with past violence and conflict. Upon receipt of the reports of today's events, my Government immediately issued a statement which deplored the Israel military action across the cease-fire lines and characterized it as damaging to the hopes for a peaceful settlement of the basic issues involved.

5. The position of the United States with respect to the matters which concern us has been stated many times in the Security Council. We adhere to the views we have frequently expressed. The United States Government opposes violence from any quarter in the Middle East. We oppose military actions in violation of the cease-fire resolutions of the Council; such actions create further complications in an already complicated situation. We oppose acts of terrorism, which are in violation of the cease-fire resolutions of the Council, and we are not blind to the additional problems they create. We believe, further, that military counteractions, such as that which has just taken place on a scale out of proportion to the acts of violence that preceded it, are greatly to be deplored.

6. The rule which should guide the parties in all these situations was first expressed many years ago in resolution 56 (1948) of 19 August 1948, in which the Council declared that:

"Each party has the obligation to use all means at its disposal to prevent action violating the truce by individuals or groups who are subject to its authority or who are in territory under its control";

"No party is permitted to violate the truce on the ground that it is undertaking reprisals or retaliations against the other party."

7. We deem these principles to be applicable to the cease-fire resolutions of June 1967 which both Israel and Jordan have pledged to observe. No one faithful to these principles can view with equanimity the acts of terrorism

which have taken place. But my Government feels strongly that large-scale military actions across cease-fire lines are not the answer. Such actions do not bring security; they only bring deeper insecurity.

8. The wise response, the effective response, is to have recourse to all possible peaceful means of ending the provocation rather than seeking to match it and even to out-top it.

9. There is, as I shall later point out, a peaceful means available on the ground—the United Nations.

10. We also view very gravely the peril which the recent events have created for the all-important peace-making process set in motion by this Council last November. Under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, the Secretary-General's special representative, Mr. Jarring, has been working tirelessly and patiently to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned, and thereby to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with principles unanimously approved by this Council.

11. All recognized that this mandate would not be easily fulfilled; all recognized that the June conflict had raised new emotional and psychological barriers against rapid progress; and, similarly, all must now recognize that those barriers will only be further heightened by violations of the cease-fire, including the action of earlier today.

12. Our experience in the Security Council during the many months in which we have grappled with the Middle Eastern problem has demonstrated that no useful purpose is served by calumny or name-calling. What we should try to do is to shore up the United Nations mechanism available for peace-keeping until Mr. Jarring's peace-making efforts have succeeded, as we all fervently hope they will.

13. In the light of today's developments my Government believes that it is vitally necessary to strengthen the United Nations role in the Israel-Jordan sector of the cease-fire line. In contrast to the Israel-Syrian and Israel-United Arab Republic sectors, where a most helpful United Nations presence has been maintained, there have been no United Nations observers in the Israel-Jordan sector. The Chief of Staff of UNTSO and the Secretary-General have therefore been handicapped in observing and supervising the cease-fire and in reporting on violations of it in this area. This situation should not be permitted to continue in circumstances where the maintenance of the cease-fire and the prospects for a more lasting peace in the entire area are very much at stake.

14. We believe that the Council has the right to expect Israel and Jordan to extend full co-operation to the Chief of Staff of UNTSO and to United Nations observers so that the cease-fire may be fully implemented and strictly observed by all concerned.

15. Today's events demonstrate once again that violence is not and cannot be the answer to the problems of the Middle East. What is urgently required is this: the parties must scrupulously comply with the cease-fire arrangements.

They must co-operate in strengthening the supervision of those arrangements. All concerned must rededicate themselves to the principles of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November which was unanimously adopted by this Council. And all parties must co-operate with Mr. Jarring to hasten the achievement of the objective set forth by the Security Council, a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security'.

16. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The Security Council is now holding a meeting of the greatest urgency at the request of Jordan, the victim of the Israel aggression of 5 June 1967. On the very day when the international community was commemorating the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacres, Israel chose to re-enact that tragedy against the Arab population. That disturbing coincidence clearly illustrates the identical nature of the two situations. The one created today by the Israel forces is particularly grave and disquieting in that it constitutes a direct continuation of the Israel actions of 5 June and part of an over-all policy of constant provocations followed by repeated acts of aggression.

17. Unfortunately, the events which have led to the convening of the Security Council are not isolated, and we are obliged to note, unless we would condemn ourselves to failure, that this phenomenon cannot be examined separately from the links binding it to the problem as a whole.

18. The war waged by Israel against the Arab States is only the manifestation of a colonial type of policy carried out by expatriates from the four corners of the world and upheld by the guilty conscience of the west: a policy which consists in driving from its homeland a peaceful population, deeply attached to its native soil. The whole tragedy cruelly afflicting the Middle East, the whole tragedy for peace in that region, is contained in one word, Palestine. It cannot be said often enough that it is Palestine, the desire of the Palestinians to recover their national rights, which is the crux of the problem. As long as that one basic fact is overlooked, the future is more than likely to repeat the past. The United Nations itself has constantly recalled that fact, which Israel has constantly and unequivocally rejected.

19. We should like to recall certain features of Israel policy towards the United Nations and the principles of our Charter before and after the events of 5 June, for Israel has just violated those principles once more today through its massive attack on the non-occupied part of Jordan. We should like to recall that Israel's acceptance of any decision has always been tied to the attainment of clearly defined objectives. To go back only as far as June 1967, it is well known that despite the Security Council's decision, Israel continued its aggression in Syria, the United Arab Republic and Jordan, until it had achieved the objectives it had set for itself.

20. For example, the entire occupied zone of Syria was occupied after the Council had called for a cease-fire.

21. In order to achieve its objectives, Israel took advantage of the complicity and support of certain Governments and was assisted by certain Zionist organizations. Israel acted in

this way because it knew what lesson to draw from the fact that the United Nations has never imposed sanctions when confronted with problems arising from settler colonies.

22. Merely by reading its statements of the past few days, one could infer that Israel had decided to go beyond the Security Council's decision in order to consolidate its position in the occupied areas and to achieve its standing objective, the definitive annexation of the occupied Arab territories. Moreover, this situation will last as long as that new Messianism, the purpose of which, we are told, is to carry out the divine will, which wants Biblical promises to be fulfilled at the expense of the indigenous people. Recent history reminds us how certain Messiahs arose in Europe and how they met their end.

23. This policy has been expressed in several ways, particularly by the publication of official maps prepared by the Israel authorities, who have even stipulated that the cease-fire lines constitute the only currently valid demarcation lines so far as jurisdiction and international relations are concerned.

24. Furthermore—to quote from a document distributed this afternoon by the Press Services of the United Nations Office of Public Information—as the spokesman for Zionist diplomacy told us this morning, a detail which implies a concern for objectivity, as will be noted: “attacks on Israel from Jordan territory had continued and had steadily increased.”¹ This document recalls that, to the Israel authorities, the cease-fire lines have become the “frontiers of Israel”.

25. In addition, in order to dispel any doubts, the Israel authorities are proceeding to rename the occupied areas with Biblical names, such as “Samaria” and “Judea”, in order to “Zionize” those regions. It is obvious to everyone that such a situation exists, for it is the direct result of the occupation of Arab territories after the aggression of 5 June, which was itself the result of the aggression, clandestine at first and later spectacular, by Zionism against the Palestinian people. The aggression in Palestine is like all colonial aggression, particularly the type found in southern Africa. The presence of Israel in the heart of the Arab world is in itself an act of aggression and can logically be continued only by recourse to aggression.

26. This prolonged occupation has in fact reinforced the Israelis' determination to proceed to the definitive annexation of the occupied territories. The population which remained in the occupied areas despite the war represented, for the Israel authorities, an obstacle to that annexation. Therefore, a policy of oppression and systematic destruction was developed in order to overcome that obstacle and drive the Arabs from their country to swell the ranks of the million and a half Palestinian refugees. The dynamitings, the collective repression and the destruction of entire villages have aroused the indignation of world public opinion.

¹ Quoted in English by the speaker. See United Nations Press Release SC/2981 dated 21 March 1968, take 7.

27. I should like, if I may, to cite a few passages from an article which appeared in *The Guardian* of Manchester on 26 January:

“In response to a series of minor incidents in the last three weeks, the Israel Army has imposed collective punishments on the population (mainly refugees from Palestine) regardless of age and sex. They include curfews lasting several days, during which no proper provision is made for the distribution of food and water; arbitrary arrests; and the random demolition of houses and property belonging to civilians in no way”—I emphasize, in no way—“connected with incidents.

“When I left Gaza this morning, three refugee camps, housing 100,000 Palestine refugees, were under day and night curfews and there was sporadic shooting in the streets of Gaza City which served no apparent purpose beyond the intimidation of the civilian population.

“ . . .

“I had my ups and downs during four years as a prisoner of war in Germany, but the Germans never treated me as harshly as the Israelis are treating the Arabs of Gaza Strip, the majority of whom are women and children.”²

28. The same policy imposed by terror on Jerusalem, Gaza, the region west of the Jordan, and the Sinai, is today being extended by the Zionists to the east bank of the Jordan. Israel is now initiating the third phase of its plan; the first phase was aggression, the second was the annexation of the occupied Arab territories, and the third is to stifle any response to that annexation. For this is not in fact a policy of reprisals, as the Israel authorities would have it, but rather an extended act of expansionism, as the facts demonstrate.

29. Less than a year later, at dawn on 21 March, the Zionist soldiery, estimated at more than 15,000 men, invaded another part of Jordan. We are witnessing today a full-scale territorial invasion carried out by an expeditionary force which has mobilized its full military potential, its tanks, its airborne troops and its aviation. The war front thus opened extends over more than a hundred miles, from the valley of the Jordan to Aqaba.

30. The strength of the forces deployed and the length of the front itself thus clearly show that these are large-scale military operations which can in no sense be likened to selective reprisals, as the propaganda from Tel Aviv contends, even if one were to accept the imperialist concepts of reprisals and the “right of pursuit”. In the face of the daily intensification of what some call “terrorism”, but what is, in fact, the strengthening of Arab resistance movements against the enemy occupation, the Israel troops in addition to using fascist methods denounced by every human conscience against the resistance, have launched a new aggression. Are the examples not conclusive enough to prove to them that neither reprisals nor massacres will suffice to overcome a people fighting for their freedom against foreign occupation?

² Quoted in English by the speaker.

31. In the usurped land of Palestine, an entire nation is proudly and courageously preparing itself to forge and fulfil its destiny. The Palestine liberation movement, notwithstanding the traditionally colonialist epithets with which it has been labelled this morning, is leading its people towards their destiny, as in Viet-Nam and Rhodesia.

32. The Security Council has had to debate the Palestine question for nearly twenty years without respite. The members of this Council know by now the never-changing Israel scenario: prepare public opinion, then attack. The objective is always the same, to acquire more territory and to drive off yet more Palestinian nationals.

33. Israel sees itself as, and in fact is, a series of *faits accomplis* imposed on the international community and particularly on the Arab world. Moreover, according to Israel, we should accept this expansionist phenomenon and grant it the right to work itself out!

34. Not content with merely terrorizing and massacring the Arab population in the occupied territories, the Israel authorities are pursuing these people as far as their refugee camps which have been placed there under the auspices of the United Nations. Hysteria, hatred and unpunished offences have led these authorities to see in every Palestinian a potential resistance fighter, even, or rather particularly, when he has been driven from his homeland.

35. And how could it be otherwise, when we all know that instead of preventing aggression, our Council often meets merely to take note of it? More than once now, the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Jordan have repeated their warnings to this Council that military preparations were well under way in Israel. But bitter experience teaches us that this is only a prelude to further aggression. Knowing what it does, the Security Council can no longer evade its primary responsibility: to condemn aggression. In so doing, it will only be abiding by its own decisions and, above all, discouraging any inclination towards aggression.

36. My delegation would like to reserve its right to speak again at such time as it may deem appropriate.

37. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Today the Israel armed forces have launched a massive armed attack against the east bank of Jordan. The pretext given for this inexcusable action was to attack the so-called terrorist bases in Jordan. The Israel forces crossed the Jordan River in strength, using helicopters, tanks, and all kinds of weapons. There is not a shadow of doubt that that armed attack was premeditated; it is only too obvious that it is part of a series of well-planned actions by Israel against its Arab neighbours, in disregard of the Security Council resolutions calling upon Israel to cease and desist from all acts of aggression in the name of retaliatory action.

38. The representative of Jordan, in his moving speech earlier in the afternoon [1401st meeting], drew our attention to Security Council resolution 228 (1966) adopted on 25 November 1966. Operative paragraph 3 of that resolution reads as follows:

“Emphasizes to Israel that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that, if they are repeated, the

Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts”.

39. Only a few weeks before, Israel had resorted to crimes such as blowing up Arab homes to strike terror in the population of the occupied Arab territories, in contravention of the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Conventions of 1949.³ The whole world stands appalled and aghast at Israel's methods of military occupation and government.

40. On the broader question of the Middle East I shall set forth the views of the Pakistan Government at the appropriate time. Since we are concerned at the moment with the situation created by Israel's act of aggression today, I would emphasize two basic factors involved.

41. First, as long as the Israel forces are not withdrawn from territories occupied by them since June 1967, it is inevitable that a resistance movement should grow among the population of those territories. Indeed, the so-called terrorist activities are but a manifestation of this resistance.

42. Second, the pretext offered by Israel for this action is based on the doctrine of the right of reprisal which Israel has on previous occasions also asserted before the Security Council. I need hardly remind my colleagues that the Council has regarded this doctrine as intolerable. For if we let Israel claim this right, we destroy the very foundations of the Charter.

43. It is time that the Security Council turned its eyes again to the scene and pronounced itself in plain terms in regard to Israel's actions. They call for condemnation. They call for immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from all occupied territories. They call for an immediate halt by Israel of its violations of the Geneva Conventions. My Government is firmly convinced that the Security Council should do no less. The Security Council must act immediately.

44. Those are the observations concerning the present situation that my delegation would wish to offer at this stage. We reserve our right to intervene later.

45. I would mention, parenthetically, that as I listened to the statement of the representative of Israel this morning, I was astonished, as I imagine my colleagues were, that he opened his statement by directly impugning the integrity and impartiality of the Security Council. I have been here for a number of years, and I did not know that I would ever come across a representative of a Member State who, wishing to appear before the Security Council, would begin the presentation of his case by admonishing the Council. But the representative of Israel went further. He served notice on the Security Council that Israel would sit in judgement over it. We consider that such an attitude and such an imperious tone are out of place in this important body.

46. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): The French delegation wishes to thank you, Mr. President, in

³ Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of war victims.

whose abilities we have every confidence, for having urgently convened the Security Council following the extremely serious events which have erupted once again in the Middle East and which have inflicted new and cruel agonies on the unfortunate people of that area.

47. I shall be very brief. Today is not the time to speak at length. It is the time to act, and to act as soon as possible, to put an end to such thoroughly reprehensible military operations. The French Government is deeply concerned by the action taken by the army of Israel against an adversary who, on several occasions since the conflict last June, had demonstrated his willingness to find a just solution to the crisis which has ravaged the region in question.

48. The attack unleashed by Israel, with forces estimated at 15,000 men, over the seventy-mile course of the Jordan River from Lake Tiberias to the Dead Sea, was carried out with tanks, infantry and commandos and supported by aircraft. It was especially directed against the Karameh refugee camp.

49. The fact that this operation has been termed an act of reprisal does not diminish the responsibility of the Government which ordered it. We cannot allow a State to reserve the right violently to take the law into its own hands, as the representative of Israel would have it. Even if certain events alleged to have preceded it are cited by way of excuse, this action is out of all proportion with those events. Moreover, the very concept of reprisals has never been acceptable to us. It is condemned by our Organization and by our Charter. On many a previous occasion, my Government has pointed out that acts of so-called terrorism are the almost inevitable consequence of military occupation; calling particular attention to this danger, it has constantly called for the evacuation of the occupied territories. We now renew that call.

50. This new action cannot be described as "localized and limited preventive measures", as it is in the Israel representative's letter [S/8486], nor can we accept any talk of "necessary measures for the security of the territory and population under [the Israel Government's] jurisdiction", for we cannot recognize that jurisdiction, which was established through occupation.

51. This action was carefully prepared, because for several days preceding it the Amman Government, especially in its letters of 19 and 20 March addressed to our President [S/8478, S/8482], had been stating that it was imminent. The special representative of the Secretary-General, who was called to the Jordanian capital, was informed of the grave concern felt by that government. At the very time when Mr. Jarring, to whose efforts my delegation would like to pay a public tribute, had just studied this grave situation with the Jordanian authorities and was seeking to re-establish peace in that region, in accordance with the will of the Council, and *a fortiori* to avoid any new outbreaks, Israel's attack was launched.

52. The Security Council demands that the cease-fire be respected. It must thoroughly condemn this military operation by the Israel forces. It must demand their withdrawal from the occupied territories. It must insist on

prompt and full compliance with resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967; that compliance can no longer be blocked on fallacious pretexts.

53. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): An urgent meeting of the Security Council has been convened today at the request of the representative of Jordan in order to discuss a new criminal act of aggression committed by Israel against Jordan. This is a further flagrant violation by Israel of the Security Council's decisions on the cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities.

54. In the statement he made today, the representative of Jordan told the Council that Israel armed forces had carried out a large-scale attack on towns and populated places in Jordan and on refugee camps in which many peaceful Arabs were living, and that the Israel air force had also carried out air raids on the territory of his country. He informed the Council that this piratical raid had resulted in heavy casualties and widespread damage to property.

55. He also adduced numerous facts and irrefutable evidence to show that unprovoked aggression had been committed by Israel against Jordan. It is quite clear that this is not a fortuitous incident, but a new deliberate and premeditated act of military provocation—a large-scale aggressive military operation on the part of Israel.

56. The Israel authorities do not even attempt to conceal the fact that this new, flagrant defiance of the Security Council decisions on the cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities is obviously deliberate. On the eve of this criminal attack, we heard various representatives of Israel repeatedly make open threats against the Arab countries, in particular Jordan. Members of the Council well know that the Government of Jordan informed the Security Council well in advance about Israel's preparations for a new aggressive attack.

57. The Security Council has today received official confirmation of the fact that this military attack was planned and prepared by Israel in advance. This can be confirmed by reference to the document containing the communication dated 21 March from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, which says in paragraph 2: "There have also been reports of an unusual build-up of Israel military force in the Jordan valley area." [S/7930/Add.64.]⁴ This is an official confirmation in a United Nations document that the attack against Jordan was planned and prepared.

58. All of this happened at a time when consultations are being carried out by the representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) adopted on 22 November 1967. This is yet another most convincing piece of evidence that Israel does not intend, and has never intended to seek a peaceful settlement in compliance with this Security Council decision. Israel continues to play an unscrupulous double game, trying to mislead the peoples of the world and to make the Arab countries relax their vigilance.

⁴ Quoted in English by the speaker.

59. The diversionary manoeuvres which Tel Aviv used during the consultations with Mr. Jarring were only a camouflage for the preparation of a new act of aggression against the Arab countries. It has also become quite clear why Israel has been stubbornly refusing, and continues to refuse, to accept and implement this Security Council resolution, and why the Israel authorities have been pursuing such a provocative policy, arbitrarily interpreting and distorting this resolution. Only the Security Council, not the Government of Israel, has the right to interpret its resolutions.

60. As the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic quite rightly pointed out in his recent statement—the text of which has been circulated as an official Security Council document dated 19 March 1968 [S/8479] at the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic—Israel's expansionist policy is emphasized by the recent steps it has taken, among which are the administrative annexation of the occupied territories to Israel, the annexation of Jerusalem, its acquisition by force of the Arab lands in Jerusalem with a view to replacing the Arabs by Israelis, its imposition of Israel currency in the occupied territories as well as the repressive measures and the destruction of houses which have forced 400,000 Arabs to flee their homes. All these illegal measures have been denounced throughout the world.

61. As the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic further pointed out, the international community has become immune to Israel's deceptive practices, and is further aware that its persistent occupation of Arab territory constitutes in itself continued aggression against the Arab countries and a violation of the United Nations Charter and Security Council resolutions, no matter how Israel tries to deceive the world by uttering words of peace.

62. Israel's criminal acts reveal the Israel extremists for what they are; they are clearly part of Israel's aggressive policy aimed at the open annexation of territories of the Arab States for the purpose of consolidating the results of their aggression. This is a flagrant violation of both the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

63. Now, as in the past, Israel is attempting to justify its aggression, and its blatant violation of Security Council decisions, by alleging that the attack on Jordan was "an act of reprisal".

64. In this connexion we should recall that on four occasions—in January 1956, in April 1962, in April 1964 and in November 1966—the Security Council categorically condemned Israel for carrying out so-called "reprisals" of a military nature.

65. On 25 November 1966, the Security Council condemned the Government of Israel for its carefully planned "large-scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter" [resolution 228 (1966)]. At that time too Israel was trying to delude the Security Council and the whole world by speaking of the alleged necessity for so-called "reprisals". The Security Council exposed this trick and warned Israel that if actions of military reprisal were repeated the Security Council would have to

"consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter" [ibid.].

66. In his statement, the Israel representative made use once again of a favourite tactic of aggressors, and tried to mislead the Security Council by casting Israel in the role of the "innocent lamb" and shifting the blame for aggression on its victim. But one can have no faith in the words of the aggressor. The facts adduced by the representative of Jordan and the information contained in the Secretariat document to which I have referred, expose Israel beyond all doubt as a violator of the cease-fire and as a country which has committed another act of aggression against the Arab countries.

67. Neither can we fail to remark on the Israel representative's provocative attitude towards the Security Council. He almost posed as a prosecutor, dwelt at length on the impotence of the Security Council, tried to tell the Security Council how it should act, and stated cynically that Israel would continue to carry out so-called "reprisals".

68. All this shows that Israel is once again challenging all the peace-loving nations of the world, the United Nations Charter and the Security Council, and that its ruling circles are continuing to pursue an adventurist, irresponsible and senseless policy which is not only a cause of extreme tension in the Middle East, but a danger to the Israel people themselves.

69. We must also note that responsibility for this new breach of the peace in the Middle East rests not only with the head-strong Israel politicians. It must be shared by the American and British protectors of Tel Aviv, who supply Israel with financial resources and arms, shield the aggressor and, as has recently become clear, place at Israel's disposal their own propaganda machinery for disseminating hatred of and hostility to the Arab world.

70. Recent events are further proof that Israel is still relying for the support of its aggressive policy first and foremost on the political, economic, military and diplomatic assistance of the United States, the United Kingdom and several other Western countries. It is typical that since the recent visit of Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel to Washington, Israel has been acting more provocatively and has now carried out a large-scale armed attack on Jordan.

71. The Security Council cannot overlook such a state of affairs. It must try to ensure that the policies and actions of the United States and some other Western countries do not give Israel the opportunity or the grounds to rely on the assistance and co-operation of those countries. Those countries on whose assistance Israel counts and relies to carry out its aggression must cease to encourage this policy of aggression and must co-operate effectively to improve the situation in the Middle East. It is no secret to anyone that they have the means to do this and should do it.

72. The main and essential prerequisite for a political settlement in the Middle East, as has repeatedly been stated by the Soviet Union, remains the immediate withdrawal of the troops of the Israel aggressors from all seized Arab territories to the positions they held prior to 5 June 1967.

If Israel does not remove its troops from the seized Arab lands, it will be impossible to create the conditions necessary for the settlement of all outstanding problems in that region of the world.

73. In his statement, the representative of the United States mentioned the question of sending more United Nations observers into the Israel-Jordan region. In that connexion, the following considerations should be borne in mind. Does the sending of yet another group of United Nations observers to the region really touch the heart of the matter? The circumstances surrounding this further act of aggression by Israel against Jordan are perfectly clear. Indeed, the Israel representative himself did not deny the facts, nor did he trouble to conceal that a wide-scale military attack had been carried out. So why should we need to concern ourselves with the question of observers?

74. But the question does arise whether this idea has not been thought of for the mere purpose of diverting the Council's attention from the main issue, which is the need to take forceful and effective measures to put a stop to the aggression.

75. We have serious doubts about the value of sending United Nations observers into this region. It is well known that there are United Nations observers—and quite a number of them—in the Suez Canal zone. But this certainly did not prevent the Israel aggressors from committing acts of armed provocation and continuing their aggression. What is more, we only have to refer again to the United Nations Secretariat document I have already mentioned [*S/7930/Add.64*] to convince ourselves once more that Israel is ignoring not only the United Nations observers, but the Organization itself.

76. In paragraph 3 of this document the representative of the Israel authorities states that talks between the representatives of Israel and Jordan should be held without United Nations presence. This shows that Israel is ignoring the United Nations, and does not wish representatives of the United Nations to be present during the meetings and talks with the representative of Jordan. In that case, what is the point of sending more United Nations observers to the region?

77. The Soviet Union considers that the Security Council should categorically condemn this new act of armed aggression which has been committed by Israel against an Arab country, Jordan. Israel has violated Security Council decisions, which are binding on all States Members of the United Nations, regarding the cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities. This entirely justifies the Security Council's undertaking immediately and urgently the most effective measures against the Israel aggressors in accordance with the United Nations Charter and in defence of the rights and interests of the victims of this aggression.

78. If the measures taken by the Security Council in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security have proved inadequate, the Council is authorized to apply appropriate sanctions. Therefore, as the Soviet Union has stated, if Israel continues to disregard the decisions and demands of

the Security Council, it will be necessary to apply sanctions against it as an aggressor who has violated Security Council decisions.

79. If such a decision is taken by the Security Council, the Soviet Union will be ready to take part in implementing those sanctions.

80. We must sternly condemn and firmly call a halt to Israel aggression against Jordan, and force the aggressor to comply with and respect the decisions of the Security Council, as required by the United Nations Charter.

81. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Once again the Security Council is meeting under the shadow of a crisis in West Asia which has been forcefully brought to our attention by the Israel armed attack today on Jordanian territory east of the Jordan River. According to the latest reports, Israel armed forces mounted a large-scale operation across the cease-fire positions along the Jordan River and attacked several Jordanian villages. This has resulted in heavy loss of life and damage to civilian property.

82. This is not, of course, the first time that the Security Council has been called to meet and consider a situation resulting from violations of the cease-fire. In July 1967, after the Council met to consider a similar situation, it emphasized the need for all parties to observe the provisions of Security Council resolutions 233 (1967), 234 (1967), 235 (1967) and 236 (1967). On 25 October 1967 the Council, in its resolution 240 (1967), condemned the violations of the cease-fire, reaffirmed the necessity of strict observance thereof, and demanded the immediate cessation of all prohibited military activities in the area.

83. From the account given by the representative of Jordan as well as from the reports which have appeared in the press, it is clear that we are once again facing a similar situation. But this time the Government of Jordan had foreseen the massive violation of the cease-fire by Israel. The representative of Jordan, in his letter dated 19 March, informed the Council that the "Israel authorities are now contemplating a mass armed attack against the east bank of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan" [*S/8478*].

84. In view of the gravity of the situation and the urgency of positive action by the Council, my delegation would not at this stage like to go into details. Suffice it to say that the latest action of the Israel authorities is in utter defiance of resolution 236 (1967) of 12 June 1967 which specifically prohibited any forward military movement subsequent to the cease-fire. In the context of this clear prohibition, the Israel attack on Jordanian territory today cannot be justified on any ground and must therefore be condemned as a grave violation of the cease-fire imposed by the Security Council. It is incumbent upon the Council to act immediately and not only order an immediate cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of Israel military forces which have crossed the Jordan River—if they have not already been withdrawn—but also demand of Israel that it desist from action of that kind in the future.

85. Resolution 236 (1967) of the Council, to which I have just referred, also called for "full co-operation with the

Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the observers in implementing the cease-fire". In this connexion, my delegation cannot but notice from the Secretary-General's report that on 20 March Jordan had proposed a meeting with Israel under the auspices of the United Nations. This was refused by the Government of Israel. The Secretary-General has rightly characterized that refusal as "unnecessarily negative and rigid" [S/7930/Add.64]. That refusal is in violation of the relevant paragraph of resolution 236 (1967) which I have just quoted.

86. During the entire discussion of the West Asian crisis in the Security Council and the General Assembly in 1967, my delegation consistently maintained a position which is not only one of principle, but also the most just and practical one. The continued occupation of vast Arab territories and the frequent clashes along the cease-fire positions are constant reminders of the serious situation prevailing in that area. My delegation has always held, and would like to reiterate again, that we cannot expect the return of peace and security to the area without the withdrawal of the Israel forces from occupied Arab lands. This principle was clearly recognized in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

87. It is a matter of regret that, in spite of the patient and arduous efforts of the special representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, no progress has yet been made in the implementation of that resolution. Without such implementation we cannot hope to lay the foundations of lasting peace in West Asia. It is therefore of prime importance that this resolution be implemented in full. We are glad to note from the letter of the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic [S/8479] that his Government has informed Mr. Jarring of its readiness to implement this resolution. Speaking in the Council this morning, the representative of Jordan also affirmed his Government's desire to give Mr. Jarring every chance to succeed in his mission. My delegation is apprehensive, however, that such serious violations of the cease-fire could jeopardize the mission.

88. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to express my thanks to you and to the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to address the Council on the grave situation in the Middle East.

89. The last time I addressed the Council on this question was at the 1348th meeting on 6 June 1967, immediately after the adoption of the cease-fire resolution of that date [233 (1967)]. I would recall that I cautioned the Council against a cease-fire resolution that was not accompanied by a demand for the withdrawal of the occupying forces from Arab lands. I stated at the time that a resolution which merely concerned itself with a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities, without asking for withdrawal, would give Israel the opportunity and the chance to perpetuate its occupation of Arab lands and enable it eventually to annex those lands. In fact, the representatives of Israel in this Council and in the General Assembly have never ceased to say that the failure of the Council to ask for the immediate withdrawal of the occupying forces from Arab lands was, in

effect, agreement on the part of the Council that Israel has no international obligation to withdraw its forces. Encouraged by this, every single action taken by the Government of Israel from June 1967 until today has been carefully planned and calculated with a view to the eventual annexation of the occupied territory.

90. Barely three weeks after the adoption of the cease-fire resolution of 6 June, Israel annexed the Arab part of Jerusalem—on 28 June 1967. That matter, of course, was brought before the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly which adopted two resolutions on the question [2253 (ES-V), 2254 (ES-V)] and asked the Secretary-General to send a special representative to look into the situation and report to him thereon. The General Assembly, by overwhelming majorities, considered that the actions taken by Israel in respect of Jerusalem were invalid, and called upon that Government to rescind them forthwith. But the report which was presented on 12 September 1967 [S/8146] by Mr. Ernesto A. Thalmann of Switzerland, the special representative of the Secretary-General, informed the international community that the position of Israel had not changed and that he had been informed by Israel officials that the actions and measures taken in Jerusalem were not negotiable and were irreversible.

91. At the same time, the well-planned and calculated campaign of terror against the Arab people of Palestine continued unabated, with the result that nearly 400,000 people were evicted from their homes and had to flee across the Jordan River, and this in spite of the solemn resolution adopted by the Security Council on 14 June [237 (1967)], which was reaffirmed twice by the General Assembly, at its fifth emergency special session [2252 (ES-V)] and also at its twenty-second regular session [2341 (XXII)].

92. It was clear from the very beginning that Israel did not want the United Nations to intervene in this question; they made no secret of this position. They greeted the failure of the fifth emergency special session to adopt a resolution on the substantive question of withdrawal as a great victory for them, in spite of the fact that at the time there was virtual unanimity in the United Nations on asking for withdrawal because it was considered inadmissible under the Charter to achieve territorial gains by military force.

93. At the opening of the twenty-second regular session, the Foreign Minister of Israel again cautioned the General Assembly against interfering in the question, and said: The Middle East is not a protectorate, and therefore the matter should not be a subject of decisions by the General Assembly.

94. They did everything possible, as all members of the Council know, to prevent this Council from taking a substantive decision. But the Council took a decision on 22 November 1967, when it adopted unanimously the draft resolution proposed by Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom. But I am sure all members of the Council recall that during the agonizing weeks and months that preceded the adoption of that resolution and the continuous discussions and contacts between the members of the Council and the parties directly concerned, it was made quite clear that there was no possibility of the

Council's taking a decision on direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. The fact that resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 did not contain a provision for direct negotiations was not accidental; it was deliberate. For if there had been any possibility of the Arab side accepting direct negotiations while their territories were under military occupation, there would have been no need for the contacts and for the discussions that went on for weeks and months. There was a delicate balance presented in that resolution, in which the main effort of the international community to settle the problem peacefully was entrusted not to the parties directly concerned but to a special representative of the Secretary-General, on whose shoulders the main responsibility had lain from that day, 22 November.

95. But we have seen that since the adoption of that resolution the Government of Israel has never tired of trying to read into it its own interpretation, of trying to show that that resolution provided for direct negotiations, when everybody knows that it did not; and it did not because it was impossible to have a resolution calling for direct negotiations go through the Council. And our rejection of direct negotiations is based on a very simple premise and fact—namely, that no self-respecting Government can possibly negotiate under the threat and shadow of foreign occupation of its land. Such would be not negotiation, but capitulation. The Arab people are not capitulating, have not capitulated, and never will capitulate. History and time are on our side.

96. But what has Israel done since the adoption of that resolution? Has it co-operated loyally with the special representative of the Secretary-General? Has it tried to provide the necessary conditions for the success of his task? Has it, in other words, facilitated his mission? Or has it by every means at its disposal tried to ensure the failure of his mission and prevent a peaceful settlement of the problem? From the beginning of December 1967 there has been a continuous and increasing provocation on the part of Israel against Jordan. The Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations has given the Council all the necessary information about the actions of the Israel armed forces in shelling refugee camps across the Jordan River, with tragic loss of life. The wholesale expulsions and the reign of terror in Gaza have continued; more than 800 acres of Arab land in Jerusalem have been expropriated; and then, finally, the decision was announced that the occupied territories were no longer to be considered as enemy territory, and that therefore all points of entry into Israel would be at the commencement of the occupied territory. The Israeli authorities could not have been ignorant of the fact that those measures made the tasks of Mr. Jarring difficult, if not impossible.

97. One thing I must hand to the Israelis: they never act rashly or on the spur of the moment. Everything they do is well planned and calculated. And I think when one considers the whole picture of these actions which began right after the adoption of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November and culminated in the massive attack of today, we have a clear picture with a very clear aim, and that is to prevent the success of Mr. Jarring's mission, since they failed to prevent the Security Council from adopting a resolution on this question.

98. What is the situation facing the Council today? A cease-fire line was established following the adoption of Council resolution 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967, when the Council made it quite clear that no violation of the cease-fire shall be tolerated coming from any side. Yet, how many times has Israel violated the cease-fire, whether across the Jordan River or in the Suez Canal area? And what greater violation is there than the dispatching of 14,000 or 15,000 troops across the cease-fire line, supported by tanks, artillery and aircraft, sending hundreds of paratroopers deep into Jordanian territory, and then massacring more than 150, perhaps 200 civilians in Jordan?

99. They have called these civilians terrorists. But perhaps what they did, in the short time available to them today, was to kill any young man under thirty. And this reminds me of what we read in the Bible about King Herod when the birth of Christ made him perpetrate one of the greatest crimes in history, that is, the massacre of the innocents. Is that not the same thing, killing 150 or 200 young men within a few hours? Could they not possibly know that those young men were so-called terrorists? They slaughtered them all just in case some of them might be freedom fighters, as we call them, or terrorists as they call them.

100. But is it conceivable that in a country under occupation, and under repressive military rule, there will not be opposition on the part of the inhabitants? As I look around this table, I can see representatives of many countries which were victims of foreign occupation; and the resistance fighters and freedom fighters of those countries against heavy odds fought against the occupying Power. The people of Palestine are no different. There is no Government in the Arab world that is able or willing to prevent the activities of those freedom-fighters. As long as Israel maintains its occupation of our territories, as long as it continues measures aimed at the eventual annexation of those territories, it cannot expect the Arab countries to provide it with defence and sanctuary against the efforts of the people of Palestine to regain their lost homeland.

101. In any case, the cease-fire resolution was addressed to Governments. It was not addressed to individuals acting as individuals without the instigation of any Government. Because, I am sure nobody can disagree that all these acts of the infiltrators or of the freedom fighters who are still on occupied territory are not the result of official or governmental instigation, but are the actions of peoples who cannot tolerate the continuance of foreign military occupation of their homeland.

102. It is wrong to state, as the representative of the United States stated this afternoon, that the activities of those freedom fighters can be considered as violations of the cease-fire resolution. That resolution was addressed to Governments. And it is only the action of the Israel armed forces, under direct orders of their Government, that can properly be considered as a violation of the cease-fire resolution.

103. But what is the Council to do in the face of this clear violation not only of the cease-fire resolution but of the obligations of Israel as a Member of the United Nations,

and of the most elementary principles of international law and equity? Are we to satisfy ourselves with a recommendation that United Nations observers be stationed there, and forget about this violation and the tragic loss of life that it caused? Or is the Council called upon to protect its own resolution, to protect a vital and basic principle of the United Nations Charter by making it quite clear to Israel that actions of this kind cannot be tolerated by the international community, but must be roundly and clearly condemned as acts of aggression? Therefore, we support the view of representatives who spoke before me that the Council must invoke Chapter VII of the Charter and take enforcement and punitive measures against Israel including the imposition of sanctions.

104. Because of the urgency of the problem, I do not wish to prolong my statement now, but I hope I shall have another opportunity to speak at some length on the substantive issues relating to the Middle Eastern crisis. I think now we should try to get the whole Council behind a decision that would make clear to Israel that actions of this sort shall not pass unnoticed or unpunished.

105. But before concluding, I must say that I was struck by the statement of the representative of Israel this morning when he spoke about armistice lines and how inadequate they were, and that Israel never considered them as its frontiers, and therefore would never go back to them.

106. I think this is the argument we have heard so often, that the armistice lines were bad frontiers and therefore Israel will never agree to go back to them; in other words, trying to justify annexation of large territories conquered from Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. But I came across an interesting statement made at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly just a few months before Israel unleashed its aggressive war on the Arab people last June. This was a statement by Mr. Eban in the general debate in October 1966, only eight months before the war; these are his words:

“Behind the armistice frontiers established by agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbours in 1949, the national life of sovereign States has become crystallized in an increasingly stable mould. There is some evidence that thoughtful minds in the Middle East are becoming sceptical about threats to change the existing territorial and political structure by armed force. Such threats, and the policies concerted to support them, offend the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter. They violate”—and these are the words of Mr. Eban—“bilateral agreements freely negotiated and solemnly signed”—meaning, of course, the Armistice Agreements—

“They undermine the central principles of international civility, and they have no chance of being carried into effect . . . [because of] the opposition of the world community to the alteration by aggressive force of legally established and internationally recognized situations.”

He went on to say:

“It is not really necessary to formulate new or special principles for peace and security in the Middle East.”⁵

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 1428th meeting, paras. 112 and 113.*

107. I have quoted the statement to show clearly the cynical opportunism of Israel's policy in the United Nations. Something which was defended with such eloquence in October of 1966 was attacked with such vehemence only a few months later when Israel was able, by its act of aggression, to occupy Arab lands. I will have a lot more to say on this and other aspects of the Middle East situation when the time comes. But I call on the Council not to heed the arrogant threats of the representative of Israel, who appointed himself judge of the Council this morning, but to take actions that are consistent with its own resolution and with the basic principles of the Charter. An abdication of responsibility now and failure to take resolute action will have the most serious and catastrophic consequences for this Organization and for international peace and security.

108. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): It is with deep regret and with a sense of grave anxiety that we have learnt of the military reprisals that have been undertaken by the armed forces of Israel in Jordanian territory which lies clearly over and beyond the cease-fire positions established in accordance with the decisions of this Council. My delegation deplores this act on the part of the military forces of Israel which we consider to be most unfortunate and ill-advised—the more so since there can be no excuse for such action in circumstances where a United Nations machinery exists in the area and a special representative of the Secretary-General is patiently endeavouring to carry out a high mission entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Council.

109. We had been hopeful that the quiet and persistent effort of Mr. Jarring would by now lead to some progress, thus making it possible for the United Nations to effectively implement the provisions contained in resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. But it is all too obvious that for Mr. Jarring to be successful in his high mission of peace in this troubled area it is necessary that he obtain the unreserved co-operation of all the parties concerned, and that nothing be done which would undermine the purposes of his urgent and delicate mission. It is only the full co-operation and restraint on all sides that can ensure the success of the United Nations effort to bring peace and tranquillity to this area; and the Security Council, which has assumed its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in the area in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Charter, is entitled to demand that the chance of peace be not jeopardized by impulsive hostile acts.

110. The military reprisal that Israel has undertaken cannot even be justified by what the representative of Israel describes in his letter addressed to the Security Council [S/8486] as being measures undertaken to meet the need to avert terrorist activities that are alleged to have been committed by armed bands organized on the Jordanian side of the armistice position.

111. While fully recognizing the need for strict observance of all cease-fire provisions and for the avoidance of hostile acts on all sides, and while also deploring the sad consequences of such hostilities, my delegation maintains none the less that military reprisals can in no way be

permissible or justified. It is the view of my delegation that all developments and incidents that might arise in the fragile situation surrounding the cease-fire arrangements should be resolved through the United Nations machinery that exists in the area.

112. We cannot allow such reprisals to continue without jeopardizing the delicate task that has been entrusted to the Secretary-General and to his special representative, Mr. Jarring. I need hardly recall in this connexion the provision of Security Council resolution 228 (1966) of 25 November 1966, by which the Security Council has already made it clear that acts of military reprisals cannot be tolerated.

113. In the face of the present act of reprisal undertaken by the armed forces of Israel, the Council has no alternative but to deplore this act of reprisal and to demand that the said forces be immediately withdrawn to the positions of the cease-fire they previously occupied behind the west bank of the Jordan River. My delegation would further urge the Council to sound a clear and unmistakable warning that acts of military hostility and reprisal are not to be tolerated and that the party that resorts to such acts can expect nothing but censure from the Security Council.

114. It is on the basis of those considerations that, in the view of my delegation, the Security Council must now take an urgent decision.

115. In conclusion, I wish to say that the cause of peace in the Middle East is in no way served by hostilities and reprisals. The way to peace in the Middle East lies in the acceptance by both sides of resolution 242 (1967) of the Council as the basis for lasting peace and permanent settlement.

116. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to express my delegation's thanks to you and to the members of the Council for having given my country the opportunity to express some of its views on the incidents which have just occurred today. I must acknowledge that I take the floor with a feeling both of professional satisfaction, since events have proven us right, and of sorrow, for our prediction has been tragically borne out by the corpses of the new Arab dead we bury today.

117. Before going any further, I should also like to make a few remarks concerning the statement made before the Council this morning by the new representative of Israel. He told us that this was the first time he had had the occasion to speak before the Council, and he did so like those missionaries who, in taking up their parish, begin their preaching with the most elementary catechism, as if their parishioners knew nothing at all of religion or of God. Apparently like all Israel representatives, he dwelt inordinately on the well-known theme of justifying the existence of Israel by the persecution and the horrors of nazism. Perhaps he thought that he would move us in his own way and that he was doing the duty of a new priest of Israel by explaining to us that the phenomenon of the existence of Israel is closely linked to the memory of the horrors of nazism.

118. I think that, like a good banker, he feels that the credit established by Hitler for the history of Israel has not yet been exhausted. That notion has been made use of, but its historical and moral falsity has been proved. While he told us of the Hitler régime, he neglected to speak to us of the activities of world Zionism well before the turn of the century, of the international deals at the time of the Balfour Declaration, or of the groups which had already been sent to Palestine before the Second World War to establish the Jewish homeland, which cannot be considered as compensation for the concentration camps of which the Jews, as citizens of the occupied countries which suffered under Hitler's racism, were the victims at that time.

119. I believe that in the treaties and agreements signed by the Great Powers after the defeat of the Germans and at the time of the Nürnberg trials, no decision was taken which obliged the world community to establish a state of Israel in order to give Jewish nationals of the occupied countries some sort of compensation.

120. At that time, certain great Powers, perhaps because they were shocked by the excesses of nazism and by the choice of the Jews as its main victims, or perhaps to soothe a guilty conscience caused by the years which preceded the war and by the anti-Semitism in certain European capitals, sought to appease the conscience of the international community. There is a very wise counsel mentioned in the Bible which I believe, has been handed down by all civilizations from the very beginnings of mankind: two wrongs cannot make a right, and an injustice can never be set right by another injustice.

121. There is no human value, legal principle or moral value which, in order to compensate the Jewish people, can permit the choosing of another victim and the eviction of a community from its own homeland to make room for nationals of various countries who receive financial and territorial reparations both as a nation and as a people, when the State of Israel itself continues to exploit the conscience of German Christian democracy in order to receive compensation for the Jewish victims in the form of armaments and money.

122. I wonder what Power in the world would dare to say, before the Arab victims who are scattered everywhere as refugees or those in the refugee camps which Israel still attacks today, that there is an international conscience which can justify such behaviour and which can find moral justification for refusing compensation to the Arabs.

123. I have made these preliminary remarks in order not to disappoint the Israel representative, who doubtless expected his statement to provoke some reply.

124. But to come to the crux of the problem, we have been told this morning that for twenty years Israel has been fighting day after day for its survival and its existence.

125. I should like very briefly to review exactly what has occurred in that part of the world in the past twenty years. On the one hand, we have been witnessing a State growing stronger each day, becoming a Power, perhaps even a great colonizing and imperialist Power; we have seen Jewish

immigrants come from all over the world to swell the nation which has installed itself in that territory. On the other hand we see an uninterrupted exile of Arabs, who have been periodically expelled from their homeland over a period of twenty years, in identical circumstances on practically every occasion, to make room for expatriates who have no right to live in that region.

126. I think that what we witnessed—in 1948 here in the United Nations, unfortunately—with the creation of the State of Israel was a ruthless violation of every legal criterion of international law, of every humanitarian and moral principle; a violation justified at the time with whatever sophistry and rhetoric one great Power or another managed to produce, but having no justification in the criteria which constitute the basis for the creation, existence and legitimacy of States.

127. The United Nations served as a shield in that international situation, and the fact is perhaps regretted by many of those responsible at the time. But lines were established limiting the territory of Israel in that region. If we look at the map of the Middle East, we see that this people, which contends that it has fought daily for its survival, has expanded far and wide, and rarely in modern history has a country which came to existence in the guise of a victim become so large, widespread and powerful an empire in so short a time.

128. This is how Israel sees itself, as victim; whereas today it enjoys the privilege of a very great Power which, by military action and legal cunning, has evaded all the United Nations resolutions permitting its existence within certain limits, and now occupies territory twice as large as the area that had been allotted it.

129. What has been done on the Arab side, these twenty years, when decisions have been taken by the United Nations? We have shown a scrupulous respect for those decisions. Whether we have found them satisfactory or not, we have acknowledged that the decisions of the Security Council are invested with an authority which all must respect. The victims of these resolutions, who have shown their respect for these values of the Charter, should not also be the constant victims of the legal trickery through which Israel distorts their meaning with ease and impunity. Aside from the resolutions which have not been respected, there is, for instance, the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, whereby three great Powers committed themselves to ensuring that the *status quo* in that part of the world would be respected. But we saw not a single measure taken by the Powers in question when the *status quo* was violently and repeatedly altered. Neither at the time of the Suez affair in 1956, nor when Israel changed the structure and status of the territories in that region, did the great Powers do anything, although they had pledged their own moral and political authority to guarantee respect for the Tripartite Declaration.

130. I can think of a Security Council resolution which caused us no satisfaction, but which we saw, at the time of its adoption, as a last effort to achieve unanimity in the Council so that useful and effective steps could be taken. We were told that if that resolution were adopted as it

stood, it would receive the moral and political support of the great Powers which had taken the initiative in proposing it to the Council or whose representatives had spoken here to explain how they intended to implement that decision. Unfortunately, since the cease-fire and since that resolution was adopted, we have witnessed a series of violations at every level—military, legal, and in the fields of public order and of human rights; we have seen these endless violations repeated with ever-increasing frequency—proof that the intentions we imputed to Israel at the time of the crisis were indeed that State's real intentions.

131. We were told that we were over-dramatizing the situation. Unhappily, today we have good reason to ask those who accused us then of systematic pessimism to bury their illusions and their trust, if they ever truly had any.

132. At the time the cease-fire decision was adopted, a Council meeting was convened for six o'clock in the morning, you will recall, and continued until after four o'clock in the afternoon [1352nd meeting]. The Israel military authorities took no action in response to the Council's appeal, for they intended to reach strategic positions, arrive at the banks of the Suez Canal, complete the occupation of the west bank of the Jordan and take the Syrian heights. We said at that time that Israel's plans went beyond a strictly military operation of intimidation, that they had political consequences and aimed at political objectives which have been the same since time began, namely to hold as many trumps as possible and so be in a position to impose peace terms or armistice conditions.

133. The cease-fire, which we accepted immediately, as the Council requested, was callously ignored from the day it was adopted until Israel had achieved its real objectives. Moreover, we have the impression that even that belated cease-fire did not satisfy Israel, for we have since been witnessing the continuation, in one form or another of Israel activities aimed at nothing less than the annexation of the territories.

134. Here I should like to stress the gravity of the position taken by the Minister of the Interior of Israel in deciding to place the occupied territories under the municipal law of the State of Israel. In all history, except in the case of the Nazi régime, or that of German nationalism under Bismarck, we have never seen an occupied territory immediately become conquered land, annexed to the territory of the conqueror by the arbitrary dictate of the conqueror's law. It will be recalled that in 1870, under Bismarck, Prussia annexed Alsace-Lorraine under the same conditions, in violation of the international law of the time. When Hitler's Germany conquered the Sudetenland, it immediately annexed that territory and placed it under the municipal administration of the Hitler régime, under the authority of Himmler. And when the *Anschluss* took place, that political and military operation whose very name signifies a union pure and simple, the territory of Austria was immediately placed under German authority. At that time the entire world, though perhaps even more powerless than today, at least attempted to take legal action against that alteration of international law. It may have been unable to take military action at the time—and that failure to react cost it dear—but in any case there were consciences

among the great Powers at the time which denounced that violation of international law. Now, Israel, with its Semitic rhetorical cunning—and I hope it will recognize that we share its awareness of these subtleties—has blatantly announced, three times over, that the territories in question have ceased to be enemy territories. If that is the case, we should like to know what they have become. Three times Israel has announced that the law relating to occupied territories is no longer applicable. What law, then, is now applied to those territories?

135. Our understanding is that a cease-fire is a form of *status quo* which covers all activities in the occupied territories. It was explained that this related to customs measures, measures to facilitate movement, and so on. Israel has accepted the cease-fire; it must therefore accept the political and legal consequences thereof. But the great Powers have not reacted, nor has the Security Council. It is that which has given Israel the courage to continue its activities, with the idea that the international community either has an interest in maintaining a tacit complicity, or stands powerless before what is being done.

136. Of course: the events of the past few weeks have shown us that a Mr. Smith or a Mr. Vorster can defy the international conscience with impunity, and Zionism, which sees Mr. Smith as its imitator and South Africa as its fellow traveller, cannot lag behind those two régimes in its behaviour.

137. Unfortunately, the Security Council has for months had nothing on its agenda but problems concerning these three States, inspired by the same philosophy, the same policy and the same insolence towards the international community.

138. I have summarized a few facts which have incalculable consequences for the future. When we have approached the Secretary-General and successive Presidents of the Security Council, it has never been our intention merely to pile up extra documents and fresh protests; fully aware of our responsibility, we wished to produce proof of Israel's intentions in completely ignoring the political situation created by the Council's decisions. It ignored that situation at the outset, because it never intended to state how it meant to implement the Council's resolution. When Mr. Jarring was endeavouring to produce some small basis for optimism and to pave the way for a dialogue, it sabotaged all his efforts.

139. I was very pleased to hear one of the most authoritative voices in the Council remark a few moments ago that it was no mere coincidence that today's events occurred at the very time when Mr. Jarring was leaving by air for Amman to continue one of the stages in his endeavours. This reminds us that on the very eve of 5 June 1967, the movements of certain ruling Powers had led us to believe that important contacts and visits were going to take place in order to bring about a settlement of the crisis; and it was on the following day that we found ourselves confronted with the aggression of 4 June 1967.

140. Is it possible that all these facts cannot make the Council more vividly aware of the events which are taking

place in the region? The method of operation is exactly that of the Nazis, who seem to be an obsession with the Israelis. It forms the background of their political doctrine, their actions and their legal approach to the problem in the Middle East and evidently draws its inspiration from the cunning of Ribbentrop or the actions of Himmler. I think that after the events which have just taken place it is important to try and gauge the scope of Israel's intentions. The challenge is hurled not only at the Arabs, but at this international Organization, whose decisions, despite all the prestige attached to the members of this Council and to the Organization itself, are wrecked and eroded day after day by the decisions of the Tel Aviv clique.

141. I think it is time we became aware of this problem. What has Israel just done this morning? It has carried out a military operation, the aims of which have been publicly announced, and the Prime Minister has said he is satisfied with that operation and that the Israel troops are returning home after having accomplished their mission and achieved their purpose.

142. I do not think Hitler ever had the courage to make such momentous statements; he left the League of Nations, rather than have to juggle with the law. Yet, Israel continues to sit among us, tries to stir the conscience of the world with reports which have nothing to do with its own conduct, and goes on behaving before the international community like an international pirate whose impunity is assured.

143. It is perhaps superfluous to add any more to our debates here, when the Council is considering a situation which everyone knows to be one of reprisals. There have been precedents in this very body; let me cite a few of them. There was a resolution condemning the United Kingdom for reprisals against the village of Harib in Yemen. There was a resolution, submitted by one of the great Powers sitting in this Council and concerning certain incidents in As Samu, which expressed the United Nations unequivocal condemnation of the principle of reprisals. It was deeply disappointing to hear certain representatives say this afternoon that the victim was being placed on an equal footing with the aggressor and that an appeal should be addressed to both parties to cease their activities.

144. I think it would be more honest today, to recall that the Security Council and the General Assembly have recently taken a very clear stand in condemning reprisals: just as, a few years ago, the international community and all the jurists of the world pronounced against the right of pursuit. If at that time everyone had turned a blind eye to the arguments advanced in support of the right of pursuit, I believe that today we should have had the conquest of Cambodia.

145. I believe it to be absolutely necessary for the Security Council to take a clear decision, to express unqualified condemnation, and not compare Israel's military operations with the actions of people who in the face of the illegal act of aggression, have no resource but the legitimate action of self-liberation.

146. We were more than a little shocked to see this morning in a United Nations text, in the supplementary

information which was circulated, that the word "terrorists" had been used. Worse still, we found the phrase "relating to terrorist activities on the Israel side [S/7930/Add.64, para. 2]." I think the Israel representative made a slip this morning—unless he did it on purpose. He spoke of terrorists infiltrating into Israel territory. I am not aware that the west bank of Jordan is Israel territory. He should say that they are infiltrating into their own country: that would be more in keeping with the facts. If Israel accuses them of terrorism, that is the conqueror's own personal point of view; but that the United Nations should use such a term in one of its documents justifies us, I think—with all due respect to the departments which drafted the text—in drawing attention to the use of such terms in United Nations documents.

147. I do not wish to say much more at this stage; I would only recall that there have been other equally serious occasions when we have called upon the Security Council, asking it to take decisions in keeping with the importance of the events, and that then, apparently, different ideas prevailed.

148. Today, confronted with a situation in the Middle East which has lasted for six months, we can see that the course on which Israel has embarked is directed to the very goal which we denounced at the beginning. If the United Nations continues to ignore it, I believe that this Organization could incur a much graver responsibility than that of its predecessor before the Second World War, and that to express moral condemnation of Israel would be a totally inadequate reaction. The Security Council must—and it is with great respect that I make this appeal—show itself equal to the events which have just taken place.

149. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The Security Council is faced again with an act of armed invasion against Jordan, the latest in a chain of aggressive actions that Israel has for years been committing against the Arab countries.

150. The Permanent Representative of Jordan informed the Council in his letter of 21 March 1968 that "the Israel authorities launched their mass attack" [S/8484], another clear case of a premeditated and reckless attack, to the possibility and even to the probability of which the Permanent Representative of Jordan had drawn our attention well in advance during the past days.

151. Not so long ago, the Security Council, after months of inconclusive discussions, finally adopted, on 22 November 1967, resolution 242 (1967) with a view to eliminating the consequences of the aggression of Israel in June 1967. It is common knowledge that that resolution has never been accepted by Israel. It has not withdrawn its armed forces from territories it occupied during that war. In sharp contrast to the attitude of the interested Arab States, which have repeatedly stated their readiness to abide by the terms of that resolution, Israel has so far refused to do so, and thus its attitude is in direct contravention of Article 25 of the Charter.

152. The fact that Israel has again seen fit to resort to naked armed aggression cannot but convince everyone that the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations remain

dead letters for Israel. It is the law of the jungle and the conviction that might makes right which constitute the foundation of Israel's policy towards its neighbours. The arrogance with which the representative of Israel felt entitled to state this morning that it is for Israel alone to decide when to attack another Member State of the United Nations should open the eyes of even those who, for reasons known only to them, have been reluctant to require that Israel should abide by the provisions of the Charter. Their failure to condemn the aggression by Israel of June 1967 has only added to making Israel more arrogant and more contemptuous of the most elementary norms of behaviour among States.

153. The representative of Israel in his by now traditional manner could again not resist the temptation to refer to matters outside the scope of our discussion. He referred to the brutalities of the Nazis during the Second World War. In spite of the irrelevance of those issues to our present discussion—and the aim of such statements is clearly to inject emotional elements into the discussion—we should be thankful to him for raising the point. By reminding us of the behaviour of the Nazis he unwittingly directed our attention to the tragic similarity of Israel's attitude in occupied Arab territories to that of the Nazi occupiers in Europe. We understand the interest of Israel in depicting the self-defence of the population of the Arab territories as violence, and those who have been chased from there by Israel as terrorists. We still remember those terms being used by the Nazis against the resistance fighters of many European countries who heroically resisted the invaders of their homelands. It brings no glory to Israel to emulate them here.

154. We want to state in the most categorical manner that the Charter of the United Nations recognizes the right of everyone to resist aggression. It is Israel which has been acting in contravention of our Charter by invading and occupying Arab lands, by driving away their inhabitants, by instituting a reign of terror and reprisals against the civilian population, by destroying their homes and committing other atrocities in the occupied territories. No amount of sophistry can conceal the fact that the resistance of the Arab peoples, like the resistance of the Jordanians against the invaders of their homeland, is lawful and is in full conformity with the Charter.

155. The Foreign Minister of my country stated very clearly our position regarding this situation in the course of the general debate of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly when he said:

"According to the Charter of the United Nations, all necessary steps are justified in order to put a stop to aggression and to liquidate its consequences."⁶

156. In his statement the representative of Israel openly claimed the right to wage preventive wars, a claim which the Charter expressly forbids. Is it not obvious to everyone that by acting in that manner Israel is clearly setting itself outside the scope of our Charter? What we are told in

⁶ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1578th meeting, para. 17.

effect in this: All Member States are obliged to abide by the provisions of the Charter except Israel which has the right to start preventive wars and search-and-destroy missions in the lands of others.

157. We heard the representative of Israel speak of "mopping-up operations". The spiritual parent of all these operations must be heartened by the knowledge which his pupils so convincingly demonstrate day by day. It was after all not useless for General Moshe Dayan to study those operations in Viet-Nam. Now he and his Government can put them into practice against other peoples fighting for their independence and territorial integrity.

158. The Arab peoples, as the representative of Jordan has reminded us, put their confidence in the Security Council. Israel's attitude towards our Council was eloquently stated by Mr. Tekoah this morning. We are not to be trusted, he stated in effect, because some of us have condemned the earlier aggressions committed by Israel.

159. We are proud of having taken a resolute stand against Israel aggressions, and will continue to do so. We are not claiming to be impartial between the invader and the invaded. We have been entrusted by our people with the task of strengthening peace and security all over the world, and resisting aggression should it occur in the Middle East or elsewhere, and we shall do everything in our power to meet these obligations, which are undertaken by Members of the United Nations.

160. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that it is the duty of the Security Council to condemn the latest Israel aggression against Jordan and to do everything to prevent the recurrence of such attacks. The Council should achieve by all means at its disposal the full implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 to eliminate all consequences of Israel aggression. The lawlessness perpetrated by Israel should be condemned and Israel should be made to understand that the United Nations will not tolerate any Charter violations.

161. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of the United States, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

162. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I should like to reply very briefly to some comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

163. But first, since I was detained in Washington on urgent business when he first made an appearance again in the Council, I should like, if you will permit me, Mr. President, to associate myself with the words of welcome extended to him on my behalf by my deputy, Ambassador Buffum. I shall look forward to working with Ambassador Malik and all other colleagues in the Council in the interest of seeking what we still have not been able to obtain, peace and security, not only in this area but throughout the world.

164. I followed with close attention Ambassador Malik's intervention today. He made the statement, which in effect amounted to an allegation, that the United States has not

been even-handed in its consideration of the problems of the Middle East. I should like, however, to refer to the record, which is the best way to determine how even-handed any country is in considering problems before the Council.

165. The Council addressed itself, under my Presidency, to the problems of the Middle East in November 1966. We had before us first a complaint of Syrian violation of its obligations under prior Security Council resolutions. After considerable consultation a draft resolution dated 3 November 1966 [*S/7575/Rev.1*] was offered by Argentina, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria and Uganda. That draft resolution in the most polite fashion invited the Government of Syria to strengthen its measures for preventing terrorist incidents and then went on to call upon both Syria and Israel to facilitate the work of UNTSO. That draft resolution, members of the Council will recall, was defeated after it had received the requisite number of votes in favour—10 votes—by the veto of the Soviet Union.

166. Let us contrast that, when we consider the question of even-handedness, with what occurred later that month, on 25 November 1966, when on the complaint of Jordan there was brought before the Council actions by Israel which were deemed to be a violation of Israel's obligations. There the Council, with the firm support of the United States, adopted a far more drastic resolution [*228 (1966)*], deploring Israel's large-scale military action on that occasion.

167. Now Ambassador Malik has dismissed as a diversion and a waste of time the suggestion we made that the United Nations extend its supervisory function to the Israel-Jordan cease-fire line. In discussing that, the representative of the Soviet Union read from the report of the Secretary-General. In the sentence immediately following what he read, there is a statement which indeed demonstrates the need for the extension of United Nations activities in this very situation. I shall read the sentence that Ambassador Malik read:

"There have also been reports of an unusual build-up of Israel military forces in the Jordan Valley area."

The next sentence reads:

"Unfortunately, little or no verified information on these developments has been available to the Secretary-General because no United Nations observers are deployed in the Israel-Jordan sector as has been reported previously to the Council." [*S/7930/Add.64, para. 2.*]

168. It would have aided us considerably had we had such information and perhaps the Council might then have been able to take some preventive action. I made the suggestion that I made in my original intervention in the interest of making progress towards the implementation of our prior resolutions and making progress towards seeing that the cease-fire is scrupulously adhered to by all parties concerned.

169. While no one would suggest that such action would solve the basic problems of the Middle East, it is clear that it would help to prevent or at least reduce events similar to

the ones the Council is considering today, events which serve only to heighten the already formidable obstacles to a lasting and peaceful settlement in the Middle East. These are not suggestions tailored for this occasion by my Government or my delegation. We made a similar observation when we debated the complaint against Syria on 4 November 1966, and I shall read from my intervention on that occasion:

“And the United States likewise endorsed, and still endorses, the call upon both Governments to facilitate the work of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in the area.” [1319th meeting, para. 130.]

We made a similar observation in the debate which took place on the complaint by Jordan against Israel.

170. Finally, I should like to say, as an illustration of the consistency of our position throughout, that on 4 November 1966 I made the following statement on behalf of my Government:

“The deep concern of the United States is that peace be preserved in the Middle East. This is, we trust, a common concern. The responsibility of all Members of the United Nations, and particularly the members of the Security Council, is to encourage restraint and to urge governmental action to prevent violence.” [Ibid., para. 131.]

171. That has been our position. That remains our position in the Security Council.

172. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

173. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, thank you for granting me the right of reply. The hour being as late as it is, I shall try to be as brief as possible. I should like to exercise my right of reply in order to make only a few brief observations on a number of statements made here, while reserving my right to comment on them more fully at a later stage.

174. First, however, I should like to inform you, Mr. President and members of the Security Council, that quiet prevails now along the entire cease-fire line and that all Israel forces have left the east bank.

175. I should like at the outset to refer to the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union. I am afraid that calumny in the Russian language is not new to my people. The Soviet representative has displayed today a distinct faithfulness to this dubious tradition. The world knows who started the 1948 war of aggression against Israel and who has maintained it for twenty years. The world knows who wants peace and who wants war in the Middle East, and who encourages and supports the forces of war. The world knows that the United Nations has time and again rejected Soviet attempts to shift responsibility for the events of June 1967 to Israel.

176. If the Soviet Government were interested in peace in the area, I am certain that its representative in the Security

Council would have spoken words of peace and understanding and not of abuse and hate. The nature of this abuse is most revealing. It was clearly illustrated in the words of the Hungarian representative. It is now clear that the Nazis used to call Jews Communists: the Communists call us Nazis. I leave it to history to pronounce on this unholy alliance of hate.

177. I have listened with great care to a member of the Security Council, the representative of Algeria. Algeria has been throughout one of the primary forces in the war of aggression pursued by the Arab States against Israel. On 4 June 1967 President Boumediene declared:

“Brethren, this is the battle of the Arab homeland, of the Arab nation, the battle of destiny, and we must look at the battle from this angle. The true freedom of the entire homeland must be won through the liquidation of the State of the Zionists.”

178. On 9 June 1967, Algeria announced that it had decided to reject the call for the cease-fire. Algeria persists in this attitude. What right has a State which pursues illegal war against another Member State of the United Nations, which defies the Security Council resolutions calling for a cease-fire, to come here and complain of the defence measures taken against warfare, terrorism and sabotage?

179. The representative of Algeria had referred to the situation in the areas under Israel control. Nothing could be further from the truth than the allegations made by him. We have refuted them repeatedly in a number of letters submitted to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. May I be permitted to reiterate that in the areas under its control Israel is determined to ensure normal civilian life and economic development free from the threat of violence and bloodshed. It is a source of satisfaction that agricultural, commercial, industrial and educational activities and public services are continuing normally in all these regions and are being developed and expanded.

180. It is not surprising that this situation is not to the liking of those who seek to heighten tension and foster hostility. However, they find no support for their designs among the vast majority of the area's population. Jews and Arabs alike are weary of the long and bitter strife and want now to live at long last in peaceful coexistence. It is high time that the Arab Governments respond to these yearnings of the peoples by relinquishing the dangerous path of violence and by turning towards the achievement of a peaceful settlement.

181. I do not know exactly when the ancestors of the representatives of Algeria and Morocco conquered the lands which they represent today in the United Nations. I do know when my ancestors in Israel were conquered by Roman imperialism. I do know when the Romans and then the Byzantines and after them the Persians, the Arabs, the Mamelukes, the Turks and others began to colonize the land of my fathers. I know what it meant for my people to resist for twenty centuries the consequences of conquest, imperialism and colonialism. I know what it meant for them to keep their national identity through ages of exile,

oppression and discrimination. If there is in the annals of history an example of a supreme, relentless struggle to overcome the tragedy of conquest by imperialism, it is the Jewish people that provides that example, and no attempt at rewriting history will affect it. It is too late to invent the history of the Jewish people and to distort the ethos of its rebirth in its ancestral home.

182. We have listened today to a long list of Arab orators. The speakers varied but not their statements. There was one central theme that was common to all of them: "We are at war. War must continue. War shall continue. We will not stop raids, terror and murder. We cannot do that. We are against peace. We shall not make peace". Will they in these circumstances come to us with advice on how to defend ourselves, where and how to strike at the aggressors, how to repel raiders and saboteurs, how to protect our homes, our women and children? I for one cannot think of any effort, of any sacrifice, of any measure that I would not be ready to take in order to defend my home and those who are dear to me. We seek nothing of our neighbours but the right to live in peace. But if they make war on us they must leave it to us to decide how we should defend ourselves.

183. The eyes of the world are on the Security Council. Will a small people, after a 2,000-year-old strife to overcome the results of imperialist conquest, be able at last to live at peace in its land? Will the Security Council help the nations of the Middle East to terminate the war? Will it help us to put an end to terrorism and sabotage, to raids and murder? Will it assist us in advancing toward peace?

184. Those are the questions confronting this Council. My people, and I am certain all peace-loving nations too, await the answer in the hope that it will grant us relief from the grim shadow of war, unveiling our region and bringing us closer to peace and security for all in the area.

185. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of Iraq, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

186. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): The representative of Israel has just informed the Council that quiet reigns on the cease-fire lines. I imagine that he expected the members of the Council to be overjoyed at this news. But this is the quiet of death and destruction. It is the quiet that left more than 200 people dead. It is the quiet which left numerous camps of refugees in ashes. Yet the representative of Israel comes here and tells us that everything is quiet now, that the Council really does not have much to do any more on this particular question. The Israel army went on an excursion or pleasure trip of slaughter and destruction. No, Sir, the matter cannot stop there. The Council has more reasons than ever to take action, and decisive action at that.

187. The representative of Israel harped on a familiar tune. Whoever criticizes the policies of his Government is immediately labelled a Jew-hater. This method of hanging the label of anti-Semitism on anybody who criticizes and dares to expose the aggressive policies of Israel is a well-known method and stratagem. I never thought that a representative of Israel, after all these years, would resort to this disgraceful way of trying to intimidate those who want

to uphold the principles of the Charter and tell the Israelis that they are aggressors when they are aggressors.

188. The representative of Israel spoke about the twenty-year-old war. But the war did not start in 1948. The war against the Arab people of Palestine started in 1897, more than seventy years ago, when a group of European Jews decided to establish a State which for fourteen centuries had been predominantly Arab in population and culture. The question is: Are the people of Palestine entitled to the rights that peoples of other countries in the world are entitled to and have been able to achieve? Are they entitled to the right of self-determination in their own homeland? Are they entitled to freedom and independence in the land of their ancestors? If we are going to redraw the map of the world in the shape it had 2,000 years ago, I shudder to think of the confusion and chaos into which the world will be thrown.

189. The representative of Israel spoke about the land of his fathers which has been subjected to alien conquest and aggression. But if we want to go that far back in history, it is a matter of common historical knowledge that the ancient Hebrews were not the first people to inhabit part of Palestine, that the Jewish religious connexion with the Holy Land is not exclusive, that other peoples had inhabited Palestine long before the ancient Hebrews went there and that people inhabited that country long after the Hebrews left.

190. The Holy Land does not have religious connexions with Judaism exclusively. As we all know, it occupies an important place, religiously speaking, in Christianity and in Islam. But, basing themselves on such dubious grounds, they try to dislodge, in the twentieth century, a people that has lived in that country for more than fourteen centuries, to take over its land and to establish a State composed of immigrants from the four corners of the earth.

191. It is the Arabs who have been on the defensive, and not only since 1948 but since long before that. In 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was issued, the Arabs of Palestine outnumbered the Jewish population by nearly twelve to one. But in thirty years, through the help of the Mandatory Power, the land was flooded with immigrants who came into the country against the express wishes of the majority of its inhabitants. That country alone in the world, and a country that was under the international mandate system in addition, was denied the right of self-determination. If the Arabs of Palestine are entitled to the right of self-determination, if they are entitled to be free in their homeland, it is not possible to grant them that right and still insist on the establishment of a predominantly or exclusively Jewish State in Palestine. The rights of the inhabitants of Palestine and those of the Zionist invaders have been, still are and always will be mutually exclusive.

192. Therefore, the war of aggressive invasion started long before 1948, and it continues to this very day. But even in 1948 it was the Zionist forces which occupied territories allotted under the partition plan to the Arab States, and they occupied those territories before the entry of the Arab armies into Palestine. In fact, the present Minister of

Labour in the Government of Israel, Yigal Allon—who, I understand, has ambitions to become Prime Minister of Israel—himself stated, in a book which was published many years ago, that had it not been for the entry of the Arab forces on 15 May 1948, the drive of the Haganah and the Zionist forces would have succeeded in occupying the whole of Palestine to the Jordan River. So General Allon, who of course was a commander in that war, himself, in clear and unambiguous terms, said that had it not been for the entry of the Arab forces, the whole of Palestine, including the whole of the area allotted to the Arab States under the partition plan, would have been occupied by the Zionist forces.

193. So the entry of the Arab armies into Palestine in 1948, far from being an act of aggression, was an act of salvation for whatever remained of the Arab parts of Palestine.

194. The representative of Israel spoke about the protection of their homes and their children. But who has been dynamiting houses, imposing repressive measures on the population? Who is guilty of wholesale slaughter and the killing of women and children? Who has perpetrated these acts? Only a few days ago the Commission on Human Rights, meeting in the neighbouring chamber, sent a telegram to the Government of Israel denouncing the wanton destruction of Arab property in Jerusalem.⁷ Many Governments have also expressed repugnance and revulsion at the repressive measures and the destruction to which the Arab people of the occupied territories are being subjected. All the grisly apparatus of a police-state, all the intimidation and cruelty under which people lived in Nazi-occupied Europe, are at present seen in the Holy Land.

195. As I said, I shall have another opportunity to go into the substance of the problem and into the matter of how Israel has been trying to prevent the United Nations from playing a role in this situation, and to show that all its actions are calculated and planned with one, and only one, objective in view—that is, to ensure the failure of the mission of the Secretary-General's special representative so that the measures already taken to annex the occupied territories may be consolidated and the options open to Israel for further expansion may be kept open.

196. For all those reasons, action by the Council at the present moment on this problem is of vital importance. Failure to take resolute action now will undoubtedly be regarded as encouragement by the rulers of Tel Aviv and they will embark upon new aggressions and adventures. It is therefore quite clear that the Council is at a crossroads. If the United Nations is to continue to play its vital role in this question, this is the time now to take resolute action, this is the decisive moment. Failure to take such action will inevitably lead to a renewal of hostilities and peace will never be attained in our area.

197. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of Algeria who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

198. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I thought that, having passed over in silence and treated as they deserved the accusations voiced here at the end of the morning and the beginning of the afternoon by the spokesman of Zionist diplomacy, we should have finished with accusations which are both groundless and time-wasting. I am sorry to find that this is not so.

199. In regard to Algeria's attitude, which, everyone knows, has never changed, I would say only that Algeria is accountable to the community of African States which unanimously supported us as the candidate from that new continent for a seat in the Security Council. Algeria is accountable also to the community of nations as represented in the General Assembly, which, with an encouraging majority, saw fit to elect us to the Security Council.

200. But with regard to defying Security Council resolutions, it is clear that the representative of Zionist diplomacy knows what he is talking about. The whole history of Zionism consists of challenges, direct and concrete challenges, to the resolutions of the international community.

201. My country's attitude to the Palestine question is the same as prompts our reactions to all problems of this kind. We have said this many times before and, if necessary, we shall say it again. Our position remains the same, be it on the question of Palestine, of Rhodesia, of South Africa or of South West Africa. We are not prepared to accept, and we have never accepted, decisions which we consider unjust to the Palestine people, the Rhodesian people or the South African people. Moreover, if any proof were needed of the similarities between the situations in Palestine and in South Africa, one need only pay some attention to the latest statement by the representative of Zionist diplomacy.

202. When we speak of the dynamitings, reprisals and collective repressions which are being carried out, we are told that agriculture is doing well, industry is developing, and trade is flourishing. That is precisely what we hear every so often from the representatives of the Pretoria régime.

203. With regard to the declaration of President Boumediene, I wish to say that Algeria is in fact bent on the destruction of all such régimes, be it the *apartheid* régime or the Zionist régime, both of which are inspired by the same philosophy.

204. I do not know when the Algerians conquered Algeria; they have always had it. If I understand the spokesman of Zionist diplomacy, and if I rightly follow his reasoning, we ought to accept Vorster and his clique which holds power in South Africa, and we ought to ask for Ian Smith to be represented amongst the members of this Organization.

205. Some time ago, our Secretary-General said in effect that racism was born of fear. Fear was forced upon the Jewish communities in Europe; they were driven into ghettos; they suffered massacre. That same fear still inspires them, and it is that fear which explains their racism and the fact that the Zionist state is a racist state.

206. These are the facts on which Algeria's policy is based.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 4*, paras. 400-403.

207. Of course, to allay any anxiety which the Council might feel, the Zionist spokesman told us that all was quiet on the cease-fire line. I seem to remember that a few centuries ago someone said that order reigned in Warsaw.

208. If I understand aright, the logic of the Zionist spokesman's statement would imply that power in the United States should be given back to the Indians and that the descendants of the Spanish who settled in Latin America should be asked to hand over power to the indigenous inhabitants. But that sort of logic, I must admit, is beyond my understanding.

209. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of Morocco to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

210. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): I could have wished that the representative of Israel, in exercising his right of reply, had actually answered some of the questions put to him by other speakers in the Council; I myself was one of them, and I asked him what was currently happening in the Middle East and what was the significance of the events we have been watching daily for the last few months. Of course, having first digressed to another subject, because he could not answer the questions put to him, he brought in Iraq, Algeria and Morocco and spoke of peoples which had reconquered their countries.

211. I do not think I can give a better reply to the first half of the statement of the Israel representative than that which has just been given by my Algerian colleague: that the Algerians have always been in Algeria and the Moroccans have always been in Morocco.

212. I am amazed that such an eminent Israel personality should know so little of the history of North Africa, for from the time of the Roman Empire North Africa has been the first land of exile and protection for the persecuted Jews. I would refer him to certain authors of his own religion and race, in whom he will have more confidence, to verify the truth of what I say and learn that this is an historical fact asserted by several distinguished scholars of the ancient universities of Israel, such as Léon Poliakov, who wrote a three-volume work on the history of anti-Semitism⁸, in which he paid a ringing tribute to what Islam and the Arab world have done to protect the Jewish community since the beginning of persecution under the Roman Empire and, unfortunately, in the early days of Christianity.

213. I would refer him to one of the eminent professors of the history of Arab civilization in Spain, Levi-Provençal, who brought out the part played by the Jewish community in Arab Spain over a period of six centuries. I am sure he is not unaware that the Jewish community in Spain was one of the most active, dynamic and brilliant communities of the Jewish people throughout the six centuries of its existence in Spain. Finally, I would say this to him: at the time of the Roman massacres in Cyrenaica, when Rome conquered Carthage, the monotheistic affinities that existed

between Judaism and Berber paganism, both of which held to a belief in one, supreme divine authority, made it possible for the Jews to flee from Carthage and take refuge in Morocco where, under official protection, they were able freely to practice their religion as before, and to continue the commercial and agricultural activities in which they proved to be highly expert.

214. I trust you will not object if I borrow a phrase from a journalist of the Jewish faith who said that the Jew was a swallow who followed good weather. When the Arabs were driven out of Spain, 250,000 Jews preferred to follow the vanquished to North Africa rather than remain in Spain subject to the law of the Western Christian conqueror.

215. I do not want to bring up certain facts that belong to the history of religions and empires; but I believe that since the beginning of persecution and of the Roman-Christian civilization, there has not been in the history of Islam or in the history of the Jewish community in the Moslem world a single example of a pogrom or of collective persecution. I can even say that under the Ottoman Empire, or under the Arab Empire in Spain, it was the Jews who played a dynamic role in the bourgeois classes, and they have always been well content to be able to live in those territories.

216. I would refer the representative of Israel to the Jewish immigration movement which has been going on for three thousand years. He will see that the Jew did not come from the Arab world to the West, but that in the worst periods of anti-Jewish persecution that the world has known, the immigration went from the West to the Arab world, and not the other way.

217. It was therefore a flagrant injustice that it should have been the Arabs who were expelled from Palestine, which, as the representative of Iraq said, is not exclusive, like the Jewish religion, but has been the cradle of all civilizations. We want this land to continue today to be the home of an international community adhering to all the transcendental forms of humanism and of contemporary idealism, instead of being a cradle for Israel Aryanism, in which a people's life is governed by law made by race and religion.

218. That is all I wish to say on behalf of Morocco. But in case the representative of Israel has not had time in his Zionist training to pay much attention to recent history, I shall tell him that when the entire West yielded to the power of Germany, when the entire West was occupied, when it accepted Nazi laws against the Jews, there was one country which, although it was a protectorate and therefore had neither the liberty to express itself nor the means to make its voice heard, remembered that the Jewish citizens of Morocco were Moroccans and that consequently the anti-Jewish laws enforced by Vichy would not extend to the Jews in Morocco.

219. That protection and that attitude, in my view, deprive the Israel representative of the right to mention Morocco as one of the countries involved in persecution of the Jews.

220. His statement just now was delivered in tones of emotion and pleading for peace. I think he is in a bad

⁸ Léon Poliakov, *Du Christ aux juifs de cour; histoire de antisémitisme*, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1955.

position to talk of peace, when he declared in the same statement that calm had returned and peace and prosperity were foreseeable in the Middle East. I tell him that what happened this morning in Jordan takes us further away from peace—and he well knows why. The setback has been deliberate, wretched. But I should like those events to make the Security Council more keenly aware of its responsibilities and its duty, and I should like the Council to show that awareness by taking a decision this evening.

221. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): From consultations I have had there seems to be general agreement to adjourn the meeting now and resume it at 9.30 p.m. As I hear no objection, the meeting will be adjourned and we shall reconvene at 9.30 to continue consideration of the item on our agenda.

The meeting rose at 8 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. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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