



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1405<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 22 MARCH 1968

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1405) . . . . .	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 FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 22 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/1405)

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 yesterday, I propose to invite the representatives of the two countries which requested this meeting of the Security Council, Jordan and Israel, to take places at the Council table for the duration of the discussion of the item before us.

2. I also propose to invite the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Morocco and Syria to take the places that have been reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, with the understanding that, when it is their turn to address the Council, they will be invited to take places at the Council table.

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council will now proceed with its consideration of the item before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the Soviet Union, on whom I now call.

4. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In the course of the discussion in the Security Council of the latest act of aggression committed by Israel against Jordan, the majority of members have strongly condemned the criminal acts of the Israel militarists, and have asked that the Security Council should take immediate steps to halt the aggression.

5. The representatives of the United States and certain other Western countries which are members of the Council were unable to make such a decisive condemnation of the aggressor and confined themselves to expressions of regret and, following their normal tactics in such cases, attempted more or less to propound the thesis of the so-called identical approach to the aggressor and to the victim. But this is nothing more than an attempt to shield and justify the aggression.

6. All this again clearly shows, as do the consultations now taking place between members of the Council, that those delegations—and, of course, the United States delegation in particular—are trying to give moral support to and to protect the aggressive policy of Tel Aviv, by making it impossible for the Council to condemn that policy decisively and unreservedly and to adopt effective measures against the aggressor.

7. The United States representative's vague statements about his country's alleged desire to restore peace and justice in the Middle East are in sharp contradiction to the facts of American diplomacy. Anyone can judge the true value of the verbal assurances about desire for peace in the Middle East emanating from Washington.

8. In this connexion, I think I should repeat what was said in the Soviet delegation's first statement—that if Israel did not rely on the political, economic, military and diplomatic support of the United States and certain other Western Powers, it would not have risked pursuing its aggressive policy against the Arab countries, neither would it have ventured to violate Security Council decisions and commit this new act of aggression [1402nd meeting].

9. The statements made in the Security Council by the Israel representative are further clear evidence of the fact that Tel Aviv has no intention of renouncing its provocative and aggressive policy. No verbal acrobatics on the part of

the Israel representative can help him to refute the facts, which show clearly that it is Israel which bears the whole responsibility, both for the latest act of piratical aggression against Jordan, and for the delay in implementing Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

10. Israel is disregarding the General Assembly resolutions on the question of Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V), 2254 (ES-V)]. Israel's rulers have issued decrees annexing the seized Arab territories. Israel is opposing the clearing of the Suez Canal and the removal of blockaded foreign vessels. Israel is driving out Arab inhabitants from these territories. Israel is responsible for the armed clashes on the cease-fire line and is constantly committing acts of aggression.

11. These are the true facts and in these circumstances, if the members of the Security Council really wish to do their duty under the United Nations Charter, they must severely condemn Israel for its latest acts of aggression, take effective measures to prevent a repetition of such acts, and compel Israel to abide by the decisions of the Council.

12. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation would now like to bring to the Security Council's attention the statement made by the Soviet Government, published in today's Soviet press, which reads as follows:

"The situation in the Middle East continues to attract the close attention of the peoples. The tension of the crisis brought about last summer by Israel's adventuristic policy is not subsiding. Israel, an imperialist State, is continuing its aggression against neighbouring Arab States, thereby increasing the scale of the crisis and its dangerous international consequences.

"Again and again the Government of Israel has been organizing military provocations against Arab States. This is confirmed by reports that, in violation of the Security Council's decision calling for the cessation of military actions, Israel troops committed a new bandit attack on Jordan on 21 March 1968, using large ground and air forces.

"In the occupied territories Israel militarists are perpetrating arbitrary acts and crimes, and are conducting large-scale punitive operations against the local population.

"Definite steps are being taken with the aim of integrating indigenous Arab territories, which were captured as a result of the aggression, into the State of Israel. The Ministry of Internal Affairs of Israel officially announced on 29 February 1968 that the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza area, the territory to the west of the River Jordan captured from Jordan, and the Golan Heights in Syria will from now on 'not be regarded as enemy territory'. By this unlawful act Israel is attempting to turn the cease-fire line into its State frontier.

"Even earlier the Israel authorities had begun to grant permission to numerous groups of Israel settlers to establish themselves on occupied Arab lands, including the west bank of the River Jordan. Military settlements of so-called 'farmer-soldiers' are being set up. The native

Arab population is being driven away from the lands taken over by Israel settlers and its property is being seized or destroyed.

"The number of Arab refugees is growing from day to day. Israel is deliberately pursuing this policy of driving the Arab population out of Israel-occupied territories in order to prepare conditions for the annexation and colonization of this land by Israel.

"In defiance of the unanimous decision of the United Nations General Assembly [resolution 2253 (ES-V)] Israel is continuing its acts of conquest against the Arab part of Jerusalem.

"The aim of the present actions of Israel, which is supported by the United States Government and international Zionism, is to delay as long as possible a political settlement in the Middle East, to impose Israel's imperialist terms on the Arabs and to force them to surrender and renounce the territories belonging to them. In this the Israel leaders are taking advantage of the fact that their patron, the United States of America, is itself playing the role of an aggressor in Viet-Nam, as a State grossly flouting the principles of the United Nations Charter and of international agreements. What exists both in the Middle East and in Viet-Nam is an attempt by aggressive imperialist forces to strike a blow at the national liberation movement and its advanced detachments.

"The colonialist policy of Israel, and of the forces of world reaction which are supporting it, is a serious cause of the present dangerous international tension. As a result of this policy the Suez Canal, a major international waterway, has been out of action for more than nine months, causing considerable economic damage to States whose ships use the Canal and to international trade in general.

"As a demonstration of goodwill, the Government of the United Arab Republic expressed its readiness to remove from the canal zone the ships that were trapped there as a result of Israel's aggression, and to start preparatory work for clearing the Suez Canal so that it can be used for navigation again as soon as possible. The Israel authorities, however, prevented this by resorting to armed provocations.

"Israel's continuing aggressive line cannot remain without consequences. By adopting its resolution on the Middle East on 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)], the Security Council set States a clear task—to achieve the withdrawal of Israel troops from all captured Arab territories and to take other measures necessary to bring about the speediest political settlement of the problems of this area. The principle of the 'inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war' and the demand for the 'withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict' are given prominence in the resolution and are the main and indispensable conditions for the restoration of peace in the Middle East. It is only on this basis that secure and recognized frontiers of States in this area can be ensured.

"The Security Council resolution on the Middle East is not a recommendation or an opinion that Governments are free to follow or to ignore. In joining the United Nations, every State has undertaken to fulfil unconditionally the decisions of the Security Council adopted in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Not to fulfil these obligations means to oppose the United Nations, and to challenge the Organization responsible for maintaining international peace.

"The United Nations has been officially informed that the Arab States which suffered most from Israel's aggression are ready to comply with the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and to co-operate with the Secretary-General's Representative in the Middle East who has been empowered to facilitate the implementation of this resolution.

"Israel, on the contrary, has from the start pursued and is still pursuing a line aimed at obstructing the Security Council and General Assembly decisions on the Middle East. Israel's adventurism is such that, in response to the appeals of States Members of the United Nations to respect the Organization's principles and the Security Council's decision, it puts forward arrogant territorial claims to Arab States, threatening them with further acts of aggression and resorting to the use of armed force.

"The Israel Government has hindered in every way and is hindering the activities of Mr. Jarring, the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Middle East, whose task it is to find the shortest ways to a political settlement of the conflict on the basis of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and the United Nations Charter. Israel would like to use Jarring's mission to distort the meaning of the Security Council resolution. Giving no hint of its readiness to withdraw its troops from all the Arab territories occupied during the recent conflict—that is, to withdraw them behind the line existing prior to 5 June 1967—Israel and those who support it are trying to impose negotiations on Arab countries on conditions which are incompatible with their lawful national interests and with their sovereignty, and are attempting to delude world public opinion.

"Israel is following in the footsteps of the Hitlerite criminals. As is known, fascist Germany also captured foreign territories and then tried to dictate its own terms of 'settlement' to the victim of the aggression. But such actions were branded by the peoples as banditry, and those who engaged in them were condemned as international criminals after the rout of Hitler's Reich. Those who today covet the lands of others and like to interfere in the domestic affairs of States would do well to remember this.

"The Soviet Union states with the utmost firmness that it is determined, together with other peace-loving States, to strive for the cessation of Israel aggression and for the liquidation of all its aftermaths, for the return to their rightful owners of the territories captured from Arab States as a result of the aggression of 1967, and for the achievement of the necessary political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of respect for the sovereignty,

territorial integrity and political independence of every State in this area.

"The Israel Government must strictly comply with the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, and must first withdraw its troops from all occupied Arab territories. It must know that its challenge to the interests of international peace and security and its sabotaging of a political settlement in the Middle East cannot go unpunished.

"So long as Israel's leaders, with support from outside, adhere to the position of annexing Arab territories the Soviet Union and other countries which are friends of Arab States and advocate a stable peace in the Middle East, will help the victims of aggression, for in so doing they are fulfilling their duty in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the interests of maintaining peace. This must be clear to everybody." [S/8495.]

13. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): As I have done on previous occasions, I must reject as unwarranted the gratuitous comments of the representatives of Jordan and Syria concerning the activities of private American citizens in groups. My country is a pluralistic society. This is a principal source of our strength as a nation and we are very proud of the various strains from which our country derives that strength. We have among our citizens, citizens of Jewish and Arab origin. They are free individually and in groups to express their views and lend their financial assistance to causes they support. This is their privilege and constitutional right—and we would not have it otherwise.

14. What is pertinent here is the fact that under the Charter the differing views of these groups, constitutionally protected, are matters of domestic jurisdiction and not an appropriate matter for discussion here. What is relevant under the Charter are governmental actions, and I am always prepared to discuss as I have been doing throughout these many months the policies of the United States Government.

15. In this context I should like to recall the statement made by President Johnson in which he said:

"The United States has consistently sought to have good relations with all the States of the Near East. Regrettably, this has not always been possible, but we are convinced that our differences with individual States of the area and their differences with each other must be worked out peacefully and in accordance with accepted international practice."

16. If the nations of the Middle East will turn towards the works of peace they can count with confidence upon the friendship and the help of all the peoples of the United States of America. This continues to be the attitude of the United States Government and the basis for the policy which I have enunciated in the Council during this and previous debates.

17. I have also listened with great interest to the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union;

Ambassador Malik. I regret to state that his anti-cold war, arrival statement policy has lasted about ninety-six hours. But I shall continue in the hope that perhaps it will be resurrected and given more practical application than his intervention today would indicate.

18. The representative of the Soviet Union has referred to United States policy in the Middle East. The records of this Council disclose that policy. It has been clear, explicit and even-handed throughout. We favour the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We do not favour return to improvisation, a state of belligerence, uncertain boundaries or hostilities, major or minor. In other words, we stand on the text and in full support of resolution 242 (1967) adopted by the Council on 22 November 1967. We have used and are continuing to use our full political influence in support of that resolution and of Mr. Jarring's mission, and if the Soviet Union would truly use its political influence in the direction of a just and lasting peace in the area it could make a major contribution.

19. We also are opposed to the use of violence in the Middle East, regardless of the direction from which it comes. We have by our votes shown that this is more than a verbal statement. It is a deep commitment of the American Government. We have not cast any vetoes of resolutions of this Council which decried violence. The Soviet Union has. We are quite prepared to let our record stand under examination at any time.

20. We hope that policy of standing against the use of violence in the Middle East will be reiterated by the Council in the present debate. We shall, in consultation with our colleagues in the Council, show every evidence of arriving at a reiteration of what the Charter commands, which is to stand against any form of violence, disruptive of peace and security. To this we pledge our earnest efforts. We have displayed in the consultations already taking place, and shall display in the consultations which are going to take place, every effort to arrive at a common agreement so as to clearly express this point of view. We have not, however, felt at any point that it is useful to view problems in the Middle East with one blind eye, as some members of the Council have done for so long. Such a view does not contribute to peace.

21. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Syria.

22. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to exercise my right of reply. It is not the first time that the representative of the United States has seen fit to remind us of our obligations as Member States and of the fact that we should not interfere in each other's affairs. I entirely agree with that in so far as it concerns the present situation. But I address myself to the representative of the United States as a legal man primarily and basically. That is why I shall raise this question not from the point of view of quoting newspapers, and so on, but by quoting legal documents.

23. In this connexion, the point that I would raise is the following. There is legal evidence supporting our attitude when we object to the activities of the Zionist organiza-

tions, either in the United States or when they are given opportunities similar to the ones that are given in the United States. In fact, my piece of evidence is derived from the Status Law of the State of Israel, passed on 24 November 1952; article 3 of this Israel law says the following:

"The World Zionist Organization, which is also the Jewish Agency for Palestine, takes care as before of immigration and directs absorption and settlement projects in the State."<sup>1</sup>

The important words here are those which clearly state that the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency are one and the same structure and organization.

24. I ask my colleagues here to bear this fact in mind, because there is no other situation obtaining in the world in which a government acknowledges another organization, with other citizens of a foreign country, to be responsible towards the government of that country or part of the government of that country. We have no objection to the Zionist Organization working in the United States. It is their privilege; it is the privilege of the United States Government to permit any organization to work. But when that organization works and acts as part of a foreign government, which is the Israel Government, then the legal question arises how is this permitted, because it is really beyond my understanding to see this possibility. When that Government, or the part of it which resides in the United States, is permitted to collect hundreds of millions of dollars as tax-free money, not to be spent on charity but for military and other purposes—such as the one which I mentioned here, according to that law, which refers to the settlement of Jewish immigrants in Israel—certainly we are not only immediately and directly concerned, but immediately touched by the situation, because it pertains to some basic principles that relate to the very existence of our own country.

25. Therefore, it is on a legal basis that I have raised and still raise my objection, and maintain it. Certainly, the representative of the United States cannot have it both ways—to serve his purposes and at the same time to be damaging to another government, whether that government is a friendly government or not.

26. I wish also to direct two other questions to the representative of the United States. In his statement of yesterday and in explanation of the stand of the United States Government he said: "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." [1402nd meeting, para. 5.] But what acts of terrorism are spoken of here? To whom is this reference made? The Government of Jordan, which has complained to the Security Council, cannot be accused of acts of terrorism. Those so-called acts of terrorism are being carried out by individuals who feel themselves to have been the victims of an aggression, the Israel aggression. They are not

<sup>1</sup> World Zionist Organization-Jewish Agency for Palestine (Status) Law, 5713-1952. (See: *Government Year-book*, 5714 (1953-4). Jerusalem, Government Printer, 1953, p. 243.)

responsible to the Government. Neither is the Government responsible to them.

27. Then the representative of the United States went on to say: "We believe, further, that military counter-actions, such as that which has just taken place on a scale out of proportion"—I underline the words "out of proportion"—"to the acts of violence that preceded it, are greatly to be deplored." [*Ibid.*] The expression here is "out of proportion". Does it imply that there is a proportion which the representative of the United States would tolerate or accept?

28. Then he goes on to say: "the parties must scrupulously comply with the cease-fire arrangements" [*ibid.*, para. 15/]. Here again there is an ambiguity in the statement. Which parties are meant? Is it the Government of Jordan or the Government of Israel? If it is the Government of Jordan, that Government has seized every possible opportunity to prove its co-operation with the United Nations, with the Security Council, with the Mixed Armistice Commission on the spot. If there is a party that has denied the United Nations presence—as I will show later—it is the Israel Government and not the Jordanian Government. Therefore, to put on a par of equality the two parties to the cease-fire arrangements is, to say the least, ambiguous.

29. I come now to the statement that was given today, in a very detailed manner, by the Israel representative. I certainly would not tax the patience of the Council or take the time of the members by going into the details of everything that the representative of Israel stated this morning. But one thing I would stress, and that is the utter cynicism with which, time and again, the Israel representative is approaching this very grave situation, and, indeed, the utter disregard shown for the Security Council and the international community.

30. Let us take, for instance, his letter of 21 March 1968 submitted to the Security Council. This was submitted after the representative of Jordan submitted his letter of the same date [*S/8484*]. In the last paragraph of his letter, the representative of Israel says:

"In bringing this development to your attention, I have the honour to request that the Security Council be urgently convened in order to deal with the continuous acts of aggression . . ." [*S/8486*].

But if he is really concerned, to the extent of calling for an urgent meeting of the Security Council, he should have called for this meeting before the dastardly wanton attack which was perpetrated by the Israel army against the innocent civilians in Jordan, and not after. If this means anything, it means utter disregard of and even an insult to the intelligence of the members of the Council and the international community. Again, let us take the second paragraph of his letter. He says:

"I stressed that these acts imposed a heavy strain on the structure of the cease-fire and that my Government must maintain its right and duty to take all necessary measures . . ." [*Ibid.*].

31. I wish to take up the word "cease-fire". The cease-fire has been arranged by the Security Council. In a previous report submitted by the Secretary-General on 21 March 1968 we were very clearly informed by the Secretary-General of the following:

"At 2130 hours GMT, Major Levinson"—that is the Israel Major—"responded that he was ready to meet Colonel Daoud on Thursday, 21 March, at 1100 hours GMT at Allenby Bridge without United Nations presence. In this connexion Major Levinson stated that 'Israel's stand has always been that such talks should be direct without United Nations presence and that even in this particular case they would not be able to change their attitude'. General Bull reported that he had transmitted Major Levinson's reply to Colonel Daoud. In the circumstances, Major Levinson's reply, rejecting any United Nations presence, seemed unnecessarily negative and rigid." [*S/7930/Add.64, para. 3*].

The contradiction, the utter negation of each other's attitude in the two letters of the Israel representative dated 18 and 21 March [*S/8475, S/8486*] addressed to the Security Council and in this answer of Major Levinson are too clear and too obvious to need any further stress.

32. In spite of all the evidence that I submitted this morning, the Israel representative again wanted to go into the history of Arab-Israel relations. I listened carefully to his long statement but, to the best of my recollection, nowhere in it was there any mention of United Nations resolutions, of the Security Council resolutions. He said that Syria did not accept the Security Council resolution.

33. But what about Israel's behaviour after the Security Council's resolution? The representative of the Soviet Union at this very meeting has gone into the details of the flagrant violations by Israel of Security Council resolutions, which spares me the need to take it up again.

34. With regard to his alleged accusations about Arab terrorists, here we must look into a very basic fact from two points of view, first historically and second fundamentally. Historically there is not a shadow of doubt that Israel terrorism and the Zionist underground in Palestine was established—as shown in the books which I quoted, Israel and Zionist references—as of 1913. For what purpose? For the purpose of driving the Arabs out of Palestine.

35. He went on in the usual manner to speak about peace and to deplore the attitude of the Arabs. But the United Nations has adopted at least nineteen resolutions in the General Assembly in twenty years confirming and reaffirming the rights of the Arab refugees of Palestine. The Security Council has in the past adopted resolutions concerning the intermediate refugees, those who were driven from the demilitarized zones. What did Israel do with those resolutions? Then again, which Israel is he speaking about? Is it the Israel of 1947, the Israel of 1948, the Israel of 1956 or the Israel after the 5 June 1967 war? One answer is given—I have many—by the *Government Year-book* of Israel which states:

"Every State consists of a land and a people. Israel is no exception, but it is a State identical neither with its land

nor with its people... The truth is that the State inherited a wasted and desert land which must be rebuilt almost in entirety, yet it has not the means, either financial or technical—materials, tools, instruments, machinery—or in manpower. All three requirements—capital, materials and equipment, and manpower—must come from outside.”<sup>2</sup>

36. When we are faced with a situation of this sort, are we supposed to bow down and welcome those who have taken such a position, who themselves recognize that they are identical neither with their land nor with their people? In fact, what we are concerned with now is the same Status Law which I cited a while ago in putting the question to the representative of the United States; the very first article states:

“The State of Israel regards itself as the creation of the entire Jewish people, and its gates are open, in accordance with its laws, to every Jew wishing to immigrate into it.”<sup>3</sup>

Between 1947 and 1968 we have seen the State of Israel expand to four times its area and its gates are wide open to immigrants from all over the world while the legal inhabitants, the owners of Palestine, are in exile living outside of Palestine. How can the Israel representative create all those things and address himself in this manner in full cognizance of the cause? It certainly stems from a basic philosophy which is the Zionist philosophy.

37. I should like here to quote an address that was made in Jerusalem during the Session of the Zionist General Council (Fifth Session after the Twenty-third Congress) held in Jerusalem from 21 to 29 July 1954. So that the representative of Israel will not think that I am quoting from the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the address was given by Mr. Berl Locker who said *inter alia*:

“The World Zionist Organization exists and must continue to exist. Every Zionist must be a member of this organization through his territorial Zionist organization.”—So far so good, but listen to this—“In the event of there being legislation in any country hindering Jews from fulfilling their tasks towards the Zionist Movement, the Jews of that country must endeavour to have such legislation amended.”

That speaks for itself.

38. The Israel representative spoke a great deal about the belligerency of my country, Syria. But he forgot the record of his country, Israel, in the Security Council and in the United Nations. I shall not go into that. But taking the events with which we have been dealing as from 5 June 1967, I wish to quote from *The New York Times* of 13 May 1967:

“Some Israel leaders have decided that the use of force against Syria may be the only way to curtail increasing terrorism.

<sup>2</sup> *Government Year-book 5713 (1952)* (Jerusalem, Government Printer, 1952), p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 243.

“Any such Israel reaction to continued infiltration probably would be of considerable strength but of short duration and limited in area.

“This has become apparent in talks with highly qualified and informed Israelis who have spoken in recent days against a background of mounting border violence.”

39. On that same day I went to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and showed this article to him. As a result of that a statement to the press was issued at 2 p.m. on 13 May 1967 as follows:

“In reply to questions regarding the reports emanating from Israel on contemplated use of force against Syria, a United Nations spokesman said today that the Secretary-General had expressed very serious concern over such reports.”

Then the Secretary-General went into a great many things and mentioned statements made by Syrian leaders.

40. Here again, apparently the new Israel representative is not fully acquainted with the documents of the United Nations, and I refer him to document S/7896 of 19 May 1967, a report by the Secretary-General to the Security Council, paragraph 8 of which states the following:

“Intemperate and bellicose utterances, by other officials and non-officials, eagerly reported by Press and radio, are unfortunately more or less routine on both sides of the lines in the Near East. In recent weeks, however, reports emanating from Israel have attributed to some high officials in that State statements so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could only heighten emotions and thereby increase tensions on the other side of the lines.”

41. I could go on and on, citing quotation after quotation, but I am sure it would lead nowhere because the very basic principles by which the Israel representative is inspired are based on distortion and falsification. The appeals for peace do not deceive anyone. You cannot force peace by occupying someone's house and then asking him to submit to your own terms. You cannot make peace by speaking beautiful words about peace. Deeds speak much better than words.

42. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of the United States of America in exercise of his right of reply.

43. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): Ambassador Tomeh, the representative of Syria, has asked some questions, and in all courtesy I owe him a brief reply.

44. Ambassador Tomeh asked me a legal question about our tax laws, and then he purported to answer it. In so doing, he reminded me of some of my former clients. If it will comfort Ambassador Tomeh, I can assure him that our tax laws are enforced impartially with respect to all groups and across the board.

45. He also asked what acts of terrorism I referred to when I made my intervention yesterday. I refer him to the



details in official Security Council documents which have been circulated and I leave them to his expert appraisal.

46. Thirdly, he asked what I meant in my intervention yesterday. I shall repeat what I said yesterday:

“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 counter-actions, 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.” [1402nd meeting, para. 5.]

I think it is quite clear what I meant when I said that and I have nothing to add to that statement.

47. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Iraq.

48. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): A little while ago the representative of the United States, Ambassador Goldberg, spoke about resolution 242 (1967) adopted by the Council on 22 November 1967 and reminded the Council of what he considered to be its principal provisions. I think his statement was conspicuous for what it omitted to say rather than for what it said. Ambassador Goldberg mentioned non-belligerence, secure and permanent boundaries, and the necessity not to return to the ambiguous situation which existed before the war. He failed to mention two important provisions of that resolution, in fact the essential provisions, perhaps: the emphasis that it is inadmissible under the Charter to make territorial gains through military force, and the necessity for the withdrawal of Israel troops from occupied Arab territories.

49. It is, I think, revealing that the representative of the United States repeated the stock phraseology of the Israel side, who always speak about non-belligerence and secure boundaries but never speak about withdrawal or the inadmissibility of territorial expansion by military means. It must have been a slip of the tongue, but it is revealing none the less and it is a serious revelation in view of the fact that the representative of the United States himself, when the resolution was adopted last November, assured the Council that the United States Government would use all its diplomatic and political influence to help the special representative of the Secretary-General in his task.

50. The question that arises is: What influence has been exerted on Israel for it to announce at least its acceptance of the resolution, its readiness to implement it and its willingness to co-operate with Mr. Jarring for its implementation?

51. We all know that if the influence of the United States was needed at all, it was not with the Arab States that it was needed, it was with Israel. That that influence has failed to change the attitude of Israel is borne out by the astonishing statement we heard this afternoon from Ambassador Goldberg when, in describing the resolution,

he completely ignored its central and most important provisions, that of withdrawal and that of the inadmissibility of territorial conquests by military force. The problem before the Council now is really a simple one: Has there been a serious violation of the cease-fire as a result of Israel's attack on Jordan yesterday? I think there is not one single representative at this table who would deny that the Israel attack was in fact a grave and serious violation of the Council's cease-fire resolution [233 (1967)].

52. And the second question is: Are the activities of the freedom fighters—or, as some representatives call them, the terrorists—violations of the cease-fire?

53. In our submission, these activities cannot be considered, for many reasons, as violations of the cease-fire resolution. First of all, the cease-fire resolution was addressed to the Governments concerned. The activities of the freedom fighters are not instigated by, and are not under the control of, the Government of Jordan.

54. The representative of the United States quoted a resolution adopted by this Council on 19 August 1948 [56 (1948)] which asked that all the Governments concerned should deter the activities of individuals under their control or residing in their territories. But the representative of the United States failed to mention the circumstances under which that resolution was adopted. That resolution was adopted on the basis of a report by the late mediator, Count Bernadotte, on the situation in Jerusalem when fighting was still going on and sniping was continuing in view of the fact that no cease-fire line as such had been clearly defined.<sup>4</sup> The situation in 1967 was quite different, and I might say in passing that that report of Count Bernadotte mentioned, among other things, that it was the Jewish side in Jerusalem which had been sniping at the Arabs and that most of the firing had come from their side. I say this in passing to remind the Council that less than a month after that report Count Bernadotte was brutally murdered by Zionist gangsters in Jerusalem; and I am sure the representative of the United States, a former judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, must have a feeling of repugnance and revulsion at the fact that the perpetrators of that crime not only have escaped justice but have been hailed as heroes in Israel and that some of them have even become members of the Israel Parliament.

55. But even if we consider the actions of Israel on 21 March this year as an act of reprisal, how many times has the Council stated that reprisals and acts of retaliation are not permissible under the Charter and under the various resolutions adopted by the Council? The fact, of course, is that the Chief of Staff of the Israel Army himself said yesterday that this was not an act of reprisal; he said—and this was on the news broadcasts—that it was a carefully prepared military operation with specific and clear-cut objectives. It was not a spontaneous reaction to provocation, as we are led to believe. The representative of the United States himself admitted that really there can be no comparison between the scale of the attack of the Israel Army on Jordan yesterday and the alleged acts of

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 107*, 354th meeting, pp. 40-41.

provocation. I think it is grotesque even to suggest that there is any relationship between the blowing up of a water pump or the placing of a mine in some deserted country road and the dispatch of 15,000 regular troops supported by artillery, aircraft and tanks, and the wholesale and indiscriminate slaughter of civilian population.

56. Another point which has been raised in this debate concerns the necessity of dispatching observers to the Israel-Jordan cease-fire line. But the case before us is one, I know, where there was no necessity for United Nations verification of the facts. The representative of Israel himself furnished the Council with the facts yesterday and read to us the official announcement of the Government of Israel about sending its troops across the armistice lines. There was no question of conflicting reports or conflicting allegations; one side said it sent troops, and that was that.

57. Therefore, the action to be taken by the Council should be based on the following: It should be an expression of its opposition to bloodshed and slaughter; it should be a warning for the future against the perpetration of such acts; it should be an expression of concern for the principles of this Organization and its own resolutions; it should be a warning that such acts will only result in the weakening of the peace-making process of the United Nations. Any resolution which does not contain these main elements and which tries to confuse the issue by introducing the question of the so-called terrorists can only encourage the aggressors to undertake similar actions in the future and undermine the authority of this Organization and the resolutions of the Security Council.

58. It is particularly important that a strong resolution be adopted in view of the background of the situation. Politically, Israel has undertaken in the last few months the following measures: its annexation of Jerusalem; its expropriation of Arab lands in Jerusalem in order to alter permanently the character of the city; the expulsion of a large number of Arabs from Gaza, for example, to facilitate its eventual annexation; its decision not to consider the occupied territories as enemy territories, and the changing even of the names given to those territories; its cynical and unilateral action to prevent the opening of the Suez Canal to international shipping; its refusal to declare unequivocally its acceptance of Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967; and its undisguised efforts to subvert and destroy the efforts of the special representative of the Secretary-General.

59. On the humanitarian side, we have already been told of the curfews, the beatings, the searches, the detentions, the arbitrary arrests and the inhuman treatment of the people of the occupied territories—on such a scale that even the Government of the United States drew the attention of the Government of Israel to the necessity of applying the Geneva Conventions<sup>5</sup> to the occupied territories. It is things like that which we should like to hear from Ambassador Goldberg, things his Government has already done, which I think the Council should know about. It should know about the economic squeeze deliberately put

on the population of the occupied territories in order to persuade the people to leave those territories; the dynamiting and blowing up of homes, and so forth.

60. These inhuman acts have aroused a wave of indignation in Israel itself. I have before me a news item from the French newspaper *Le Monde*, dated 12 March. I should like to read it out to the Council:

“About a hundred Israel intellectuals—novelists, composers, journalists, priests, professors, doctors, lawyers and cinema producers—have just published a statement protesting against the violation of human rights in Israel and the occupied territories. Referring to information published in the Israel press, the signatories state, among other things, the following:

“‘Israel citizens, Jews and Arabs, are kept under house arrest or detained without trial.

“‘Collective punishment, including the dynamiting of houses and the imposing of a curfew, continue to be applied to the inhabitants of the occupied territories at an alarming rate. Families of workers and peasants, women, children and old people are being deprived of shelter and of a means of existence. The flood of refugees fleeing from the Gaza zone and the west bank of Jordan continues. An increasing number of Arabs has been driven away from the west bank on the order of the Israel Military Governor.

“‘Where are these methods leading us if not towards a gulf of hatred? Such actions can only strengthen clandestine resistance, create new victims on both sides and encourage a fresh outbreak of war with unforeseeable consequences. A people that dominates another exposes itself to moral degeneration and impairs its own democratic system. A people which oppresses another loses its own freedom and that of its citizens in the end.

“‘Jewish citizens: Remember that courageous non-Jews were at your side in times of distress. The evil has now struck our brother Arab people. Do you think that it is fair for you to wash your hands of that people, to remain silent?’”<sup>6</sup>

61. That is the background against which our work has to proceed and the Council has to take its decisions.

62. Finally, I should like to say a few words in respect of the statement made this morning by the representative of Israel, in which he referred to me personally and to my country. He spoke of the 1948 and 1967 aggression—as he called it—of the Arab States and alleged that Iraq had taken part therein.

63. Yesterday I had occasion to inform the Council that in 1948 the Arab armies entered Palestine only after a considerable part of the area allotted to the Arab State under the partition plan had been overrun by the Zionist forces. In fact, the fighting which took place between the Arab armies, including the Iraqi army, and the Israel forces

<sup>5</sup> Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of war victims.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

took place not on the land allotted to the Jewish State under the partition plan, but completely and exclusively in the area allotted to the Arab State under that plan. The result of the Arab intervention in 1948 was to prevent the complete annexation of the area allotted to the Arab State under the partition plan. It was therefore, as I stated, not an act of aggression but an act of salvation, which in fact resulted in saving some part of the area allotted to the Arabs under the partition plan.

64. In 1967, I need hardly remind the Council, the Arabs entered into a defensive war. It was Israel which started that war. It was Israel which launched an attack on the Arab countries. The right of self-defence is guaranteed under the Charter and international law. In fact we are constantly being reminded by Israel military leaders what a disastrous mistake the Arabs made in not attacking first. General Dayan reminded us of that, and so did the present Israel Ambassador in Washington, General Rabin.

65. Therefore, in 1967 it was clearly a war of defence against a premeditated attack, an attack which even the Israelis do not conceal was planned and was the result of more than twenty years of careful and meticulous preparation.

66. I do not want to enter into a historical argument with the representative of Israel. He said that my references to history were based on what was taught in Baghdad—or something to that effect; I do not remember his exact words. But all I said was that the Jews were not the first people to inhabit Palestine, nor were they the last. I referred the representative of Israel to his own Bible, where it is said that when the Hebrews came into Palestine it was called the Land of Canaan and was inhabited by a people called the Canaanites. That is a fact which is based not only on history but on divine revelation also.

67. In conclusion, I would again urge the Security Council not to let this opportunity pass without warning against the perpetration of similar acts in the future; I would again urge it to advance the cause of peace in the world.

68. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

69. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I apologize for taking this time and I do not intend to make it a practice to reply on each occasion. I did, however, want to apologize to Ambassador Pachachi, the representative of Iraq, for stepping out when he started. I had an urgent telephone call which I had to take. I should like to say this to him, however, that in talking about resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, I referred to that resolution in all of its parts and aspects. Withdrawal is a part of that resolution. I did not take the time of the Council to read the whole resolution. I assure him, however, that we support the entire resolution, in all of its parts, in all of its aspects.

70. I reaffirm the statements I made in this respect at the time, both before and after the vote, and—to use a practice we use in our Congress—incorporate them by reference at this point.

71. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Israel.

72. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel) (*translated from Russian*): The representative of the Soviet Union and I are old acquaintances; at one time we were even friends, and we understand one another very well. But in order to make him understand me even more clearly, I should like to say a few words in his language.

73. When I listened to the speech of the Soviet representative, I was reminded of the words with which he is no doubt very familiar: “Beat the Jews, save Russia.” We are in no way opposed to everything being done to ensure the prosperity of Russia, but I am sure that the Soviet people do not think that in our time one can beat Jews with impunity.

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

74. The statement just made by the Soviet representative reminds me of one of Krylov’s fables, the one about the fox which accused the sheep of killing chickens. The fox then set himself up as the judge and pronounced the verdict: “Put the sheep to death; and its meat—hand it over to the Court.”

75. Again we heard today a Soviet reference to Zionism and to Zionists. I am very much surprised by this reference. After all, following the recent developments in Poland, it has become quite clear what the term “Zionist” means in the present-day Soviet lexicon. “Zionists” to them means freedom fighters, those who strive for the dignity of man and for the rights of the people. I am proud to be a representative of a Zionist Government.

76. The Soviet representative referred to a number of administrative regulations issued by the Israel authorities with a view to facilitating freedom of movement of Jews and Arabs alike. In all due respect, may I suggest that when the Soviet Government desires to make observations on Israel regulations it should not rely on the texts or interpretations of these texts transmitted to it from Arab sources.

77. On 29 February 1968 four administrative orders were promulgated. Briefly, they declare that it is now legal for Israelis to travel to the areas under Israel’s control and for residents of those areas to visit Israel. The directives are all technical in content, simply giving legal sanction to a situation that already existed in fact. Their promulgation was designed to remove juridical anomalies, a principal one being that up until the issuing of these administrative orders passage to and fro between the areas of Israel proper and the areas under Israel control could be construed as a technical offence. There has for a long time been freedom of movement between the areas in question, and the recent regulations now give that movement retroactive sanction. They in no way deal with the status of the areas nor do they establish new political facts with regard to them. The orders make no mention at all of the term “enemy territory”.

78. In malicious disrespect for the memory of 6 million innocent Jews cruelly murdered by the Hitlerite hordes, the

statement of the Soviet representative, whose country signed the infamous pact with Hitler that triggered off the Second World War again made comparisons between my people and its oppressors. Let me repeat what I said yesterday: The Nazis called us Communists. The Communists call us Nazis. I leave it to history to pronounce judgement on this unholy alliance of hate.

79. Finally, the Soviet representative showed particular concern about the well-being of the Arab inhabitants in areas under Israel control. May I make a simple suggestion. I am certain that if the Soviet Government were to grant to the Jewish citizens of the USSR the same rights, privileges, facilities and freedom of expression and confession in schooling, language, literature, work and communication with the outside world as are enjoyed by the Arab population in all the areas under Israel jurisdiction, all would recognize this as a magnanimous act ending the disabilities, discrimination and suffering to which the Jews of the Soviet Union are subjected today.

80. As for the statements made just now by the Arab representatives . . .

81. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

82. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I think it is quite obvious that the purpose of such a slanderous statement just made by the Israel representative is to divert the Security Council's attention from the substance of the problem. With such slanderous statements he would be well suited for the Voice of America but not for the Security Council meetings.

83. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call again on the representative of Israel.

84. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): As for the statements made just now by the Arab representatives, the hour is late and I would only refer to an ominous idea suggested by the Iraqi representative who spoke last. The thesis put forward by the Iraqi representative concerning the cease-fire is not a new one. He suggests that acts of aggression carried out by small military or paramilitary units or by individual marauders are not violations of the cease-fire.

85. This is precisely the thesis which was used to justify the warfare continued against Israel during the truce, under the armistice, and now under the cease-fire. This is the thesis which brought about the renewal of hostilities in 1956 and again last June in 1967. This is the thesis that has been repeatedly rejected by the Security Council and the General Assembly. I trust that the Security Council will recognize it for what it is: an attempt to gain immunity for the continuation of war, terror and murder.

86. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in exercise of his right of reply.

87. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have already answered the representative of Israel, and therefore I shall take this

opportunity to make a few brief remarks on the point raised by the representative of the United States and on which he addressed himself to me.

88. If I understood him correctly, Mr. Goldberg mentioned in his speech the question of the Soviet Union exerting its influence in the matter of the peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East. However, he did not specify in what particular matter, on whom this influence was to be exerted or in what direction.

89. It is no accident that this question was raised in such general terms. The United States representative is clearly attempting to evade the main issue which must be settled before a peaceful settlement in the Middle East can be achieved. This main issue, as everyone knows, is the acceptance by Israel of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) adopted on 22 November 1967, agreement as to its implementation and co-operation with the special representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring. And the crucial point of this resolution is, as we all know, the question of the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops from Arab territories occupied by Israel.

90. The question will, of course, be asked: is it necessary to exert influence on the Arab side in this matter? I do not think so, because it has already been made clear in the statement of the Soviet Government of 22 March 1968 that:

"The United Nations has been officially informed that the Arab States which suffered most from Israel's aggression are ready to comply with the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and to co-operate with the Secretary-General's representative to the Middle East who has been empowered to facilitate the implementation of this resolution." [S/8495.]

91. I would also draw Mr. Goldberg's attention to the letter in the Secretariat document S/8479 of 19 March, signed by the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony, in which we find an official statement made on behalf of the Republic to the effect that:

"The United Arab Republic on its part has informed Mr. Jarring of its readiness to implement the Security Council resolution adopted on 22 November 1967."

92. I would ask whether Israel has made such a direct, clear categorical official statement in the United Nations, whether it has stated, firstly, that it agrees with this resolution, secondly, that it is prepared to put this resolution into effect and thirdly, that it is ready immediately to carry out the main clause of the resolution, which is the withdrawal of its troops from the Arab territories it has occupied to the positions they held on 5 June 1967? Such official statements are not to be found in the documents. There lies the difficulty, the main difficulty causing the deadlock which has come about in the Middle East. This is the main obstacle to the fulfilment of Mr. Jarring's mission.

93. So I would address myself in the same way to Mr. Goldberg: let the United States exert its influence on Israel

in these matters to ensure that Israel officially declares that it recognizes the resolution, that it is ready to put it into effect and that it is ready immediately to proceed to withdraw its troops from Arab territories occupied by Israel. Exert your influence on Israel—your country has all the facilities for doing so.

94. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Israel in the exercise of his right of reply.

95. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The representative of the Soviet Union has left me no alternative but to read into the record of this meeting a letter submitted by me yesterday to the Secretary-General and distributed in document S/8494. It reads:

"I have the honour to refer to the letter addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations on 19 March 1968 [S/8479] in which he transmitted to you a statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic on 13 March 1968. Upon instructions from my Government I have the honour to draw your attention to excerpts from a statement made by Mr. Abba Eban, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, at a press conference in Jerusalem on 12 March 1968:

"Recent Cairo statements shed light on policies and attitudes of the United Arab Republic. I refer especially to the addresses by President Nasser and articles in the Egyptian Government press. Everything received from other sources indicates these to be authentic expressions of the United Arab Republic's policy.

"The position is clear. The peace effort of the United Nations has not advanced and responsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of the United Arab Republic. Cairo policy, as formulated and practised, is quite incompatible with Charter principles and with the ideas behind the United Nations peace effort.

"Israel's policy is to seek the replacement of the cease-fire arrangements by permanent peace, negotiated, accepted and contractually ratified by the States concerned in accordance with normal international practice. Such a peace would eliminate the threat or the use of force, establish agreed secure political territorial boundaries, ensure freedom of navigation for Israel's ships and cargoes in all waterways leading to and from the Red Sea, commit all signatories to permanent, explicit, mutual recognition, the respect of sovereignty, security and the national identity of all Middle Eastern States.

"For nineteen years, relations between States in the Middle East have been fragile, anomalous, ambiguous, indeterminate and unresolved. The hour is ripe for building a stable and durable edifice within which the peoples of this region can pursue separate national vocations and a common regional destiny.

"What is the policy of the United Arab Republic? President Nasser has spoken of restoring the previous situation by force. Hasnein Heikal (regarded as the public

interpreter of Egyptian policy), has stated, on 8 March 1968, that the Security Council resolution of 22 November [242 (1967)] is "inadequate to promote a solution of the Middle Eastern problem, quite apart from its being obscure". Egyptian official spokesmen have let it be known, publicly and otherwise, that the United Arab Republic rejects the United Nations proposal to convene the United Arab Republic and Israel for a conference in which they would negotiate a mutually accepted peace settlement.

"We have made a careful study of the real intentions of the United Arab Republic as expressed in public utterances and various diplomatic contacts.

"The United Arab Republic's policy is as follows: The United Arab Republic rejects the principle of binding engagement, a commitment establishing a peace agreement with Israel.

"The United Arab Republic does not intend to meet Israel representatives in order to negotiate a settlement of differences with Israel."

96. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I apologise for interrupting the speaker, but the representative of the Soviet Union asks to speak on a point of order. This is in order. I call on him to speak.

97. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to bring to the attention of the Israel representative the fact that literate people are sitting around this table and that they have all read this document. Therefore I do not think there is any need to read it again here, particularly since no mention is made in this document of the questions which I asked.

98. But I should like the representative of the United States to specify in which document and when the Government of Israel officially stated that it accepted the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967, and that it was ready to implement it and to withdraw its troops immediately from foreign territory. These are the questions I am asking the United States representative, and I am waiting for an answer.

99. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Israel may continue his statement.

100. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): As I said, the Soviet representative left me with no alternative but to request that the official stand of the Government of Israel, as expounded in the letter submitted by me yesterday, should be included in the records of this meeting. However, I should be grateful if this could be done without my having to read it fully.<sup>7</sup> If my understanding on this is correct, I shall of course waive the right to continue with the reading out of this text.

101. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of the United States in the exercise of his right of reply.

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1968*, document S/8494.

102. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I speak for the United States; I speak for no other country in this Council.

103. I think that the Council has the right to consider that points of order relating to the reading of documents are very inappropriately raised by the representative of the Soviet Union. We listened with great patience to his reading of the statement of his Government, all of which we had read earlier today as a public release by the Government of the Soviet Union.

104. The representative of the Soviet Union inquired what type of influence we were talking about and with respect to whom. When that resolution was adopted I made a statement in that respect, and I should like to read it. I hope that no point of order will be raised on it. I stated:

"I have already given my Government's pledge on this score and I wish to reiterate it today—a pledge to this Council and to the parties concerned that the diplomatic and political influence of the United States Government will be exerted in support of the efforts of the United Nations special representative to achieve a fair, equitable and dignified settlement so that all in the area can live in peace, security and tranquillity. Similar pledges from other members of the Council and the United Nations membership, particularly those with great diplomatic and political influence, would be invaluable..." [1382nd meeting, para. 102.]

105. The representative of the Soviet Union should know that the United States has used its political and diplomatic influence in support of the resolution of the Security Council and Mr. Jarring's mission. Our diplomatic efforts have been directed with respect to all countries concerned, and we would hope and still continue to hope that the Soviet Union will similarly use its diplomatic influence in that direction.

106. I do not want to burden the records of the Council with a recapitulation of the statements that were made at the time that the resolution was adopted. But those records will show that the resolution was adopted as an entire resolution, and the main point of the resolution is the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. That is the main point of the resolution.

107. There are principles set forth in that resolution, not only one principle; the principle that has been talked about, withdrawal, is a principle that is stated in resolution language. There are other principles involved in the resolution, and if anything is clear from the records of this Council the principles that are set forth are interdependent and there is nothing artificial about this interdependence. We did not manufacture it. It is in the nature of the situation and of the history of this conflict.

108. I shall say in the strongest terms for my country—and I should like to hear the same expression from the representative of the Soviet Union—that we support the resolution in all its parts. We support it as a resolution of the Security Council. We support the efforts of Mr. Jarring pursuant to the mandate contained in operative paragraph 3

of resolution 242 (1967) which states that he is: "to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution".

109. If the Soviet Union would say the same thing clearly and explicitly, then I think that Mr. Jarring would have the type of support he really needs, and that is the whole-hearted support of this Council behind the resolution as a whole—which is the way the Council adopted the resolution.

110. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Morocco.

111. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): Although I have been invited to appear before this Council as a non-member, seeing that I represent a country which is directly concerned in the general situation in the Middle East, I shall beg the President's indulgence and ask him to allow me to draw the Council's attention to certain facts.

112. The present discussion is being held at the request of Jordan, which asked for urgent consideration of a specific situation. The facts have been established in the clearest possible way. The highest authorities of Israel do not in any way dispute the terms of Jordan's letter [S/8484], and there is also an extremely lucid account of the course of events in the report of the United Nations Observer which was submitted to us yesterday morning [S/7930/Add.64].

113. For the past two days, the Council has allowed itself to be led into discussions which serve only to document still further the general background to this wretched Middle Eastern question that has occupied our attention for the last twenty years. Some representatives retrace for our benefit the entire course of history over the last 2,000 years; others speak in reply to criticisms and comments which have no direct bearing on the problem before the Council. We give them our close attention; we respect the right of each to make whatever observations he considers necessary and to reply to any interlocutor. But I think it has been established already—and certainly to the satisfaction of the delegation of Israel—that such a flagrant and violent punitive expedition as has just been carried out is still producing no reaction whatsoever from the Security Council after two days of discussion. So, after the murder of the inhabitants of Karameh, Israel has scored another diplomatic victory, for which, in my view, the Council is entirely to blame.

114. We are talking about the general situation in the Middle East. A resolution was adopted several months after the outbreak of the war. It was the subject of endless negotiations, manoeuvring and pressure. It was adopted and it has a meaning and significance. In the first place, it is a text which is binding on those who voted for it, and it is also a decision which must be imposed on those to whom it is addressed.

115. What has happened since that resolution was adopted? It is perhaps unnecessary to recall every event,

but I believe it would be difficult to deny that, in all his efforts, the Secretary-General's special representative has met with direct or covert opposition and with delaying tactics, all with the effect of hindering him as much as possible from seriously seeking the kind of solution that the Council wished to produce.

116. In the meantime, this has enabled Israel to commit with impunity certain acts of the utmost gravity, without provoking the slightest reaction at the international level.

117. We talk about influence in the Middle East. Who is supposed to be exerting influence and on whom? It has been generally recognized that the countries of that region are sovereign States. There are Powers there which have committed themselves to seeing that the Council's resolution is carried out. We are waiting for their answers to the questions which have been asked. We are waiting for them to tell us what has been done at such a level of international political and moral responsibility, for a start to be made on implementing this resolution. We can talk about that again later.

118. The special representative of the Secretary-General has not given up hope, and his recent visit to United Nations Headquarters must certainly have shown him there are other encouraging elements favouring a solution. But a new event has occurred since that visit; I refer to the deliberate attack, acknowledged by the Government of Israel, which has described it as a punitive expedition. This matter has finally come before the Security Council, which was convened urgently and has not yet found a way of solving the problem and of taking the necessary decisions in this matter.

119. Every judicial body has emergency procedures for dealing with *flagrante delicto*. I have not stated why the Council—the facts having been established, the situation being clear and the guilty party, with great presumption and audacity, having admitted its responsibility—why the four great Powers, which are permanent members, and the representatives of many other States have not yet managed to reach a decision on this problem.

120. If it is thought in some quarters that the right of reply is a facility provided for refuting this or that aspect of the international policy of this or that country, or of the philosophy of this or that country interested in the problem, I say that the Council must first address itself to a study of this question. Two hundred people have been killed; a village has been destroyed; a United Nations resolution has been violated; international law has been breached. There have been no such precedents in any other war no matter who may have committed war crimes. We never saw the Germans crossing the line of the unoccupied zone to take action against resistance movements. We never heard in the United States a radio broadcast calling on the European resistance fighters to abandon their efforts to free their territory. We have never heard in London a radio broadcast to the effect that the resistance movements to free the occupied territories should stop. Is there one kind of freedom on one side of the Mediterranean and another kind on the other side? On the line of demarcation separating the great Powers from the rest, is there justice for one victim and injustice for another?

121. I believe that the Council should not hesitate when faced with the facts. Nor should it take into consideration the identity of the guilty party or that of the victim. There are precise facts before us which no one here disputes, not even the Israel delegation. Forty-eight hours have gone by and the entire world, which has its eyes on the Council, can plainly see that it has been unable to take a decision on the basis of precise facts.

122. I remember other occasions when the Council was convened, occasions on which it immediately found the political and moral strength to face up to the necessary decisions without delay and without time-wasting manoeuvres. When the Council is convened urgently, what is urgent is not only the discussion but the decision.

123. I apologize, in view of the conditions in which I have been invited to speak before the Council, for interposing this reminder in what may be a discourteous way; but I believe that we are in the process of adding to the crimes of Israel a crime of indifference, which is utterly unworthy of the Council. I regret to say that Friday evenings have a particular importance for the tactical experts of the Security Council because they can use them to defer the discussion until the following week. In the interval, the ground will have been strewn with two hundred corpses, five or six days will have passed before the highest international authority reaches its verdict, and Israel will presumably have triumphed once again, but the Council will certainly have lost.

124. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in the exercise of his right of reply.

125. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I shall be very brief. I am quite justified in saying at this meeting of the Security Council that we have received no answer from the United States representative to the three direct questions which I asked—whether Israel agrees with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)], whether it agrees to implement it, and whether it agrees to withdraw its troops to the positions they occupied before 5 June 1967.

126. As for his question regarding the attitude of the Soviet Union to the resolution, Mr. Goldberg should know by now that the Soviet Union does not vote for resolutions which it does not accept and does not recognize. The Soviet Union voted for the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.<sup>8</sup>

127. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I am aware that the Soviet Union voted for the resolution, but we have had no answer to the question whether the Soviet Union will support the resolution in all its parts.

<sup>8</sup> The English text of this paragraph which appeared on page 60 of the provisional verbatim record of the meeting read as follows:

"In so far as concerns his question regarding the attitude of the Soviet Union to this resolution, Mr. Goldberg should know that the Soviet Union does not vote for resolutions it does not recognize. The Soviet Union voted for the resolution concerned." On 25 March 1968 a corrigendum (S/PV.1405/Corr.1) was issued to change the English text to read as paragraph 126 above.



128. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) *(translated from Russian)*: The Soviet Union voted for all parts of the resolution in question; it follows that it recognizes all parts of the resolution.<sup>9</sup>

129. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I welcome that statement very much, because it was not apparent from the prior statements.

130. Now, with respect to the attitude of the parties to the resolution, I said I was speaking for my own Government, and that is my responsibility. Mr. Jarring is

<sup>9</sup> The English text of this paragraph which appeared on page 61 of the provisional verbatim record of the meeting read as follows:

"The Soviet Union voted for all parts of that resolution; it therefore recognizes all the parts."

On 25 March 1968 a corrigendum (S/PV.1405/Corr.1) was issued to change the English text to read as paragraph 128 above, and to complete the Russian text which, on page 15 of the provisional verbatim record, had appeared without the phrase corresponding to "it follows that it recognizes all parts of the resolution".

engaged in a very delicate mission on behalf of the Council. We all knew when we adopted the resolution that it would not be an easy task. I do not think that we can accept any interpretation of the resolution that is made by the Soviet Union alone. At the appropriate time, Mr. Jarring will finally report to this Council, and we will have an impartial assessment of what is the attitude of the parties with respect to his mission and with respect to the resolution and at that time, I think, I—speaking for my Government—will be prepared to take appropriate action in the light of Mr. Jarring's report.

131. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French)*: From the consultations which I have had with members of the Council, it appears that a large number of them are in favour of adjourning now and reconvening at 9.30 p.m. If there is no objection, I shall adjourn the meeting, and we will resume discussion of the item on our agenda at 9.30 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*