



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

NOV 15 1972

UN/SA COLLECTION

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1434<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 5 AUGUST 1968

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1434) . . . . .	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President and expression of welcome to the new representative of the United States of America . . . . .	1
Expression of welcome to Mr. Kutakov, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs . . . . .	2
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	2
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616);	
(b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617);	
(c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721);	
(d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724). . . . .	2

## 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 THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 5 August 1968, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. João Augusto DE ARAUJO CASTRO  
(Brazil).

*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/1434)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
  - (a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616);
  - (b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617);
  - (c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721);
  - (d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724).

### Expression of thanks to the retiring President and expression of welcome to the new representative of the United States of America.

1. The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding to the provisional agenda for today's meeting, may I be permitted to express my personal satisfaction at being with you in the Security Council and at joining you in this common endeavour for peace and security under the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. All I can say is that I count on your help and ceaseless collaboration and that I shall do my best to pursue the constant effort of the Government of Brazil towards reconciling the actions of nations so that conditions of peace and security shall prevail in the world at large. My Government has extended to this Organization its utmost support and unremitting collaboration, and will not depart from this purpose and responsibility. May I also express my gratitude to Ambassador Tewfik Bouattoura of Algeria, who bore the responsibility of presiding over the Council during the month of July? Although the Council did not meet during the month of July, Ambassador Bouattoura was called on to engage in many active consultations on important matters on the Council agenda, and I am sure that I speak for all members of the Council in paying tribute to that tact, courtesy and statesmanship with

which he discharged his function as President of the Security Council for the month of July.

2. I now call upon the representative of Algeria, Ambassador Bouattoura.

3. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, may I first thank you for the very kind words you have said about me? In my turn, I should like to express the great confidence which my delegation has in you and to welcome you both as the representative of Brazil and as the President of the Security Council for the month of August.

4. I should be remiss in my duty if on this occasion I did not welcome the active participation of the representative of the United States, Ambassador George Ball. As an expert on the theory of controlling power he will be practising here with us the control of force, since, by its very nature, this Council is called upon essentially to discuss problems deriving and resulting from the use of force.

5. Mr. President, you have mentioned the efforts we made during the month of July. All we did was to try to live up to the duty generally entrusted to the Security Council, which is to safeguard international peace and security. Strictly speaking, our sole aim was to ensure that they were safeguarded or, at any rate, appeared to be so, and indeed nothing seems to have disturbed international peace and security during the month of July.

6. Once again, Mr. President, may I reaffirm the confidence my delegation feels that you, as President of the Council, will not fail to guide our labours with all the tact and courtesy with which we are already so familiar? We are certain that the results of the Security Council's work during this month will be equal to our expectations.

7. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind and generous words. May I also be allowed to welcome to our proceedings the new representative of the United States of America, Ambassador George Ball? It would be superfluous to enlarge on the qualifications and merits of a personality so well known to us all, a distinguished diplomat who has occupied many high positions in the course of a brilliant career in the service of his Government and his country. We are happy to see him sitting among us today, and on behalf of all members of the Security Council, I extend to him the hearty welcome he so richly deserves.

8. I now call on the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador George Ball.

9. Mr. BALL (United States of America): Mr. President, I am grateful for your gracious words of welcome to the Security Council. Although we are both newcomers to this body I, together with all of us here, am very well aware of your long and distinguished diplomatic career. You have served not only on the staff of the Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations and as a member of Brazilian delegations to some eight General Assembly sessions, but you have also been the Minister for External Relations of your country. There is no doubt that this Council will be guided effectively under your wise leadership.

10. I also feel it appropriate on this occasion to express to Ambassador Bouattoura of Algeria my deep appreciation of his words of welcome. During his Presidency last month he set a wise example as far as the formal meetings of the Council are concerned. I thought, when I had served as President of the Council for the last two or three days of June, that I had by my inactivity greatly contributed not only to the convenience of the members but to the cause of peace. However, Ambassador Bouattoura made my efforts in this regard seem quite insignificant: he managed to avoid a Council meeting for the entire month of July.

11. Although I profoundly regret the tragic events that have brought us together today, I feel honoured to be present in such distinguished company. I am aware that in most legislative bodies of the world there is a tradition that new members should maintain a decent reticence for a certain period of time. I promise, Mr. President, to disregard that tradition conscientiously. This means, however, that I must count on you, my colleagues, both for advice and forbearance, and, from what my predecessor has told me of your wisdom and compassion, I am confident that such assistance will be forthcoming.

12. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States of America for his generous words.

#### **Expression of welcome to Mr. Kutakov, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs**

13. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Council, I also wish to welcome to our midst the new Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Leonid Kutakov.

14. The new Under-Secretary-General is well known to most of us who have known him in the course of his distinguished service in the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations and have learned to respect his ability, competence and learning. We all look forward to a continuation of the co-operation we enjoyed with his predecessor.

15. I now call upon the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Kutakov.

16. Mr. KUTAKOV (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, permit me to express my feelings of sincere gratitude for the kind words you have addressed to me here. The discharge of the complex duties which have been assigned to me will be facilitated by the co-operation and mutual understanding which I hope to receive from the

members of the council. I regard this as an important and indispensable condition for successful work in the Security Council.

17. Allow me to express the hope that under the guidance of the Secretary-General, and with the mutual understanding and assistance of the members of the Council, I shall be able to discharge satisfactorily the duties which have been assigned to me.

#### **Adoption of the agenda**

18. The PRESIDENT: This meeting has been convened at the urgent request of the representatives of Jordan [S/8721] and Israel [S/8724]. We now come to the adoption of the provisional agenda which is before the Council in document S/Agenda/1434. Members of the Council will note that the provisional agenda lists under the general heading of "The situation in the Middle East" four letters from Jordan and Israel. The first two, listed as items (a) and (b), are the letters which were placed on the provisional agenda of the 1429th meeting on 5 June, which was not adopted, as the Council decided to adjourn in view of the tragic shooting of Robert Kennedy. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the agenda is adopted.

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### **The situation in the Middle East:**

- (a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616);
- (b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617);
- (c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721);
- (d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724).

19. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and with previous practice, I propose, if there is no objection, to invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to be seated at the Council table.

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

20. The PRESIDENT: I have just received letters from the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Iraq requesting that they be permitted to participate in the Security Council's discussion of this item. If I hear no objection, I propose to invite the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Iraq to be seated.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Hilmy (United Arab Republic) and Mr. A. Pachachi (Iraq) took places at the Council table.*

21. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker on my list is the representative of Jordan, to whom I now give the floor.

22. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Mr. President, let me at the outset welcome you among us both as Ambassador of Brazil and as President of the Security Council for this month. We wish you every success in your new task. It also gives my delegation great pleasure to welcome Ambassador Ball, an outstanding American statesman. We know that the task ahead of Mr. Ball is not easy but we are confident that he will meet it with his usual insight, wisdom and determination. Mr. Kutakov is assuming his duties in a new capacity. He is not a newcomer to the United Nations. We have experienced his ability as a diplomat during the past few years and feel certain that he will assume his new tasks with interest and dedication.

23. Once again we come to the Security Council to deal with a situation fraught with danger. We find ourselves compelled to bring to the Security Council a new flagrant and premeditated attack by the Israeli forces against our unarmed civilian population.

24. Yesterday's Israeli aggression was carefully directed against civilians in the city of Salt and its neighbouring area. This is similar to the attack committed on 4 June 1968 against centres of civilians in the city of Irbid and its surrounding villages. It may be recalled that the complaint concerning the Irbid attack is still pending before the Security Council, and I take it that the Council is convened to consider both complaints. As a result of the treacherous Irbid attack, 59 Jordanians were killed and 121 injured; most of them were elderly people, women and children. Casualties were numerous; damages were very heavy. A great number of stores, bus terminals, commercial centres, harvested wheat and plantations were destroyed and completely burned.

25. Besides the destruction wrought upon the city of Irbid, its suburbs and communications, the Israeli attack extended to other areas and places of the Jordan Valley: the Jordanian villages of Umm Qays, Al-Makheebah, Al-Fauqa, Malkiyya, Tayybat Bani Adwan, Al-Shaq-Al-Barid and Kufor Asad were bombed and shelled.

26. Yesterday, at 1305 hours local time, Israeli military aircraft attacked and bombed areas west and south of Salt City nineteen miles from the capital of Amman. The Israeli aircraft continued hitting the areas around Salt intermittently for over three hours. The civilian population, innocent men, women and children were subjected to these Israeli acts of lawlessness.

27. At 1545 hours local time and while the Israeli military aircraft continued to bomb the areas around Salt, the Israeli forces opened fire, using tanks at the area adjacent to Prince Abdullah Bridge and Suamah in the south of the Jordan Valley.

28. Shooting and artillery shelling stopped at 1600 hours local time and bombing stopped at 1625 hours. The Israeli forces opened fire again at 1705 hours at Saumah killing 5 persons, among them 2 women and 1 child; 20 civilians were seriously wounded, among them 9 labourers working on the Al-Arda road.

29. Later in the day, the Israeli forces resumed their indiscriminate shelling and bombing. The number of casualties among the civilians has increased.

30. The information received so far indicates that 34 Jordanians were killed and 82 Jordanians seriously wounded in yesterday's attack.

31. The barbaric nature of the Israeli attack and behaviour is reflected in the wicked manner in which they planned it. During the operations they would cease their bombing for a while until civilians had gathered to give first aid to the injured and carry away the dead, then resume their attack bombing the gathered groups and hence increasing the number of casualties. Thus, first-aid vehicles of the Red Crescent did not escape the Israeli shelling and bombing.

32. The Israeli fighters crossed over these tragic scenes of the victims, leaving trails of white smoke behind them in a sort of victory display: a victory against the helpless, the aged and the innocent. The Israeli Chief of Staff boasted at a news conference in Tel-Aviv last night that all the Israeli planes had returned safely, and he gave the reason that no Jordanian planes had been seen. He said that they had seen only light Jordanian anti-aircraft fire. This is true. Jordan had no planes with which to meet the Israelis, had no heavy anti-aircraft equipment and was therefore an easy target for an Israeli victory. However, a question arises: if all the vast military equipment delivered to Israel for defensive purposes is used to murder our people, is it fair or just to continue arming Israel to the teeth in order to be intoxicated by its power? This is for the Security Council to ponder, the organ primarily responsible for peace and security in the area.

33. While Jordan anticipated and warned against the attack in the same way that it warned against the previous attacks, it never contemplated that the Israelis would again use its superior military air force against civilian populations, many of whom were rendered refugees for the second and third time in less than twenty years.

34. The bombing and shelling of the civilian population is an inhuman and barbaric act. At the Nuremberg Trials the indiscriminate bombing of the civilian population was included by the very big Powers sitting around the table in the indictment of the German war criminals. What is before the Council is, therefore, a charge of greater magnitude. This is all the more so since the perpetrator of these crimes is not only a Member of the United Nations, but also the only Member that owes its very existence to this Organization.

35. The Israeli representative in his letter to the Security Council [S/8614] claims that Israel's role in the Irbid operation was to return the fire against the attacking positions. But no matter how one looks at it, it is clear beyond doubt that the Israeli aggression was pre-planned at the highest levels. David Holden, of the *Sunday Times* of London underlined this Israeli "get-tough" policy when he wrote that "the Israelis are exceedingly tough and they are embarrassingly frank about it."

36. On 26 April, the Israeli Defence Minister, Mr. Dayan, warned Jordan that the Jordan Valley will turn into a battlefield and that "there will not be room there for civilian life, for families, children, and agricultural cultivation." Sure enough, Dayan kept his word, but this time he did not content himself with the Jordan Valley. He

extended his aggression to the Heights as far away as the City of Irbid, whose civilian population had already swelled as a result of the repeated Israeli attacks—from a few thousand to about 100,000 people, mainly women and children, the expellees from the west bank and the Jordan Valley.

37. Yesterday's attack extended to Salt and its surrounding areas. The Israelis, after killing more women and children, reported their victory to the world. These are not isolated cases. They are deliberate. They are dictated by irresponsible leadership. They are motivated by the arrogance of power. They are encouraged by the inaction and/or the indifference of Powers that can afford to tell the truth and take an objective stand but which have failed to do so.

38. On 3 June 1968, the *Christian Science Monitor* gave the following report:

"... shortly after General Dayan's speech, a steady stream of reports, some from eye-witnesses, described heavy new Israeli troop build ups on the Jordan River's West Bank especially in the north, near the Sea of Galilee.

"Tanks, half-tracks, self-propelled guns and armoured troop-carriers, were seen near Al-Hamma, a fragment of former Palestine at the junction of the Jordan-Israeli-Syrian borders.

"There was also unusual military activity above Al-Hamma on Syria's Israeli occupied Golan Heights".

39. It is worth noting that many of the Israeli shellings of Irbid and other villages came from that position—from the Golan Heights. Similar statements were made by Mr. Eshkol and Mr. Eban only the day before yesterday—the day before that vicious attack on Salt. Other Israeli officials made other statements last week, and surely enough these hostile, aggressive pronouncements and premeditated build-ups were the prelude to yesterday's attack on the City of Salt.

40. What the Israelis did not occupy they are now destroying. They aim at achieving more than one result: they want to destroy the agriculture on the east bank of Jordan; they want to terrorize, intimidate and expel the inhabitants of that area. Yesterday's attack was another link in the chain of intimidation against Jordan. We have reminded the Council of this in previous circumstances. After rendering more than 450,000 people homeless and refugees, they are now trying to do the same to the residents of the northern area of the Jordan valley on the east bank of Jordan. Their crimes of last June were not completed, and now they are starting the process of a final solution.

41. The fact that the area subjected to yesterday's Israeli aggression and the one attacked last June are purely agricultural ones and are considered the most successful projects in irrigated farming in Jordan proves beyond doubt the sinister Israeli aim to destroy civilian life in the area.

42. Because of the heavy bombing and shelling by Israel, the farmers of the east bank of the Jordan valley have lost

the season's crops, worth about \$12 million. They are also bound to lose their citrus and banana trees, which cannot survive more than three weeks without irrigation. Some of these banana trees were burned by napalm. The value of these plantations amounts to \$14 million.

43. The East Ghor Canal irrigates about 30,000 acres in the valley, planted in citrus, bananas, tomatoes and other crops. In addition to this area, 22,000 acres in the valley east of the river get water from other sources, such as wells, pumping from the river and small tributaries of the Jordan River.

44. Because of previous Israeli attacks, farming in this area became impossible; and now, through their recent inhuman bombing and shelling of the Salt area, the Israelis have made farming in all these parts impossible. They have destroyed much of this irrigated area and burned the crops in the peak of the season. This is of special significance. These areas are the most productive; they are the areas on which Jordan depends for its agricultural needs; these are the areas which feed half the population of the east bank.

45. On 26 April 1968, the *New York Post* published General Dayan's statement in which he boasted that 70,000 civilians had already left upper Jordan valley settlements, while in Israel, border *kibbutzim* had been reinforced by civilians and youthful volunteers.

46. I have presented the facts of the Israeli aggression to this Council. These facts leave no room for doubt that the Israelis planned both attacks on Irbid and Salt. They adopted the same pattern in fixing the time for the execution. Now, what is the other sinister aim behind these Israeli crimes? Is it to intimidate Jordan into submission to the expansionist designs of Israel and surrender to its will? Is it to make Jordan agree to Israeli conditions? Or is the bombing of civilians in the City of Irbid and the City of Salt intended to cause a panic among the inhabitants of the cities and their surrounding areas so that more people will abandon their homes, either because of their complete destruction or because of the repeated Israeli attacks, so that a vacuum is created for further Israeli expansion and aggression?

47. These are all issues connected with the Israeli attacks of yesterday and last June. They and the repeated attacks of Israel against my small country impose on all Powers the duty to examine their consciences and see whether, by not taking effective measures to stop Israeli attacks, they are promoting peace in the area or inflaming the feelings of the people in Jordan.

48. As I explained earlier, the recent Israeli act of aggression is not an isolated military operation, nor can it be dismissed as a simple incident. The attack against my country is also a political one. It is meant to remind Jordan that it is exposed to permanent danger of attacks from overpowering forces. In the past, in the face of these serious violations, we asked the question: how could the Council remain indifferent? This is all the more pertinent since yesterday's premeditated Israeli attack has already aggravated the already inflammable situation existing in the area.

49. Time and again, the Security Council has emphasized 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. We therefore are entitled to expect further and more effective measures as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. The murderous Israeli campaign and continued acts of aggression should be met with an effective Security Council response reflected in sanctions. It is very clear now that Israel is intent on pursuing a course contemptuous of the authority of the world Organization, contemptuous of its decisions, contemptuous of the wishes of the Council members, and contemptuous of world public opinion. If this is the case, is it not incumbent upon the Security Council to take more effective measures to cope with the problem? Unless you take effective measures, we will have to expect more of the same Israeli attacks and defiance.

50. The inaction of the Council or its submission to any pressure will frustrate the hope not only of Jordan, a small country, but of all mankind. This will consequently destroy the image of this great body, for this body is an organ of peace intended to check aggression and liquidate the consequences of aggression. Surely the Council cannot afford to be indifferent, because this amounts to condoning Israeli crimes.

51. *The Jerusalem Post* reported that Israeli officials were appraising the various forms of so-called reprisal action. The paper went on to say that high Israeli sources pointed to the fact that, while some reprisal operations like the Karama action had led to international reaction, other later actions did not.

52. The Israelis made an appraisal of the standards of the Security Council vis-à-vis Israel's crimes and discovered that the Security Council did react on Karamah, did not react on Shunah, did not react on Irbid, and this encouraged them to go ahead, seeing a green light for more crimes.

53. What I have quoted raises many issues for members of the Council to ponder.

54. The Israeli attacks on both the City of Irbid on 4 June and the City of Salt on 4 August were of the same magnitude as the Karama aggression. All of them were aimed at the destruction of civilian life. The international inaction after the attack on Shunah on 29 March and the postponement of international action with regard to the Israeli large-scale aggression on Irbid seem to have whetted the Israeli's appetite for more and more attacks, and hence their attack on the City of Salt and its adjacent areas.

55. The time has come to seek an effective and proper international action. It is the task of the Security Council today to refute such Israeli statements by adopting a strong international reaction to such Israeli attacks and aggression.

56. The PRESIDENT: I call on the next speaker on my list, the representative of Israel.

57. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, allow me to extend to you my delegation's warm greetings and best wishes in your capacity as Permanent Representative of your great country and as President of the Security Council. It is the ardent hope of all men of goodwill that

during your tenure of office the cause of understanding and peace in the Middle East will be strengthened and advanced.

58. I should also like to associate myself with the words of welcome addressed at this table to Ambassador George Ball, the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, and to wish him success in the discharge of his great responsibilities.

59. May I also extend our best wishes to the new Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Kutakov?

60. Again we meet in the Security Council. We meet because Arab aggression has not been brought to an end and warfare against Israel is pursued from Jordanian territory despite the obligations assumed by Jordan under the cease-fire. In the last few months the Security Council has twice discussed situations arising from Jordanian acts of aggression and Israel's defensive measures.

61. My delegation has addressed itself repeatedly to the Council requesting effective action to stop Jordanian violations of the cease-fire. We have appealed to the Council to show understanding of the gravity of these violations. We have explained that the cease-fire cannot be a screen for Arab aggression, and that Israel must defend itself against attack. We have emphasized the impact that Security Council deliberations have on the area. We have said time and again that resolutions lacking in equity would increase intransigence, encourage extremism, breed additional violence.

62. The Security Council resolution of 24 March 1968 [248 (1968)] deplored all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire and declared that violations of the cease-fire could not be tolerated. Jordan promptly interpreted it as non-applicable to Arab acts of hostility against Israel. On 4 April [1412th meeting] the Security Council expressed its concern at the deteriorating situation. Jordan ignored it. Since then, military attacks and armed incursions from Jordanian territory have continued unabated.

63. In my letters to the President of the Security Council, and in particular in those of 8 April [S/8535], 23 April [S/8556], 4 June [S/8614], 24 June [S/8651], 17 July [S/8683] and 2 August [S/8716], I drew attention to this grave situation. On 7 May I found it necessary to do so at the Council table. On 5 June we called for a meeting of the Security Council to consider the grave and continual violations of the cease-fire by Jordan.

64. Israeli villages were being shelled. Israeli citizens were being killed and wounded by mines. Terror and sabotage squads were being dispatched from Jordanian territory to murder and maim.

65. Jordan became the principal base for continued Arab aggression against Israel. Special military camps were established to train saboteurs. Recruiting centres were opened in Amman. Officers and men of regular Egyptian and Syrian army units were transferred to Jordan and assigned to terror operations. Iraqi troops, openly supporting and participating in the continuation of warfare against Israel, were given the free run of the country.

66. Warfare against Israel from Jordanian territory has been conducted by two methods: terror raids and armed

attacks from military positions. Both these types of aggression have been carried out from across the cease-fire line. Both these methods were meant to offer maximum immunity to their perpetrators. Both have been developed because of the failure of the Arab Governments to use the Arab inhabitants inside the areas under Israel control as instruments in the pursuance of war.

67. As was reported in *The New York Times* of 2 June 1968:

"The terrorists cannot find shelter among the local Palestinians. Of the 1,500 terrorists now in Israel's prisons, many, perhaps most, were captured through information given by Arab villagers and townfolk. . . . No one forces them to volunteer information. They do so because they themselves do not want the terror."

68. Terror raids and attacks from military positions have another element in common. Both of these methods of warfare are directed primarily against civilians and civilian localities.

69. Thus, having failed in its frontal aggression against Israel in June 1967, Jordan has turned to that most despicable type of belligerence, warfare by stealth, and to attacks from the distance of well-protected gun emplacements.

70. The campaign of aggression from Jordan has singled out as its primary targets such densely populated areas as the Beit She'an and Upper Jordan valleys and the constantly used trails along the Jordan River.

71. The shelling of Israeli villages by Jordanian artillery reached a climax in May and early June. From positions in the hills on the east bank, dominating completely the low-lying villages, Jordanian heavy guns rained fire and death on Israeli territory and Israeli citizens. The villages of Neve Ur, Tirat Zevi, Gesher, Beit Yosef, Ashdot Ya'aqov, Sha'ar HaGolan, Ma'oz Hayyim, Yardenia, Kefar Ruppin became targets for daily wanton shelling.

72. On the morning of 4 June a large-scale assault was launched from Jordanian territory. At approximately 1040 hours local time, Jordanian military positions, mainly in the vicinity of the police station at Manshiya, opened an artillery barrage on the Israeli villages of Neve Ur, Gesher, Yardenia, Beit Yosef, Ashdot Ya'aqov, Afikim and Menahamya, and then on the town of Beit She'an. Later Jordanian artillery positions at Irbid joined in the shelling. Fire was returned against the attacking positions. Extensive damage was caused to the villages and to the central part of Beit She'an. Ashdot Ya'aqov alone was struck by at least 250 shells. At Neve Ur one woman was killed and three other persons were wounded.

73. At 1500 hours one farmer was killed at Ashdot Ya'aqov and two injured. A second man was killed there ninety minutes later. By 1630 hours local time three Israeli farmers had been killed and six wounded.

74. In view of the persistence and intensification of the Jordanian artillery barrage, it became necessary at 1505 hours, more than four hours after the Jordanian attack had

begun, to order Israeli aircraft to take action in self-defence and silence the sources of fire. Due to the configuration of the area this was the only way to reach the well-protected heavy-gun emplacements and to end their harvest of death.

75. It is regrettable that the Jordanian Government should use inhabited centres such as Irbid as locations for their artillery positions. It is this irresponsible action that is the cause of inevitable civilian casualties resulting from Jordanian aggression and Israel counter-action.

76. Since then the tactics seem to have changed somewhat. Warfare from Jordanian territory was carried on in particular by means of terror and sabotage raids. These attacks have steadily increased in intensity and become a daily occurrence.

77. In July alone, 98 acts of aggression were committed from Jordanian territory. I should like to mention some of them.

78. On 2 July 1968, at approximately 0200 hours, an Israeli patrol encountered a marauder unit two kilometres east of Hamadya in the Beit She'an valley. In the ensuing exchange of fire and pursuit which lasted until dawn, two raiders were killed and the others escaped to the east bank. While the pursuit was taking place, Jordanian forces opened fire to support the raiders. Seven Israeli soldiers were injured in the clash.

79. On the same day at 1645 hours fire was opened from the east bank on workers south of Tirat Zevi. The fire was not returned.

80. On 3 July at 1540 hours Jordanian raiders opened fire on an Israeli patrol travelling on the patrol trail in the Damiyah Bridge area, west of the Jordan River. Jordanian artillery joined in the attack. Fire was returned and directed at the sources of the Jordanian fire. The exchange of fire lasted until 1740 hours.

81. Again in the afternoon of 3 July, fire was opened on Israeli forces south of Kibbutz Gesher.

82. On 4 July at 1130 hours a civilian truck was blown up and damaged by an anti-tank mine laid at km. 65 of the Arava Road linking Sdom to Eilat.

83. On 6 July at 0915 hours Jordanians opened machine-gun fire on Israeli forces in the Um Sus area. Some forty minutes later machine-gun fire was opened by Jordanians seven kilometres north of Um Sidra in the Jordan Valley.

84. In the morning of 9 July two anti-vehicle mines were discovered in a dirt track in the Neve Ur area. A patrol that was removing the land mines was fired upon from the east bank of the Jordan, from Jordanian military positions.

85. Later that morning a vehicle was blown up by a mine one kilometre west of the Sdom-Eilat Road in the Ein-Yahav area. One Israeli soldier was wounded.

86. At the same time an Israel Defence Forces patrol encountered armed raiders sixteen kilometres north-west of Damiyah bridge. Four of the raiders were killed and one



captured. Klachnikov rifles, Karl-Gustav sub-machine-guns, improvised bazookas and explosives were found in their possession.

87. On 12 July at 0815 hours an Israeli half-track was subjected to fire by marauders south of Um Shurt. The patrol fired back, killed two saboteurs and wounded another who fled to the east bank. While this was taking place Jordanian military positions opened machine-gun fire on the patrol to cover the retreat of the saboteurs. Fire was returned. The exchange lasted until 1030 hours. The Israeli forces suffered three wounded.

88. On 17 July an Israeli patrol encountered armed raiders seventeen kilometres north-east of Jericho. In the clash 13 raiders were killed, one captured, one escaped. One Israeli soldier was wounded. The saboteurs, who had penetrated from the east bank at night, were dressed in spotted uniforms, wore commando boots and carried sabotage material in addition to their personal weapons.

89. On 20 July at 1130 hours a military jeep was mined in a dirt track three-and-a-half kilometres south-east of Fiq. One Israeli soldier was wounded.

90. On the following day raiders from Jordan attacked with small arms and fired a bazooka shell on an Israeli jeep and command car at km. 79 of the Arava Road. The passengers returned fire, and the raiders fled to Jordanian territory. One Israeli soldier was wounded. Three anti-vehicle mines were found on the spot.

91. On 22 July at 1100 hours an Israeli patrol clashed with raiders from Jordanian territory about seven kilometres north-west of Um Shurt. Six of the marauders were killed. Personal arms and bazooka shells were found in their possession.

92. On 23 July at 1300 hours a member of Kibbutz Massada near the Jordan River was wounded when he stepped on a shoe mine east of the village.

93. A few hours later a military command car was blown up in the same area by a mine. Three soldiers were wounded, one of them fatally. Still on the same afternoon, a tractor was destroyed by a mine about three kilometres south of Tirat Zevi.

94. Jordanian positions attacked again on the following day in the Massada area. Fire was opened on Israeli forces and civilian workers north-east of the village. Fire was returned, and the exchange lasted for about an hour.

95. On 26 July at 0800 hours raiders from Jordan clashed with Israeli forces south-west of Damiyah Bridge. Two Israeli officers were killed, and four Israeli soldiers were wounded, one of them severely. Seven of the raiders were killed and one captured. The raiders were dressed in khaki and carried personal arms, Klachnikov rifles, hand grenades, a bazooka and sabotage material.

96. On 27 July 2 Israeli policemen were wounded when their vehicle struck a mine on a trail about 1.5 kilometres from Kibbutz Geshet.

97. On 28 July Jordanian positions launched another attack on Israeli forces and civilians, this time south-east of Sha'ar HaGolan. Fire was returned and the exchange lasted half an hour. Jordanian light arms fire was resumed later that day and fire had to be returned again.

98. Still on 28 July an Israeli patrol clashed with a marauder unit one kilometre east of Ma'oz Hayyim while it was trying to penetrate into Israeli territory. During the encounter fire was opened from Jordanian territory to cover the retreat of the raiders. Fire was returned. The exchange of fire lasted one hour. Two of the raiders were killed.

99. On 31 July a bulldozer was blown up by a mine on a track near Ein-Yahav, half a kilometre west of the cease-fire line with Jordan. Two men operators were wounded.

100. On 1 August at 0530 hours a vehicle of the Border Police was attacked with small arms and bazooka fire while travelling on a trail along the Jordan River near the Israeli village of Ma'oz Hayyim in the Beit She'an Valley. Fire was returned. One Israeli soldier was killed, 3 border policemen were wounded.

101. These are only some of the acts of aggression—98 of them in a single month.

102. These attacks have been accompanied by official Jordanian pronouncements in support of continued warfare against Israel. In a dispatch from Cairo which appeared in *The New York Times* of 17 June 1968 we read: "King Hussein has abandoned his former efforts to control or suppress guerrilla operations from within Jordanian-controlled territory."

103. On 19 June the *Christian Science Monitor* reported: "Interior Minister, Ahmed Al-Kayed, the chief of Jordan's military intelligence, Mohammed al-Rasoul, and other 'anti-fedayin' figures in Jordan resigned and were replaced in April. "The royal palace then appeared to have reached a sort of tacit accord with the front and al-Fatah. Their operations would not be hindered."

104. In an interview on Cairo's television, on 9 July 1968, King Hussein stated that there can be no doubt at all concerning his support for terror operations against Israel.

105. On 26 July, Jordan's representative to the United Nations, Ambassador El-Farra, declared in an interview with the Lebanese daily *Al-Muharrer*: "The united fedayeen activity is the only means in the present circumstances to keep the ember of our cause burning."

106. Israel has repeatedly emphasized Jordan's grave responsibility for this unabated warfare and called on the Jordanian Government to put an end to attacks by the Jordanian Army and by terror groups overtly supported by the Jordanian authorities and operating from Jordan.

107. This has proved to be of no avail. The attacks did not end. On the contrary, they increased in number and intensity. There was no peace, there was no cease-fire. Israel's security was in danger, its people, under constant attack. There was no alternative for Israel but to resort to self-defence.

108. Yesterday at 1300 hours local time Israeli aircraft took action against the terror bases from which these attacks against Israel emanate. The action was directed against two terrorist bases in the Salt area, including the central headquarters of the El-Fatah organization, stores of ammunition and sabotage equipment, training facilities and barracks. These were the only targets. The town of Salt and the Jordanian army camps in its vicinity remained outside the scope of the action.

109. The Salt area has become known as the centre and source of terror operations. In the *Christian Science Monitor* of 14 June we find a report from Beirut, Lebanon, describing the area in the following terms:

"Salt . . . a town astride the main road from Amman to the Allenby Bridge, main crossing point to the Israeli occupied west bank of the Jordan River. Its approaches bristle with training grounds and encampments of the Jordan Army and guerrilla organizations."

110. The following is from an official document published following the interrogation of a raider captured by the Israeli forces on 23 May 1968:

"On 23 May 1968 at 1100 hours, after a short exchange of fire, a band of 6 saboteurs was captured some 15 kilometres north of Jiftlik. Israeli forces suffered no casualties.

"The prisoners had in their possession 3 Russian Klachnikov assault rifles, a F.N. rifle, a Seminov rifle, 6 improvised bazookas, 8 bricks of explosives, 23 fingers of gelignite, equipment to detonate explosives and a quantity of hand grenades.

"One of the arrested men, Mahamed Selin Geradi, served in the 2nd Engineering Battalion under No. 24 Brigade of the Syrian Army which is stationed in Katana. His personal serial number is 26337.

"Geradi told in his interrogation that on 23 April 1968 he was called to his Battalion C.O. Captain Suleiman Sasa. There Geradi and other soldiers were ordered to proceed immediately to the El-Fatah Training Camp at Al-Hamma, and there join the sabotage organization.

"Geradi is not and never was a Palestinian.

"In the framework of El-Fatah he was incorporated into a band of saboteurs being organized in the Jordanian town of Salt.

"When the band reached the Jordan Valley they went to the Jordanian Police Station north of the townlet Craime and there, by means of a telephone conversation, their crossing of the Jordan was co-ordinated with an advanced Jordanian army position."

111. Two centres were established by the terrorist organizations in the Salt area: one five kilometres south of the town, the other, three kilometres to the west of it. Here were the central headquarters of El-Fatah. Here hundreds of raiders received their military training and arms. Here they were given guides and Jordanian army transportation to reach the Jordan River. From here they went out on their missions of death against the people of Israel.

112. The Salt region became a state within a state. The El-Fatah put up their own roadblocks. Special El-Fatah passes were necessary for movement through the area. The terror organization even established an independent prison. The terrorist bases in this area were destroyed in yesterday's action.

113. The Security Council is confronted time and again with the same problem. The Arab States having launched a war of aggression against Israel, having mounted last June a military and political offensive with the avowed aim of destroying Israel, the Arab States, disregarding the cease-fire and persisting in warfare against Israel, come before the Council to bewail Israel's refusal to co-operate with their deadly designs. Jordan, an active participant in this twenty-year war, Jordan which had chosen to attack Israel last June despite Israel's peace appeal to it and now pursues with tenacity its campaign of belligerency, finds it appropriate to complain of the consequences of its own aggressive policy and actions. Day after day, blow after blow, Jordan continues to strike at Israel, Israeli villages, Israeli civilians, Israeli forces. Then when, in desperation, Israel finally strikes back to stay the arm of aggression, Jordan has the audacity to plead innocence and demand sympathy for itself. Jordan's policies and behaviour have been replete with irresponsible adventures and fatal misjudgements. Yet after a war waged against Israel for two decades, Jordan cannot but be aware of our determination to ensure Israel's right to security and Israel's right to peace.

114. We are a small people. The annals of our history are filled with pages of oppression and martyrdom. We are firm in our resolve that no one be allowed again to smite Jews with impunity. We are a small people, and after the annihilation of 6 million of our brethren in Europe, as the world watched in silence, we are smaller than ever before. While Arab rulers may boast that they are ready to lose a million citizens in war, we shall do all in our power not to sacrifice a single one. To us every Israeli, man woman or child, wantonly murdered by the artillery shell, the terrorist's bullet or the saboteur's mine, is a living tissue cut out from our body. It is time for Jordan to realize that no Israeli citizen will find himself unprotected; no Israeli village will be undefended.

115. The attacks carried out from Jordanian territory are expressions of a concerted campaign of warfare waged by Jordan in open defiance of the cease-fire.

116. This is warfare pursued with vehemence, malice and cruelty and openly espoused by Jordan's leaders.

117. Has not the time come to stop, to ponder, to reappraise?

118. A year ago Jordan rejected our appeal to stay out of the aggression that was being mounted against Israel. Jordan's reply to Israel's exhortations not to attack was a Jordanian assault on Jerusalem and an offensive along the entire front. We remember what Jordan had in store for us. On 2 June 1967 King Hussein declared:

"Our increased co-operation with Egypt and the other Arab States, both to the east and to the west, will enable

us to march forward along the right road leading to the . . . liberation of Palestine."

"The hour for which you longed is here", cried Radio Amman. "Forward to arms, to battle, to new pages of glory. Oh Arabs, wherever you are! Hit everywhere and hit till the end. The end of Israel is in your hands."

On 1 June Amman Radio broadcast:

"Citizens, workers, fellaheen! How long did we wait and prepare for these hours of glory. . . . Prepare to meet on the soil of eternal Palestine."

119. This meeting was to take place after the complete destruction of Israel, after the annihilation of its people. Special units of the Jordanian army were assigned to raze Israeli villages and towns to the ground and kill all their inhabitants. Israel was saved from this fate only by the courage and dedication of its people. They will never agree that their sacrifice should prove to have been in vain.

120. Today, a year later, Israel turns to Jordan again and exhorts it to forgo war, to abide by the cease-fire, to take together the road towards peace. Israel exhorts Jordan not to make again the mistake committed a year ago. Let us scrupulously observe the cease-fire. Let us at long last have peace and security in the Middle East.

121. There has been enough tragedy, enough terror, enough violence and death and suffering in the region. It has stemmed from a continuous denial of Israel's basic rights, from a concerted Arab campaign of hate and incitement, from a macabre process of educating the young to destruction and murder. This must no longer be. It is not difficult to call for more hostility from the armchairs of this hall. It is simple to preach war and slaughter from the palaces of Cairo, Amman, Damascus and Baghdad. This must end if further tragedy is to be averted. This can end if the Arab rulers begin to think of their peoples rather than of themselves.

122. To the Security Council we appeal again to consider the situation in the Middle East as it is. Formulations born of the whims of those who deny Israel's rights cannot contribute to understanding nor prevent further deterioration of the situation. Only faithful and reciprocal observance of the cease-fire and an effort by the parties to reason together and work together towards a peaceful agreement can break the vicious circle of the twenty-year war.

123. We ask the Security Council to understand that after all these years of unabated belligerency and bloodshed, a nation that has had to pay for its independence with the longest war of this century cannot agree that the right of every Israeli citizen to life and security become a plaything of Arab warmongers.

124. We call upon the Security Council to raise its voice against the sanguinary acts of aggression that are continuing against Israel. We have waited for years to hear from the Council that it condemns the murder of Israelis.

125. We appeal to the Security Council to impress on Jordan the vital need for it to abide by its cease-fire

obligations and terminate all acts of aggression from its territory directed against Israel.

126. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Iraq.

127. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): May I first of all extend to you, Sir, our warm welcome as the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations and as the President of the Security Council for this month.

128. We should also like to welcome Mr. George Ball, the United States representative to the United Nations, on his first appearance in the Council, and Mr. Kutakov, the new Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs.

129. I have asked to participate in this debate because of the grave concern and deep anxiety of my Government and our people over the continued acts of aggression and lawlessness by Israel in the region which will undoubtedly endanger peace and security and, if unchecked, are likely to lead to a new outbreak of large-scale hostilities in our region, thus destroying whatever hope there is for the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the area.

130. Perhaps that is Israel's intention. Apparently it can only live and sustain itself by war and aggression. But the Security Council cannot allow itself to be a party to such odious designs.

131. More than four months ago the Security Council met in almost identical circumstances. The Israeli armed forces crossed into Jordanian territory and undertook the destruction of a town in Jordan with the killing of a large number of civilians.

132. The same excuses, the same justifications and the same arguments which we have heard this afternoon were presented to this Council last March. I believe that by now members of the Council are quite familiar with the unchanging pattern and technique of Israel's representation of its case before the Council. It usually presents a complaint immediately after an Arab country has presented its complaint to the Security Council. It is strange, is it not, that until this very day, in spite of this long list of alleged provocations and acts against Israel, not once has Israel come before the Security Council to complain of its own will and volition, but only after Jordan or some other Arab country had presented a complaint to the Council. Obviously the presentation of such complaints is a screen behind which Israel hopes to hide its own aggressive acts against its Arab neighbours.

133. I believe too that members of the Council are now familiar with the ways in which the representative of Israel presents his arguments. He tries, first of all, to quote from various newspapers and other sources. Then he gives a one-sided account of alleged incidents, which has no substantiation in fact; we only have the word of the representative of Israel as to whether they are true or not. Then he mentions the desire of Israel for peace and goes back to the old tune of a small people being threatened by predatory neighbours.

134. I am sure that the Council must be tired of this argument by now. It has heard it time and again, and it has categorically rejected it time and again. The fact is that Israel, depending upon its present air of superiority in the region, is able to strike at will and to choose its time and place against its Arab neighbours. This is hardly the behaviour of a small country surrounded by powerful neighbours bent upon its destruction. It is the other way round.

135. As I have said, the representative of Israel repeated all the arguments this afternoon without exception that he presented last March when the Council met in similar circumstances to discuss another act of aggression by Israel, and the Council rejected those arguments and adopted unanimously a resolution on 24 March [248 (1968)] which said the following—and I believe we must examine the present case against the background of that resolution. First of all, the resolution observed that the military action by the armed forces of Israel on the territory of Jordan was of a large-scale and carefully planned nature. Is there any doubt that the action taken by the Israeli air force yesterday was of a large-scale and carefully planned nature by the selection of targets, by the scale of the attack, and the time of the attack? Is there any doubt about the facts of the situation? Is the Council in a position to determine whether an attack has occurred or not? Can we be told today, as we were told last April, that because there are no United Nations observers in the area it is not possible to know who started the action? The fact of the matter is that Israel itself has admitted that it sent its aeroplanes against the town of Salt and bombarded it for several hours, causing great damage and loss of life.

136. Therefore, there is no doubt about the facts of the situation. There is no doubt that this was a carefully planned military action on a large scale.

137. In addition, the resolution of 24 March 1968 deplored all violent incidents and violations of the cease-fire and declared that such actions of military reprisal—and I believe that the representative of Israel this afternoon did not conceal the fact that this was an act of military reprisal because of alleged infiltration from Jordanian territory into Israel—and other grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated, and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps, as envisaged in the Charter, to ensure against the repetition of such acts.

138. Therefore, it seems to me that the aggressive acts undertaken by Israel yesterday fall entirely within the scope of the resolution of 24 March 1968, and since the Security Council considered more than four months ago that such acts of military reprisal could be tolerated and that it would have to consider further and more effective steps against the repetition of such acts, the Council is now placed in a situation where it has to take responsibility and act in accordance with its past decisions. Because if the Security Council fails today to honour what amounts to a warning by it, if it fails today to honour its undertaking made, last March, then that will be the surest way to encourage the aggressor to continue its acts of aggression with all the incalculable consequences for peace and security in the area.

139. What I have said about yesterday's attack on Salt applies, of course, entirely to the attack on Irbid on 4 June 1968. So what is the Council to do? Should it satisfy itself with another censure of condemnation? Should it satisfy itself with merely an expression of sorrow at the loss of life and property? Should it merely content itself with a reaffirmation of its past resolutions? We have seen how this inaction on the part of the United Nations has encouraged Israel to continue its acts of violation. Let me give the Council a few examples.

140. A few days after the adoption of the resolution of 24 March 1968, Israel attacked Jordan on 29 March with the result that a meeting of the Security Council took place. On 8 April, Israeli troops crossed into Jordan in the Dead Sea area. On 12 May they attacked Lebanese villages. On 4 June they attacked Irbid in Jordan. On 8 July they bombarded the city of Suez with considerable loss of life.

141. At the same time they continued their policy of expulsion of Arab civilians from the occupied territories: from the Syrian heights, from Gaza. The obliteration of whole villages continued—the bulldozing of homes, the expropriation of properties. Last but not least, their refusal to co-operate with the Secretary-General in having a special representative of the United Nations sent to the area in order to see for himself the situation of the civilian population, in accordance with past resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

142. In Jerusalem their violation of the two resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council resolution continues. The expropriation of property and the expulsion of Arab civilians in the Holy City continues. We remember only too well their utter disregard of the resolutions adopted by this Council regarding the holding of a military parade in Jerusalem and we remember too, their efforts to undermine and ultimately nullify any possibility of success of the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

143. To this very day, they have not come out to say clearly, unequivocally and unambiguously that they accept the resolution of the Security Council adopted on 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)]. Undoubtedly, Israel was encouraged to maintain this attitude of intransigence by the knowledge that the Security Council would remain powerless in the face of its repeated aggressions and repeated violations of the Council's resolutions.

144. Now, the serious and ominous implications of this attitude are not confined to the Middle East, but they have the most adverse and serious repercussions elsewhere in the world. I have before me the latest issue of *The Economist*, dated 3 August, and there is an item by its South African correspondent which reads as follows:

"What is even more disturbing is that as South Africa becomes more closely involved in the fighting in Rhodesia, the danger will increase of a counter-strike against the guerrilla bases in Zambia and even Tanzania. The mood in Pretoria has lost some of the long-headed caution of Dr. Verwoerd's day: Mr. Vorster is more a man of blunt power. So the prospect is now quite openly discussed. Three months ago Mr. Botha"—who is the

Defence Minister—"declared that South Africa regarded assistance given to the guerrillas as an act of provocation—"provocation can lead to hard retaliation in the interest of self-respect and peace'."

Almost the same words are being used by Mr. Tekoah this afternoon. "Significantly"—and this is important—"he drew the analogy of Israel's raids against El-Fatah's bases across the Jordan." Then he goes on to report that South Africa was deeply impressed by the Israeli example and that "the feeling is growing that the forces of the white south could deliver a quick knock-out blow against the guerrilla camps—an air raid perhaps—and get away with it. No doubt a lot of dust would be kicked up at the United Nations, but would anybody actually do anything about it?"

145. This is what was written by the special correspondent of *The Economist* in South Africa.

146. I have quoted this to show the ominous implications towards peace and to the movements of national liberation all over the world if that example of Israel, with which the racist Government of South Africa was greatly impressed, should continue unpunished and unchecked. Can the United Nations afford to accept the theory of the right of any State to take the law into its own hands and attack at will other States for alleged provocations? What kind of international order would there be if that theory and concept were accepted and if any State, regardless of the provocation, were given the right to take the law into its own hands and attack its neighbours?

147. Therefore, the Security Council is now faced with a grave responsibility. The time has come for it to take the effective steps to which it referred in its resolution of 24 March [248 (1968)]. Without taking such effective steps as are envisaged in the Charter, then we shall be giving encouragement and licence to Israel and also to its imitators in the South African continent and elsewhere.

148. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): We are well aware that an atmosphere of disillusionment reigns over our meeting today which is being held to consider the steps that should be taken to put an end to the repeated aggressions of which Jordan is periodically the victim.

149. I say that there is a certain feeling of disillusionment because it is somewhat difficult, in all honesty, to believe that a solution can really be found until the Security Council decides to fulfil its mission in accordance with the principles of the Charter relating to the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition by force, or, quite simply, in accordance with the principles of international law.

150. No one here is unaware of what is at stake in our debates and what interests are involved. On the one hand, we have an aggressive power firmly supported at all levels by those whose interests might be endangered if peace, which means first and foremost justice, were effectively restored to the Middle East. On the other hand we have a Palestinian nation which has been cruelly torn and scattered for more than twenty years and which is no longer willing to wait indefinitely for a peace that is constantly eluding it.

151. With these two opposing forces—an imperialism that has resolutely given free rein to the aggressive forces in the

Middle East and a people determined to recover its rights—there is not and cannot be peace in that region so long as the Council is not convinced of the need to put into effect the fundamental principles of law embodied in the Charter.

152. Whether in the case of the Middle East, or Rhodesia, or South West Africa, only a firm determination on the part of the Security Council to ensure the implementation of its own decisions can bring to an end repeated aggressions by those well versed in the use of force, thereby sparing us the need to meet regularly to try to find solutions to this still unsolved problem. The first step towards a solution worthy of the name lies in the application of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the general principles of law.

153. For several months now we have been drawing the Council's attention to Israel's probable intentions with regard to the territories east of the Jordan. We have pointed out that, in view of the international situation and the active complicity which Israel enjoys, it is to be feared that Israel might show that it has further designs on other territories besides those taken during the *blitzkrieg* of 5 June.

154. Following a traditional pattern, certain friendly Powers are obviously more concerned with restoring peace in the Middle East, on the basis, of course, of a realistic point of view which would leave Israel in possession of the greater part of its conquests, than with seeing the Council effectively fulfil the mission for which it was created. These Powers have just expressed the point of view that a solution must be worked out for the Middle Eastern problem which could satisfy all the interests involved. The Members of the United Nations and the Organization itself cannot be guided by this attitude which is based on a permanent compromise. If the Organization had been created in order to find political solutions based on the application of this kind of realism to the great problems of the moment, there would have been no need to create the United Nations; indeed, it would have been enough to evolve from the Congress of Vienna to the Congress of Berlin, to quote only classical instances.

155. The United Nations was created in response to other needs, and in particular to that of protecting nations against the greed of the strongest and most aggressive. The Organization owes it to itself to apply that principle again and to avoid such regrettable confusion as arises when, following an all too frequent procedure, the complaints of the victim and the shouts of the aggressor are merged in a single agenda.

156. And what an aggressor! The latest of the great deeds of Israel, whose inclination for beauty and reconstruction has been much praised, has been—as the whole world has seen—the systematic destruction of the only region of the unoccupied part of Jordan which still serves as the source of food for the population of that area. Everything has been burned and, as the representative of Jordan has pointed out, the wheat fields in particular, by intensive aerial bombing which, we are cynically told, was supposedly a retort to the barrage fire from the Jordanian sector. But this explanation, like other explanations and justifications, does not surprise us in any way. It goes

without saying that Israel could not seriously worry about the possibility that Jordan might commit acts of aggression against it. Time and time again, Israel has boasted that its own armed forces are by themselves a match for all Arab forces combined. Yesterday's attack again really reflects the need Israel feels to force Jordan to submit to its *diktat*. But no real prospect of a solution can be found in such a *diktat*, for colonial expansionism is pitting itself against the determination of a whole people to resist the administrative and totalitarian military occupation which Israel is in fact forcing upon it.

157. The struggle can only grow because nations will not submit to the situation imposed upon them. That does not mean that no solution which could lead to peace can be envisaged. It means that we shall have to take into account first the determination of certain Powers to maintain their influence on and domination in the Middle East at all costs, secondly, Israel's warlike claims and its ever-growing hunger for territorial gains, and lastly, the intensification of the Palestinian people's struggle to recover its sovereign rights, a struggle which cannot cease until all its objectives have been achieved.

158. The Security Council should have played and still can play its vital role under the Charter. The Council should allow the decisions taken at an earlier date—decisions which have no chance of being implemented under the pressure of military occupation and even less under the threat of famine and destruction—to be applied effectively. Were the Council to refrain from adopting such a decision and fail to carry out its normal responsibilities in this field, it would not make any contribution towards a final solution of the Palestine problem, and would merely intensify further and make more inevitable the struggle of the Palestinians themselves to recover the national dignity of which they have been deprived.

159. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, before passing on to the substance of the matter, I should like to take this opportunity to offer you a cordial welcome here in the Security Council both as President of the Council and as the distinguished representative of Brazil, a capacity in which you are both our new, and at the same time our former colleague. It gives us great pleasure to have this opportunity to collaborate with you in the United Nations where you are well known for your previous activity as a distinguished diplomat whose wisdom has been enriched by long experience in international affairs, and who has brilliantly displayed his talents in serious diplomatic posts and at several international conferences, including sessions of the General Assembly, and also during discussions on matters connected with disarmament problems. We are certain that you will make full use of this experience in the responsible and honourable office of President of the Security Council, during the consideration of matters which come before the Council for consideration and decision.

160. I can only express regret that your Presidency begins with such and unfortunate act of aggression.

161. We should also like to welcome to the Security Council the new representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Ball, and to express the hope that his

broad acquaintance with international problems and the recent impressions he has gained from trips to various countries, including countries in the Middle East, will prove extremely useful in the work of the Security Council.

162. We, for our part, express our readiness to co-operate both with the representative of Brazil and with the representative of the United States in the task of maintaining international peace and security in general—the task which is assigned to the Security Council under the United Nations Charter—and particularly in liquidating the consequences of Israel's aggression in the Middle East.

163. It also gives us great satisfaction to welcome our compatriot, Mr. Kutakov, in his new post as Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations. We of the Soviet delegation, and many of the delegations here in the United Nations know him through his work. We are certain that now that he holds this responsible office in the international Organization, he will perform his duties with his characteristic sense of responsibility and fidelity to the lofty ideals of peace and the principles of the United Nations Charter. We are profoundly convinced that his broad knowledge and informed view of international problems, together with his previous experience of work in the United Nations, will enable him to be a worthy deputy and assistant to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

164. The Security Council has been convened today to discuss the question of the new aggressive acts committed by Israel in violation of the Security Council resolution calling for a cease-fire in the Middle East and despite the repeated and solemn warnings by the Council that such acts are resolutely condemned by the Council and that, if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to take measures in accordance with the Charter to put an end to them.

165. In the statement by the representative of Jordan, we have heard a very detailed description of the nature of this latest act of aggression committed by Israel against Jordan. We have also heard the Israel representative's speech of justification. What can be more repugnant than a murderer trying to justify his murder and looking for ways to explain it?

166. We have heard the detailed speech by the representative of Iraq, who exposed the well-known techniques and methods of the official representative of Israel—methods which have already driven the Security Council to distraction. What more is there to say? The representative of Israel has given the names of a few Israel casualties. But if the representative of Jordan were also to begin listing the killed and wounded, the Security Council would have to double the length of our meeting merely to hear the list of these victims, with their names and surnames. According to the approximate figures for June alone, the Israel aggressors killed 59 Arabs and wounded over 120. Now, during this present aggressive action, there have been more than 30 killed and more than 80 wounded. These are the figures which reveal the actual nature of this new, inhuman act of the Israel aggressors.

167. The representative of Israel mentioned that a bulldozer was blown up by a mine. But that bulldozer was

working in a border area which had been seized by Israel forces on foreign territory. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the Israel bulldozer was blown up by mines? Those mines were, or could have been, there in the border area long before 5 June last year—that is, before the coming of the foreign invaders. I could cite hundreds, thousands of cases in which, in parts of my country's territory occupied by the invader, the occupier, the aggressor twenty-five years ago, mines are exploding to this day, bulldozers are being blown up and people are being blown up by German fascist mines which have been lying in the ground for more than a quarter of a century. The official representative of Israel, by citing this accidental fact, hopes to convince the Security Council and wishes to blame it on the Arabs. These are cheap tactics, unconvincing arguments. They only go to prove that the Israel aggressor has no arguments to justify and defend his aggression and his aggressive policy.

168. Everybody, and especially the members of the Security Council, will remember very well that only a few months ago, in March of this year, the Security Council was discussing a similar serious situation created by an Israel attack on Jordan, an attack which the aggressor carried out with large-scale land and air forces.

169. In its resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968 the Security Council severely condemned Israel's aggressive actions. These actions were described by the Council as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It was also stated that "actions of military reprisal . . . cannot be tolerated". In the same resolution of the Security Council it was stated in particular that "the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts".

170. Today the Council is confronted by the new fact, that Israel has repeated its aggressive actions against Jordan, by the fact that the Tel Aviv authorities have outrageously ignored the above-mentioned decision of the Security Council. Moreover, Israel officials and the representatives of Israel here are advancing the monstrous theory that the population of the occupied territory has but one right: to obey the occupier, kneel down before him and kiss his bloodstained boot. Who originated this theory? Hitler and his closest associates. Can Israel have sunk so low as to propound a Hitlerite theory, denying the population of occupied territories the right to be honourable patriots of their native countries and to fight for freedom? It is now well known how Hitler met his end. Just a few days ago the press of the entire world recalled that Hitler put an end to his life—and his theory—cyanide. The same fate awaits any aggressor in our time. The peoples of the world have learned to prize their honour and are worthy of fighting for their freedom and independence.

171. And this kind of aggressive theory will not help any aggressor anywhere, whether in the Far East or in the Middle East.

172. The Israel representative's attempts to find pretexts and justifications for the aggression are groundless and cannot be considered. We know from history that the aggressor always tries to invent pretexts for his aggressive actions. It is clear to the entire world that Israel's continued

occupation of Arab territories seized as a result of the treacherous aggression in June last year constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law and represents a threat to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab countries. The aggressor continues to hold the occupied territory of neighbouring Arab countries and to terrorize the population in the occupied areas; he is trying to enslave it and crush its will to resist. But these are vain hopes. Nobody can deprive the Arab population of its lawful right to resist the invader and to fight for its freedom.

173. The letters from the distinguished representative of Jordan, submitted to the Security Council both in July and in August, present factual information on the Israel militarists' activities. They contain information on the intensive rocket bombardment of towns and inhabited localities in Jordan by Israel armed forces. Not even the representatives of Israel deny these new acts of aggression by the Israel extremists.

174. Judging by today's reports in the United States press, they are cynically bragging and boasting about these acts of aggression. In essence Israel's new aggression represents a continuation of Tel Aviv's aggressive policy which is designed, by the arrogant use of military power and in violation of all norms of international law, to further the achievement of Israel's imperialistic aims in the Middle East, intimidate the neighbouring Arab countries by military blackmail, and force them to accept the results of Israel's military aggression.

175. The acts of the Israel extremists demonstrate that Tel Aviv is not taking the Security Council's warnings seriously and is counting on impunity and even on the patronage of certain major Western Powers, and is continuing its impudent defiance of the authority of the United Nations and the will of the overwhelming majority of States.

176. To this moment Israel continues to prevent a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East and is opposing by every possible means the implementation of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November last year [242 (1967)].

177. The new acts of aggression against Jordan come precisely at the time when the United Nations, through the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, is entering a new round of consultations for the peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East. This sort of action by Israel can only be considered a deliberate and premeditated attempt to undermine the success of Ambassador Jarring's mission.

178. We cannot fail to note that this new act of aggression was perpetrated only a few days after a visit by high-level representatives of the United States to the Middle East. Everybody may legitimately ask: what does this mean? Is it the result of encouragement, or a manifest display of disregard? This is a perfectly legitimate question. It will occur to everybody who is following the development of the situation in the Middle East attentively and who is sincerely trying to contribute to the success of Ambassador Jarring's mission.



179. The peace-loving States are endeavouring to assist the United Nations, the Secretary-General, and his Special Representative in the Middle East, Mr. Jarring, in their noble efforts to achieve a political settlement on a peaceful basis.

180. The Arab States for their part, as we all know very well, are also taking constructive steps to create a more favourable situation for the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

181. Under these circumstances, no one can doubt that Israel's new provocations against Jordan have a specific political purpose: to undermine the efforts being made by the United Nations in the interests of a political settlement in the Middle East and to continue the policy of sabotaging the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Such action by Tel Aviv cannot be tolerated.

182. The Security Council must resist this policy of aggression with a firm determination and resolve to put an end to the military provocations of the Israel extremists and to achieve a political settlement in accordance with the Council's resolution of 22 November.

183. The Soviet delegation most strongly urges the Security Council to condemn Israel for its criminal acts of aggression against the Arab States and, in conformity with the Charter, to take such steps for stopping aggression and punishing the aggressor as would discourage the arrogant soldiers from Tel Aviv from wanting to continue their military provocations.

184. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that it is determined, together with other peace-loving States, to strive for the cessation of Israel's aggression, the liquidation of all its consequences, the return to their lawful owners of the territories seized from the Arab States as a result of the 1967 aggression, and the implementation of the indispensable political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in that area.

185. The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the attempts by Israel and the forces supporting it to consolidate the results of the June aggression against the Arab States are unquestionably doomed to failure.

186. Mr. BALL (United States of America): I wish to thank those representatives who have spoken here this afternoon for the gracious and generous words of welcome that they have addressed to me.

187. While it is true that I am present here today as a very new member, the argument we have been listening to is, unhappily, anything but new. It is merely one more chapter in a lamentable chronicle. Once again this Council has been called into session to consider complaints of violations of the cease-fire between Jordan and Israel, which have led to further loss of life and destruction of homes and other property. We have heard the statements of the two sides describing the events of 4 August and the weeks of violence that preceded them.

188. I wish to make it quite clear that my Government does not condone the major military attack Israel made upon Jordan on Sunday. There must be no doubt whatever of United States opposition to this attack and to others that have preceded it; but, at the same time, neither does my Government condone those acts of terrorism and sabotage that have been launched with increasing frequency from Jordan during the past days and weeks. Those acts should not be judged as isolated events; quite clearly they are incidents in a concerted effort that cannot help but have a cumulative impact. They clearly violate the cease-fire resolutions of this Council, kill not only military personnel but civilians, and free the tension, fear and hatred that frustrate the search for a peaceful settlement of this problem.

189. Once again the Council finds itself confronted not with facts that clearly define the issue but with charges and counter-charges, obscurity and confusion. To fulfil our role with the assurance and objectivity expected of us is quite impossible. And this brings home again the need for some mechanism that will make it possible for the Council to act in a truly informed manner when distasteful events of this kind occur.

190. It is timely, therefore, for the parties once again to reconsider the positions they have taken in the past and to agree to the presence of United Nations observers in the area where violence is continuing to occur with such regularity. The presence of such observers would prejudice the rights of neither side. On the contrary, it could serve as a deterrent to further incidents, save lives, assure reliable information as to what actually occurred and, by reducing tensions, help create the conditions in which peace may at long last be realized.

191. Within the last few weeks I have paid a brief visit to the Middle East and have gained a deep impression as to the hopes and desires of the people throughout the whole area. All that I saw and heard persuaded me that the people of the Middle East, no matter whether in Israel or in the Arab nations that I visited, are weary of conflict. They have known the awful destructiveness of war and, affected as they clearly are by history and passion, are none the less groping for an honourable and peaceful solution at the end of the road.

192. That solution will not be found through terror or killing or brutal border incidents or through violent reprisals, but through the incidence, the instruments and the processes of accommodation and agreement. These instruments and processes are readily at hand, for this is one of the problems which in my judgement the United Nations is best equipped to resolve. Not only this Council but the people of the area are fortunate in having available to them the services of Ambassador Jarring who is striving wisely and patiently, with sensitivity and determination, to find those areas of agreement which are the key to a peaceful settlement, the kind of settlement that can alone offer to the people of the Middle East a chance to fulfil the genius that is in them, through the resources that are their birthright.

193. Regardless of any precise adjudication of relative guilt or innocence in this particular tragic situation, the



most useful thing for us to do is to exhort the parties once more to lay aside their arms and to abide by the terms of the cease-fire resolution both in letter and in spirit.

194. How many more incidents must occur, how many more lives must be lost, how many more families must look forward to a bleak and tragic future before this hard but simple lesson is learned? How many no one can say today but, in a situation as complex as this, the best we can do is to urge and to hope.

195. Just a moment ago the representative of the Soviet Union added his contribution of obfuscation to the discussion—this discussion of a tragic situation that is already clouded in dust and dissension. By an extraordinary logic which treats fantasy as fact he accuses my country of having encouraged the violence we are considering here and, in an extraordinary flight of imagination, he even suggests some causal connexion between my brief visit to the area and the acts in question.

196. I do not believe that I need to take much notice of this statement, which is so obviously false. I am confident that the other Governments represented here today will take no notice of it. Knowing the facts they could not do otherwise.

197. It is late in the afternoon and we are all anxious to get on with the serious discussion of the sad problem before us. I hope we will have no more attempts, by the making of irresponsible charges, to deflect us from our solemn business here today.

198. Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom): As you have pointed out, Mr. President, we have both a new President and various new colleagues in our work on this Council. I was very glad to hear you extend a welcome to them, speaking as President and on behalf of all members of the Council. I believe that this used to be the old practice and all representatives then extended whatever friendly and flattering sentiments they wished privately, rather than publicly. Perhaps this will be our practice in the future. But, as other members have spoken words of welcome, I would not like to remain silent and would like to say how very glad we are to welcome you, Sir, both as the representative of Brazil and as our new President. It can be a daunting task to assume the Presidency after only a few weeks in New York, but with your great experience, both in the highest posts in your own country and of the United Nations, you are particularly well equipped to guide us. We shall all benefit from your experience, your wisdom and your broad objectivity.

199. Secondly, I am very glad to see as a neighbour Ambassador Ball of the United States. He has had a distinguished and varied career. We have all admired in his book his historical sense, his powers of analysis and his vision. The Council is fortunate indeed to have such a powerful new representative well able to speak for his great country, and we are fortunate to have such a stimulating new colleague.

200. Thirdly, I have already paid tribute in another forum to our new Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Kutakov, but I would like to say how much we welcome him here and to wish him a very successful and happy period in office.

201. The Council has not held a meeting on Middle Eastern problems for several months, but we have all been very conscious of the extent of the distress and suffering in the area, and of the violence which has continued. Feelings are running very high, feelings which we understand only too well. The Council did not discuss the attack on Irbid on 4 June, nor the circumstances which preceded it. Now we have these latest grave developments reported to us in the letters from the Jordanian and Israeli representatives.

202. My delegation has always made it clear that those who break the United Nations cease-fire forfeit international sympathy and support. We have repeatedly stressed that all acts of violence are to be deplored wherever they occur and in whatever circumstances. We now deplore this serious and deliberate new attack, just as we deplore the acts of violence which preceded it. As many members of the Council have said, violence solves nothing; it merely breeds more violence. Small-scale violence grows into large scale violence; the vicious circle escalates. If we are to break out of this vicious circle my delegation remains convinced that the only solution is an unrelenting search for a settlement which can be generally accepted and which will endure. We believe that the resolution of 22 November [242 (1967)] and Ambassador Jarring's mission still offer the basis and the best hope for such a settlement. The continued anguish, hatred and violence make it more necessary than ever that Ambassador Jarring should be given full support. Further resorts to violence and, even more, escalation of violence such as the latest reports indicate, do the opposite. We must make it plain not only that we deplore violence, but also that those who resort to it are harming their own causes and forfeiting sympathy which could strengthen and help them in the months ahead. Ambassador Jarring has shown great patience, tact and skill. I think there was a general feeling during the summer that the atmosphere showed some improvement. There is reason to believe that he may be about to embark on further talks and we must all hope for progress on which he can build.

203. It is natural to want immediate solutions to blows that sometimes seem unbearable. I hope, however, that we will not allow ourselves to be diverted from a positive and constructive course—even if this cannot bring immediate results—by those blows and anguish, however deeply we may feel them, and however much we may sympathize with those affected. We all agreed on the lines of a settlement in the resolution of 22 November. Our efforts must be directed at breaking this terrible vicious circle, and advancing, slowly perhaps but eventually, to a settlement of the present lamentable state of affairs which can be accepted by all and will endure.

204. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Jordan has signified his wish to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

205. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I realize that the hour is late.

206. Most of the points raised by Mr. Tekoah are not new; we have heard them on previous occasions, raised by the same representative. I therefore need not take much of the Council's time to refute every single point raised. I had occasion to state my answer to every question raised in the

past, and I simply would like to confine my reply to some of these points we have heard this afternoon.

207. No matter how we look at it, no one can be blind to the reality of the situation; and no matter how much Mr. Tekoah attempts to twist facts, facts are stubborn things they are clear for everyone to see. He cited many incidents—a list of incidents. He spent fifteen minutes or more speaking about incidents, although his very military authorities in Tel Aviv made things simpler for him and the Security Council. They issued a statement, which can be found in *The New York Times* of today. Reference was made to it very clearly; it is a very long article, and I shall quote only one part. Mr. Terrence Smith, writing from Jerusalem, said—to support his statement:

“...the Army press office distributed a detailed eight-page account of 98 sabotage and shooting incidents. We heard them this afternoon.

“It says it occurred along the Jordanian border.

“The list includes mining and shooting incidents in which the Israeli army says 44 Jordanian saboteurs were slain, while three Israelis were killed and 30 wounded.”

Then the statement continued:

“It is the sort of list Israel has prepared in advance of each of her major reprisal raids against the Arabs.”

208. According to their own admission or confession, they said they lost three, they killed forty-four. What was behind this reprisal of yesterday? If it is the intention to twist facts and to cite numbers and figures, these are the numbers, taken from their military authorities in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem.

209. In his statement this afternoon, Mr. Tekoah said—and I am quoting from his speech—“the cease-fire cannot be a screen for Arab aggression”. I ask the Council this question: Is the cease-fire intended to be a screen for continued Israeli expulsion of the inhabitants of the occupied areas? Did you intend by your resolution to make it a screen for continued changes in the City of Jerusalem, in violation of your resolution adopted last May by thirteen votes to none with two abstentions? Was it intended to be a screen for the continued acts of genocide in the Gaza Strip? Was it intended to be a screen for the continued arbitrary arrests in the west bank of Jordan occupied by Israel? And, above all, was your cease-fire resolution intended to freeze the situation and keep the Israelis there occupying Jordanian territories, Syrian territories, United Arab Republic territories and the Gaza Strip? I do not think that was your resolution.

210. He then went on to say: “Jordan became the principal base for continued Arab aggression against Israel”. Is it not Jordan which is now standing on the other side of the bridge, receiving the expellees every single day? Is not Jordan the country which has half a million expellees from the west bank and Gaza Strip and Sinai? Is it not Jordan now the small Member which is carrying the burden of feeding and helping and accommodating half a million expellees from the occupied areas?

211. Those people do go back—we have no control over them—to get killed, maybe, in their own homeland. They do go there, I admit, but we have no control over their movements. We are not there to defend the Israel aggression. The answer to their aggression is to get out of the west bank and then complain about possible *fedayeen* or resistance. But as long as they are there, there is only one single answer to occupation: resistance. It is not something created by the half million expellees who go back to resist: it is the mission of every single individual suffering from occupation. So it is not for Mr. Tekoah to speak about aggression while the Israelis are living and staying in and occupying almost half of Jordan. He is not coming here with clean hands when he speaks and preaches about values, because he is committing aggression; every single second he is continuing his aggression. I should hope Mr. Tekoah was not expecting the people expelled by him and his authorities to send a thank-you note to Mr. Dayan for expelling them, or to send a letter of appreciation for the crime committed by Mr. Dayan and other members of the Israeli authorities. Mr. Tekoah stated—to quote his exact words: “It is regrettable that the Jordanian Government should use inhabited centres such as Irbid as locations for their artillery positions.” Those are the exact words of Mr. Tekoah this afternoon.

212. I should like to say that this is a misrepresentation of fact; it has no foundation. Mr. Tekoah does not have to take my word for it; the big Powers around this table sent their military attachés—and they all have a complete report—immediately after the attack on Irbid. They went there on a fact-finding mission; they examined the city of Irbid; they went around the city of Irbid; they visited every single area which was subjected to Israeli attack on 4 June; and they came up with the answer; and I wish the big Powers who sent their military attachés would come openly and speak the truth about it, because the military attachés reported exactly what happened; they spoke about whether or not there was any military position there, or artillery in Irbid. We hope, maybe against hope, that some of the Powers that sent their military attachés to Irbid would come here and state in the Council whether or not we had military positions in the city of Irbid.

213. Then Mr. Tekoah proceeded, after citing many colourful incidents, to refer to my statement to *Al-Muharrer*. He said that on 26 July it stated: “Jordan’s representative to the United Nations, Ambassador El-Farra declared in an interview with the Lebanese daily *Al-Muharrer*”—and then he gave a quotation. I would say that this quotation was taken out of context; and in order to set the record straight I should like to refer to the complete text of my statement to *Al-Muharrer*. All that *Al-Muharrer* had was mine; I said it. But what Mr. Tekoah said is his own misrepresentation and his own fabrication. I have *Al-Muharrer* right here, and this is the statement:

“*Al-Muharrer*, 26 July 1968, Beirut, Lebanon.

“Jordan’s Representative Interviewed by *Al-Muharrer*.

“Amman—*Al-Muharrer*’s correspondent Sudki Al-Dhaher.

“Jordan’s Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Dr. Muhammad El-Farra, stated in answer to

questions put to him by *Al-Muharrer*, that the success or failure of Jarring's mission is directly related with the acceptance or rejection by Israel of the Security Council resolution which he is seeking to implement. It is common knowledge that Israel has refused to accept and implement the resolution in question, thus leaving no other alternative to moving her from her present position except by resort to force."

I am referring to the peaceful implementation of the resolution which we accepted and which you wanted to implement. The article on my interview continues:

"As regards optimism pertaining to a solution of the crisis, he stated"—my statement—"I am convinced that Israel is bent upon expansion; thus what peace she calls for is the peace of surrender to secure further gains."

This can be proved by its behaviour right here. They have not accepted the resolution, they have not announced their desire to implement the resolution without condition—which we did. There has been no change in the Israeli position.

"The utterances of Israeli spokesmen and their posing in the guise of moderates and extremists merely reflect the devious avenues they employ towards the ultimate and one goal, that is rejection of the Security Council resolution as part of their over-all attempts to subjugate and humiliate the Arab nation."

Then comes the quotation used by Mr. Tekoah out of context:

"As regards prevailing acts of resistance, El-Farra commented: 'Under present circumstances,'—the circumstances of refusing to accept and implement the United Nations Security Council resolution—"I am entirely convinced that unified and co-ordinated resistance are the only means available to keep the flames of our righteous cause aglow until such time as the Arab nation is capable of mobilizing its resources and carrying out its mission of liberating the usurped land from the hands of the aggressors."

214. The emphasis here is on peace. We want peace. We want implementation of your unanimous resolution. We want this to be the way to stability in the area. But if the Israelis are going to reject your resolution, continue their occupation, continue committing crimes every day, then of course resistance is the solution. It is the only remaining solution.

215. Mr. Tekoah referred to the cease-fire. He exhorted Jordan to forgo war, to abide by the cease-fire, to take together the road towards peace. But the price of peace is justice and the remedy that will bring peace is your resolution. I am sure that expulsion, intimidation, threats and bombing are not the road to peace, nor were they supported or endorsed by the cease-fire resolution.

216. These are the points I wanted to answer at this late hour of your deliberations. I may have to clarify other points, if need be. Meanwhile, I hope that before concluding you will permit me to say a few words about the question of observers.

217. Whenever we come before the Council to present a situation fraught with danger, whenever we come with a clear-cut case, we find, on the one hand, that Israel is trying to distort and confuse the issue with countercharges, and, on the other hand, we find also some members raising the question of observers. I have said, and I say again, that there already is machinery in the area called the Mixed Armistice Commission. That machinery, according to the United Nations jurisprudence, is still there; it is still binding and should be effective. We cannot think in terms of observers in the cease-fire area while ignoring at the same time violations within the occupied areas. Observers should be along the whole Armistice Demarcation Line. That includes the Gaza Strip, the west bank, the Syria-Israel Armistice Demarcation Line. That is the place for the observers. It does not help to ignore the United Nations machinery in the area. We need observers in Jerusalem. Why do you not care to think about observers in Jerusalem? We know now, and everyone knows, that the Israelis are committing violations every single day in Jerusalem in defiance of the United Nations resolution. Why not have observers there? We are for observers, but their place is the place embodied in the Mixed Armistice Agreement.

218. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

219. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like, first of all, to express my appreciation to the representative of Jordan for his having clarified the statement which I quoted earlier in my speech that warfare by terror should continue "under the present circumstances". Indeed, it is the present circumstances that are of concern to the Security Council. A similar statement was made by the Jordanian representative in support of warfare by terror, as reported by the Egyptian Agency on 27 June in the Egyptian paper *Al Ahram*.

220. The representative of Jordan—a country that invaded Palestine in 1948 in defiance of the United Nations and illegally occupied the west bank of the Jordan for nineteen years without obtaining recognition of that occupation even from other Arab States—claims from time to time to speak on behalf of the inhabitants of the west bank. In fact, he speaks only on behalf of those who are ready to continue to sacrifice the Arab people on the altar of blind hatred and hostility.

221. What had been, and what should be now, is perhaps illustrated better by a declaration made by Sheikh Mohammed Ali Ja'abari, former Minister of Education of Jordan and now Mayor of Hebron on the west bank. On 7 April 1968, Sheikh Ja'abari, according to *The New York Times*, referring to the situation prior to last June 1967, said: "We have been kicked around like a football for twenty years and it must stop. That means peace with Israel." This is what the Arab people want. Why must the Arab Governments and their representatives here in this Council deny it to them?

222. In *The New York Times* of 2 June we read:

"The six-day war has brought about more co-operation between Arab and Jew than the eighteen preceding years of armistice agreements. This co-operation has two

channels: the link across the Jordan River and the daily experience of coexistence on the west bank."

223. Why must the gory nightmare of the past be glorified by the Arab representatives, the present distorted by them and the future sown with calamity?

224. Nothing could have illustrated more the travesty of law, the mockery of human rights, than the appearance before this Council in the name of law and justice by the representative of Iraq. His statement apparently presupposes that the world has forgotten the twenty-year war of aggression his country, together with other Arab States, has waged against Israel, that the world has already forgotten what happened only a year ago, when the Arab assault was mounted against Israel, when the cries for blood, Israeli blood, sounded from Radio Baghdad. His statement apparently presupposes that the world is unaware of or uninterested in the warfare that his Government is supporting and pursuing tenaciously and maliciously against Israel, contrary to the cease-fire decisions of the Security Council. Does he not represent a Government that actively organizes and stages terror operations from Jordanian territory, contrary to the Charter and the Security Council cease-fire, assigning special units of the Iraqi regular army to that deadly task, training and arming the raiders? How is it that the representative of Iraq evinces such concern for human rights and the rights of peoples? Is not his Government the one that detains its Jewish citizens in concentration camps, deprives them of their rights by Hitlerian legislation and exterminates Kurds in a war of genocide?

225. To the representative of Iraq we say: Before anyone can be expected to recognize your right to plead in the name of law, to speak of acts that might aggravate tension, abandon your aggressive war against Israel, stop warfare by terror. Before you express views on human rights anywhere, stop the constant violations of human rights within your own borders.

226. The Soviet representative, in a passionate espousal of Arab aggression, has tried to create not only new notions of right and justice but even new facts of geography. I have repeatedly suggested to the Soviet representative that he should beware of his Arab mentors. To them, of course, any point in any part of Israel is Arab territory, to be reconquered by aggression. However, the bulldozers are being mined on Israeli soil, Israeli villages shelled by Jordanian artillery and attacked by raiders from Jordan are in Israeli territory. The least the world expects from Governments members of the Security Council, and especially permanent members of the Security Council, is respect for facts.

227. Allow me also to end once and for all the Soviet representative's abuse of the memory of those millions annihilated by Hitler and the mockery of those who resisted the Nazis. At its plenary session in Brussels from 3 to 7 April, held with the participation of distinguished delegations from Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, the United States, Luxembourg, Israel, Italy, Norway and the Netherlands, the International Union of Resistance and Deportee Movements adopted the following resolution:

"There can be no comparison between, on the one hand, the spirit of resistance and, on the other, terrorist

acts and blind and hateful crimes intended to provoke insecurity and sow violence, despite the fact that every facility is publicly offered for sincere discussion, with both sides expressing their views, of the disputed issues. Thus, to try to liken the resistance against Nazism to a movement of elements inflamed by Arab leaders surrounded by former Nazi criminals who desire to continue the Hitlerite genocide is an insult deeply felt not only by the citizens of Israel who are bravely defending their right to life but also by all resistance-fighters who have remained true to themselves."<sup>1</sup>

228. I am certain the Soviet Government would not wish to continue to usurp the right of anti-Nazi fighters to speak on their own behalf.

229. Much of the conflict in the Middle East is due to blind adherence to extreme and unjust slogans. No less of a prisoner of dogmatic slogans is the Government of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, it still believes that simply by announcing it in Moscow the reactionary and undemocratic policies of Arab régimes can be turned into progressive ones and their aggression into just wars. The people of Eastern Europe do not believe these slogans. The people of the Soviet Union do not believe them. Why should the world? If the Soviet Government desires sincerely to contribute to peace in the Middle East, it must free itself from the shackles of these out-dated, reactionary slogans, assume an objective and fair attitude and recognize the right of all peoples in the area to freedom, sovereignty, security and peace.

230. What the peoples of Israel and the Arab States need is less acrimony, less demagogy and more constructive reasoning, on how to reach understanding, security and peace. There is one essential step that must be taken towards that end: faithful, scrupulous adherence to the cease-fire.

231. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Jordan, who has expressed a wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

232. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Just one single point. Mr. Tekoah once more attempted to distort the statement made to *Al-Muharrer*. This can be regarded only as a deliberate attempt to distort the real meaning behind it. The present circumstances are very clear and refer to very clear points in the statement.

233. Point number one: the continued defiance by the Israelis of the Security Council resolution by refusing it and its implementation.

234. Point number two:—and this is mentioned in the statement—the continued occupation of Arab territories and the continued policy of aggression.

235. Point number three: the continued Israeli policy of annexation.

236. Point number four: the continued Israeli policy of "peace of surrender to secure further gains".

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

237. Those are the four points in my statement. Under these circumstances and based on these considerations of Israeli policies, the only remaining alternative is the only legitimate alternative, which is resistance. The statement is there for everyone to read and analyse. I do not think it is open to Mr. Tekoah to read something into a thing which is clear on its face.

238. I must emphasize one point in conclusion: that no matter what the Israelis say here, one thing is very clear. No Israeli crimes, no Israeli Crime attack, no attack on the rural people of Irbid, no attack on the civilian rural population of Salt, no attack on those people will make them abandon their rights. You have to understand that. That is the crux of it. None of these things will make the people of these lands surrender their legitimate rights.

239. So it is not a question of scoring points. It is a question of Israel's presence violating the Charter, United Nations values and Security Council resolutions. The answer to all this is their withdrawal from Arab lands, clear and simple.

240. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Iraq in exercise of his right of reply.

241. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): I must apologize for taking the floor at this late hour, but I think that the members of the Council will understand that the representative of Israel has left me no alternative but to speak in order to answer his statement.

242. He spoke about constructive reasoning and then gave a very eloquent display of that constructive reasoning by launching a vicious personal attack against me and against my people. He brought entirely irrelevant issues into our discussion today, trying to confuse the very grave situation with which the Security Council is seized at present.

243. Let me say only that it is grotesque to try to equate the situation of the Jewish community in Iraq—all of whom are loyal citizens of my country and who live in an atmosphere of complete equality and tranquillity—to the repressive and wholesale expulsion of the inhabitants, the people, of Palestine, to the continuous terrorization of the inhabitants of the occupied areas.

244. What are the people of Palestine expected to do? Are they expected to sit calmly in their wretched refugee camps, seeing their country being transformed beyond recognition, seeing their homes taken away by alien immigrants, seeing their villages obliterated out of existence? What are they supposed to do when they hear day in and day out responsible leaders of Israel declaring that they will not relinquish the areas occupied last June? What are they supposed to do when thousands of their brethren are daily being expelled from Gaza and other areas of the west bank across the Jordan River? What are they supposed to do when their Holy Places are being desecrated in Jerusalem? What are they supposed to do when their properties are being expropriated and their houses demolished? What are they expected to do when their whole country has been taken over by an immigrant minority and they are not allowed to return to their own homes, in

contravention of the solemn guarantees given to them by the international community?

245. No, sir, no people can be expected to accept such a fate without resisting and the people of Palestine are no different from other peoples of the world. Therefore I reject entirely the statements of some of the representatives around this table who said that the activities of the freedom fighters of Palestine are violations of the cease-fire. They are nothing of the kind.

246. I think it is not only unjust and unfair to try to equate the individual acts for which no government is responsible with the carefully planned massive retaliatory raids undertaken by the armed forces of Israel. But let us not follow the representative of Israel in his flight of fancy and let us come down to facts.

247. The Security Council since June 1967, since it adopted the various cease-fire resolutions, has adopted six resolutions, all unanimously. First there was the resolution called the humanitarian resolution, adopted on 14 June 1967 [237 (1967)], which asked two things of Israel. It asked Israel to facilitate the return of those who left because of the hostilities in the area of war. It also asked Israel to treat the civilian population in the occupied areas in accordance with the Geneva Convention. We have been informed on reliable authority that out of more than 170,000 applications for return to their homes, only 14,000 people were allowed to go back in accordance with that resolution.

248. When the Secretary-General asked the Israel Government to agree that a special representative should go to the area to see for himself the situation and the conditions under which the civilian population lives, after procrastinating and delaying for a long time they finally came up with a reply that the Secretary-General rightly considered a rejection of this proposal, trying to tie in entirely irrelevant questions completely outside the scope of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, knowing full well that such conditions as they set for the implementation of these resolutions and for the acceptance of the proposals of the Secretary-General could not be accepted either by the Arab countries involved or by the Secretary-General himself.

249. So this is Israel's attitude toward the first resolution adopted by the Security Council since the end of hostilities in June 1967.

250. What was the second resolution? It is the famous resolution 242 (1967), adopted unanimously by the Security Council, providing the basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem in the area. Is it not strange, is it not revealing that in his long dissertation about peace he did not mention resolution 242 (1967) once? He did not once mention the mission of Ambassador Jarring. What does this reveal? Does this reveal genuine interest in peace, in accordance with the wishes of this Council? No. It reveals one thing and one thing only: Israel has no intention of carrying out the provisions of that resolution. It has done everything since the adoption of that resolution to see to it that the full implementation of that resolution becomes impossible, by creating new situations and by subverting

the activities of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

251. It also means that Israel, in accordance with the often expressed wishes of its leaders, does not intend to withdraw from the territories occupied during the conflict of June 1967. The withdrawal from these territories is the central provision of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. It must be clear that under that resolution no just and lasting settlement can be made without withdrawal of Israel's troops from the areas occupied during that conflict.

252. The third resolution—resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968—is the one to which I referred in my first statement. How did Israel abide by that resolution? I have given three examples of the response of Israel to the warning which was included in that resolution: the attack on Jordan in the Dead Sea area, the attack on Irbid, and finally the attack of yesterday.

253. What about resolutions 250 (1968) and 251 (1968) regarding the parade in Jerusalem? I do not have to say much, only that Israel completely disregarded these resolutions and did not even bother to answer regarding their implementation.

254. We come to the final resolution—resolution 252 (1968) on Jerusalem, in which the Security Council deplored the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolutions on Jerusalem. What was the response of Israel to that resolution? Again, complete disregard.

255. So, instead of trying to lead the members of the Council through irrelevancies and flights of fancy, let us discuss facts—the facts of Israel's position, of Israel's behaviour, vis-à-vis the unanimously adopted resolutions of this Council. Those are the facts with which the Council should concern itself, and on the basis of those facts the Council should determine what action it should take in regard to this latest aggressive act by the Israeli armed forces against Jordan.

256. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

257. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I do not intend to engage in polemics with the representative of Israel. I shall confine myself to a statement firmly rejecting the calumny and insinuations he is spreading here regarding the Soviet and Eastern European peoples.

258. As to the question of who is offending whom, it is precisely the Israel representative who, with his theory of unconditional obedience by the population in the occupied territories, is offending the sacred memory of millions of Soviet partisans, of the Polish, Czechoslovak, Hungarian and French *maquis* and of all those who have died for their countries' freedom and independence. The Israel aggressor's

theory is: unconditional obedience by the population of the occupied territories—go down on your knees before the aggressor and kiss his blood-stained boot. Such a theory will never be accepted by any self-respecting people, no matter how the Israel aggressors may try to popularize this theory and regardless of how or where or at which congresses in Brussels or elsewhere they may manage to impose their view.

259. Finally, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the representative of the Israel aggressors has already been called to order once in the Security Council, during the Presidency of the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon. Instead of discussing the issue, the substance of which is that Israel is accused of aggression, of new acts of aggression, he is trying to distract our attention by slandering other countries and peoples. He has already been called to order once. He has been seriously warned and reprimanded; but evidently he has understood nothing and learned nothing. If he continues the same practice in the future then, obviously, the Security Council will again be obliged to take steps to ensure that he does not interfere in the affairs of other States and peoples but answers the charges legitimately brought against him both by the representative of Jordan and by the representative of Iraq, and by almost all those who have spoken here. No one has expressed approval of the new Israel aggression. No one is trying to justify it.

260. Just one more comment. The representative of Israel has tried to distract the Council's attention by asserting that, once the disobedience of the population in the occupied territories has stopped, everything will be all right, and this—he says—is the only way of solving the problem. No, Mr. representative of Israel, that is not the main point. And do not try to divert the attention of the Security Council and the United Nations from the essence of the matter. The main point is that Israel must implement the resolution adopted by Security Council on 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] and must withdraw its troops from the occupied territories. That is the crux of the matter. Once you withdraw your troops from the occupied territories, everything will be in order and the matter will be settled. Once you agree to comply with all the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 22 November, the political settlement in the Middle East will be achieved. That is the main issue and that is the key to the solution of the problem.

261. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers on my list for today's meeting. May I be permitted to extend my warm thanks for the kind and generous words of the several speakers who welcomed me today as the representative of Brazil to the Security Council? I shall endeavour to live up to their words, to their confidence, and above all to their friendliness.

*The meeting rose at 7 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. Приводите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

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

---