

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1437th MEETING: 9 AUGUST 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1437)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
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)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 9 August 1968, at 10.30 a.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/1437)

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).

Adoption of the agenda

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)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions previously taken by the Council, I shall invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Syria and Saudi Arabia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El-Farra (Jordan) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Security Council table, and Mr. M. El Kony (United Arab Republic), Mr. A. Pachachi (Iraq), Mr. G. Tomeh (Syria) and Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, before expressing my delegation's views on the items on the agenda for today, allow me to perform the pleasant duty of congratulating you again most cordially, first on the honour devolving upon you as Permanent Representative of your great country, Br  zil, which is attached to my own country by strong bonds of friendship, and secondly, on your assumption of the difficult responsibilities of President of this Council for the month of August. Knowing and admiring as we do your brilliant personal gifts, we are certain that you will lead our deliberations to a successful outcome.

3. At the same time, I should like to pay tribute to Ambassador Bouattoura of Algeria, who presided over the Council during the past month of July with the talent and ability we all know, which were particularly apparent during his consultations with members of the Council on the establishment and composition of the Committee on Rhodesia.

4. I also wish to welcome here the new Permanent Representative of the United States, Mr. Ball, whose well-known and respected personality already assures us that he will make a valuable contribution to our common endeavours in the Council.

5. Lastly, we offer our best wishes to the new Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Kutakov, for success in the delicate tasks which have been entrusted to his well-known talents.

6. When on 22 November 1967 the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 242 (1967) which laid the foundations for a possible just and lasting solution of the acute problems of the Middle East, which in the brief space of less than two decades have led to three major military conflicts, my delegation welcomed this decision; it appeared to represent the soundest, and under present circumstances perhaps the only, hope for putting an end to an era of conflict in that region and for beginning a new one in which the States concerned could at last be certain of their mutual security and could devote their entire efforts and national resources to the constructive tasks of peace.

7. This marked the beginning of the grave and arduous task which was entrusted to the Secretary-General and is now being executed by his Special Representative, Mr. Jarring. We hardly need stress the magnitude of the mission which the Council entrusted to the patience, talent, dedication and devotion to peace of the Secretary-General, who in turn placed it in the hands of Mr. Jarring. In a region so recently convulsed by war the situation was inevitably tense and unstable. The first and indispensable condition for the successful accomplishment of this mission has been and continues to be the scrupulous observance of the cease-fire by all States involved in the conflict. The situation, by its very nature, has been and is precarious and temporary, but might at least permit the minimum favourable conditions for the development of the Secretary-General's and Mr. Jarring's activities in their persevering attempts at conciliation and their search for just solutions based on resolution 242 (1967).

8. My Government and delegation deeply regret that the cease-fire has been broken and violated so often. They strongly and sincerely deplore the numerous losses, particularly the loss of human lives, because these are totally irreparable. They regret the damage caused and the new sufferings added to the many which have for so long afflicted the population of this region. They also find this situation regrettable because each and every one of these violations creates new obstacles to the endeavours, difficult enough in themselves, on which we all set our highest hopes.

9. My delegation has only been a member of this Council for the last seven months. This is a very short time. Yet this period has been marked by a constant and disturbing series of breaches and violations of the cease-fire, particularly in the Israel-Jordanian sector.

10. As a result of this and because of the many meetings the Council has been obliged to hold since we have participated in its work, practically everything we might say has been said. I need only refer to my own statements on previous occasions. Nevertheless, we feel it is our duty to express once again our growing concern at the intensity and frequency of these violations and especially to demand, first and foremost, that the parties should strictly comply with the cease-fire order issued by this Council in its resolutions of 1967, which were agreed to and accepted by these parties themselves. This compliance, I repeat, is the minimum condition for the ultimate success of the mission of the Secretary-General and Mr. Jarring, and the authority of this Council requires that its orders be observed.

11. We are now confronted by new and grave violations of the cease-fire. After repeating our sincere and sympathetic regret for the loss of life and the damage caused by each of these acts of violence, I shall briefly express our views as they have already been set forth previously. Since they are only our preliminary reactions, I reserve my delegation's right to enlarge upon them at a later stage in the discussion.

12. First, it is our primary and constant concern that we should combine all our efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the region. We believe that under the present circumstances the only real possibilities for achieving this goal lie in the complete implementation of resolution

242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, the objectives and provisions of which we must all bear constantly in mind.

13. Secondly, scrupulous observance of the cease-fire order is an indispensable condition for the eventual success of the task entrusted to the Secretary-General and to Mr. Jarring.

14. Thirdly, it has often been said in this Council that violence only breeds violence and cannot therefore solve any problems. My delegation has not been, and is not now, prepared to condone acts of violence. With this consideration in mind, it has voted for the adoption of the Council's previous resolutions in similar cases when the cease-fire has been violated. Our views have not changed, nor is there any reason why they should change.

15. Fourthly, all efforts should be made to prevent the recurrence of each and every act of violence in violation of the cease-fire, regardless of its nature.

16. Fifthly, we know that, even if the States involved in the conflict strictly observe the cease-fire, the situation in the region will be temporary, and only temporary. No peace can be built on a foundation of the use, or the threat of the use, of force; and the acquisition of territory by these means must not and cannot be accepted.

17. I must add that, now as in the past, we deeply regret that in the area where the breaches of the cease-fire have been and still are most frequent, the United Nations is not present in any form. Its presence would offer a twofold advantage: first, it would help to prevent the recurrence of new acts of violence; secondly, it would afford the benefit of impartial information in all cases.

18. These are my delegation's preliminary reactions. I should be failing in my duty if, quite apart from any decision adopted by this Council, I did not add a fraternal appeal to the conflicting parties to make all possible efforts to avoid new violations of the cease-fire, thereby hastening the hour when peace—a just, true peace—may reign in the region.

19. Mr. LIU (China): First, Sir, let me on behalf of my delegation offer our warm welcome to you both as representative of your great country and as President of the Council. I should also like to take this opportunity to associate my delegation with the words of welcome you addressed to the new Permanent Representative of the United States on behalf of all members of the Council. I do not think these sentiments need further elaboration, for I know very well that you, Mr. President, would rather have the Council proceed with the business at hand as expeditiously as possible.

20. The substance of Jordan's complaint is not new in the history of the Middle East. With varying details, such a conflict has happened many times during the past twenty years. The present case involves the bombing by Israel aircraft of Jordanian territory around Salt City, only fifteen miles from the Jordanian capital of Amman. My delegation deplores the violence and wishes to express its sympathy for the civilian population which has suffered a heavy loss of life and property.

21. The Council has been told that the latest attack launched by Israel was in the nature of retaliatory action provoked by terrorist raids of varying seriousness. It is evident, however, that the action involving the deployment of heavy artillery and aircraft has assumed a magnitude uncalled for by the nature of the provocation.

22. On a number of occasions my delegation has in the Security Council voiced its strong disapproval of the doctrine of retaliation. We believe that no Government, even under extreme provocation, should take the law into its own hands. Such an exercise of force must be regarded as contrary to the spirit of the Charter and has in the past incurred the censure of the Security Council.

23. In saying this, we are not suggesting that other acts of violence and terrorism may in any way be justified. We do not, of course, underestimate the role played by frustrations and emotions. But it seems to us that such acts of violence can only bring suffering on the civilian population without achieving the desired objectives.

24. Obviously, the first order of business before the Council is to put a stop to violence and counter-violence which cannot but exacerbate a situation already fraught with dangerous possibilities. The cease-fire must be scrupulously maintained. Steps should be taken to prevent the recurrence of violence across the border where exchanges of fire seem to have become a daily routine.

25. At the meeting of the Security Council on 21 March of this year [*1403rd meeting*] my delegation urged that some form of United Nations presence, involving no more than the dispatch of a number of observers, should be established in the Israeli-Jordanian sector, as in the case of other sectors in the affected area. Since Security Council resolution 242 (1967) stresses the "inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war" and the eventual "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict", the United Nations presence should not have the effect of freezing a temporary situation or hardening the cease-fire lines. On the contrary, it seems to my delegation that the absence of such United Nations presence would make it difficult to enforce the cease-fire and to bring about a climate conducive to a peaceful settlement in conformity with the terms set forth in resolution 242 (1967). That resolution has been accepted by all parties as constituting a just and balanced basis for a peaceful settlement of the Middle Eastern situation. This calls for strict respect of the obligations that befall all the parties concerned. Ambassador Jarring, whose unflagging patience has earned widespread commendation, must be given the opportunity to carry his mission to a successful conclusion.

26. Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. President, may I first of all join our other colleagues around this table in welcoming you as the new Permanent Representative of Brazil and as President of the Council for the month of August. As previous speakers have pointed out, you have a wealth of experience accumulated over a number of years in high posts and in the service of your country in the United Nations and in other international forums. We are sure that under your wise and mature leadership the Security Council will effectively discharge the duties assigned to it under the Charter.

27. The office you occupy has always called for a high sense of justice and duty, tireless patience, wisdom and tact. Your predecessor, Ambassador Tewfik Bouattoura of Algeria, possesses these qualities in ample measure and displayed them to the utmost during his presidency of the Council last month.

28. I should also like to take this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to the new Permanent Representative of the United States. Ambassador George Ball is a well-known international personality, with vast and varied experience of international affairs, and I am entirely confident that his participation in our deliberations will greatly contribute to the Council's role in the discharge of its functions. My delegation looks forward to close co-operation with him in fulfilling our duties as members of this Council.

29. A similar welcome is extended to the new Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Kutakov, who is no stranger to us, and whose excellent qualities are well known. Mr. Kutakov has a difficult task to perform, but I am sure he can count upon the co-operation of all members of this Council.

30. Once again the Security Council has been called to consider the grave situation in West Asia. Many representatives have already expressed their views on the large-scale aerial operation undertaken by Israel against the Jordanian city of Salt. As the representative of Jordan told us earlier in the debate, this bombing operation has resulted in heavy loss of life and considerable damage to property. My delegation fully shares the anxiety and concern of members of the Council over this severe action by Israel.

31. The precarious nature of the cease-fire in the area is only too familiar to the members of the Council. In June last year the Council had to adopt unanimously four resolutions to bring about a cessation of hostilities. Since then we have met frequently specifically to consider serious breaches of those cease-fire resolutions. On several occasions the Council condemned those violations and called upon the parties to observe its resolutions strictly.

32. On 24 March this year, when it considered the Karameh incident, the Security Council condemned Israel's reprisal action in its resolution 248 (1968) and warned against the repetition of such acts in the future. That was done because it was the view of the members of this Council that cease-fire violations, irrespective of their causes and circumstances, not only jeopardize the peace of the area but also undermine the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in bringing about a peaceful settlement of the conflict under the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The Council cannot condone any violation of its resolutions on cease-fire. We must point out that the present incident is similar to the Karameh incident, which took place in March this year, and which was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March. Speaking on that occasion, my delegation said:

"Suffice it to say that the latest action of the Israel authorities is in utter defiance of resolution 236 (1967) of 12 June 1967, which specifically prohibited any forward military movement subsequent to the cease-fire. In the context of this clear prohibition, the Israel attack

on Jordanian territory today cannot be justified on any ground and must therefore be condemned as a grave violation of the cease-fire imposed by the Security Council." [1402nd meeting, para. 84.]

33. My delegation has had many occasions to state before, and would not hesitate to repeat, that there can be no peace in West Asia without the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied Arab territories. This is one of the fundamental principles embodied in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. This and other principles of that resolution were supported by all members of this Council, as well as by an overwhelming majority of Members States of the United Nations. That resolution has yet to be implemented. This is the major task to which the international community should pay particular attention, and towards which it must bend all its energies and efforts. The representatives of the United Arab Republic and Jordan have already indicated more than once the willingness of their Governments to implement in full the resolution of 22 November. The Council must expect Israel to come forward with a similar statement.

34. In the light of what I have stated above, my delegation believes that the Security Council should concentrate its attention on ensuring the cease-fire and on bringing about the full implementation of its resolution of 22 November 1967. The Council should therefore, first, condemn violations of the cease-fire in terms of its resolutions 236 (1967) and 248 (1968), particularly the aerial attack on Salt on 4 August. Secondly, it must demand a scrupulous observance of and respect for its cease-fire resolutions. Thirdly, the Council should insist that all parties in the area extend their full and active co-operation to the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in bringing about the full implementation of the resolution of 22 November. While these efforts continue, my delegation would urge the exercise of the greatest amount of restraint.

35. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to the patient and tireless efforts of Ambassador Jarring and would wish him speedy success in his mission.

36. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers on my list and, with the consent of the Security Council, I propose now to address the Council in my capacity as representative of BRAZIL.

37. First of all, I should like to thank the representatives of Paraguay, China and India for the kind and generous words of welcome they have addressed to me.

38. The Brazilian delegation wishes to state, very briefly, its position on the serious matter of which the Security Council is seized. We view the recent incidents with the utmost concern. Not only do they constitute clear and undisguised violations of the cease-fire, not only do they represent added disrespect for and utter disregard of the authority of the Security Council, but also they tend to confront us with renewed difficulties, with a new burst of animosity and hatred along the path to a permanent peace in the Middle East. If recent events appear serious at present, they presage even more ominous prospects for the future. This is an issue which compels us to think ahead and ponder the future.

39. Over and over again we have been called to convene here in these last fourteen months to hear charges and countercharges, accusations of aggression and pleas of innocence. Throughout this period of fourteen months a merciless and virtual state of war is being pursued with an appalling sacrifice of human lives and property, in flagrant disregard of the decisions of the Security Council and constant violations of the cease-fire by both sides in the dispute, as though hatred and retaliation were the sole recourse available to them.

40. If the principle of retaliation and the logic of terrorism were accepted or tolerated, then, we fear, a tragic chain of events would gradually and inescapably lead us to a new, wide-spread conflagration in the Middle East. The moment is not for passing judgement, but for creating history and for establishing the conditions of peaceful history. The important and urgent need is to save human lives—and all too many have already been lost—not to condemn peoples and nations.

41. This is why, without in any way minimizing the seriousness of the situation created by the military action undertaken by Israel, we deem it necessary and perhaps more constructive to analyse these incidents within a broader framework, a framework of patient effort towards understanding and conciliation, rather than of punishment and repression.

42. The Security Council has not failed to discharge its responsibilities under the Charter. Meetings have been held by the Council whenever they have been requested by any of the parties concerned, resolutions have been adopted after strenuous consultations, with a remarkable degree of unanimity. Brazil firmly adheres to the view that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, still provides us, even at this critical stage, with the best, safest and speediest approach to the settlement of the explosive situation once again prevailing in the Middle East.

43. Brazil firmly adheres to the view that the Security Council should place the full weight of its authority and prestige behind the efforts so painstakingly undertaken by Ambassador Gunnar Jarring for the full implementation of this resolution, which should be accepted by all parties concerned in compliance with the pledges they freely assumed on joining this Organization. Besides, we see no practical alternative to this course, which is the course of law, and, what may be more cogent still, the course of cold political realism. Political circumstances on which it would be futile and superfluous to dwell make it extremely doubtful, precarious and disputable that we would be able to secure any considerable measure of agreement on any course other than that provided by the aforementioned resolution, which, in spite of all the frustrations, unfilled hopes and pledges not honoured in recent months, we still view as one of the most positive actions of a normative character yet attempted by the Security Council. Seldom has the Council responded with such decisiveness and statesmanship to the challenge of any given situation.

44. The experience gained since the war last June is not very encouraging. Recrimination, terrorism and retaliation have not been curbed and the arms race in that region

remains unchecked. While the search for peace goes on, the contending parties are looking for, and are being provided with, new and more sophisticated defensive and offensive weapons.

45. The parties to the dispute are certainly entitled to guarantees of defence and security by their own means. But they are also entitled to guarantees of security to be mutually provided by the major Powers that have both special obligations under the Charter, as permanent members of the Security Council, and a direct influence on the level of armaments in that area. Short of taking enforcement action, we have gone as far as we can. We have laid down the basis for a just and lasting peace, and we have condemned all actions that might prevent or impair the attainment of our aims.

46. I shall restate the position of my delegation, lest it be misinterpreted. We certainly think that the situation in the Middle East ought to be settled with the earnest co-operation of the States in the area, within the framework of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. We are not asking that the situation in the Middle East should be settled by the major Powers. Yet we cannot escape the conclusion that the atmosphere for such an effort would be substantially cleared and alleviated if the major Powers succeeded in harmonizing their actions and their interests in the area, through an understanding on this question of supply of armaments, either through the total cessation of military assistance or through an accorded regulation and balanced limitation of defensive equipment supplied. Such an understanding between the major Powers would certainly have a sobering effect on belligerency and would greatly facilitate the implementation of resolution 242 (1967).

47. The objectives we have proposed are complex by their very nature and may require a reappraisal of many former positions and attitudes. A problem of alliances and a problem of allegiance may also be implied. But it is imperative that an effort be undertaken to attain those objectives.

48. These are the preliminary remarks my delegation wished to make at this stage of our proceedings, with the understanding that we shall return to the matter in the light of any specific proposals or suggestions which may be advanced on the item under consideration.

49. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to amplify my first statement with some words of gratitude to the distinguished representative of Algeria, Mr. Bouattoura, who was President of the Security Council last month. Last month was marked by the fact that, in regard to matters falling within the terms of reference of the Security Council, there were no urgent questions and the Council did not meet. The members of the Security Council had a chance to take a breathing spell, as it were. I think that to a certain extent we should be grateful also to the President of the Security Council for this, but it would be wrong to mention this alone. During his Presidency, Mr. Bouattoura kept all of us, all members of the Security Council, in fighting trim; and, as a result of his efforts, the Committee

of seven¹ was established to deal with a very serious problem, the problem of Southern Rhodesia. I thought I ought to mention these features and to say that all of us were conscious of the way in which Mr. Bouattoura discharged his duties.

50. I should now like to dwell briefly on the problem we are discussing here at present. The Security Council is, in fact, now concluding its discussion of the question of the new aggressive acts committed by Israel against Jordan in violation of the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions and in spite of the Council's frequent condemnations of Israel for its previous acts of aggression.

51. What has emerged in the course of the discussion on this question in the Security Council?

52. First of all, from the statements by representatives both of States which are members of the Security Council and of States which are not members, it is clear that these representatives condemn the new acts of aggression by Israel against Jordan and are aware that provocative acts of this kind represent a danger for the cause of peace in the Middle East, for the prospects of a political settlement in that area and for the success of the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Middle East, Ambassador Jarring. In most of the statements the condemnation of Israel's aggression was direct, complete and definite. In some individual statements the speakers merely confined themselves to expressions of regret. It is perfectly obvious, however—and this is an undeniable fact—that no one, even among the sympathizers, dared to offer an outright justification of this new crime.

53. Another important aspect of the discussion on this question in the Council is that, with one or two possible exceptions, the overwhelming majority of the statements fully exposed and totally rejected the predatory "doctrine" advanced by the Israel aggressors to the effect that the Arab population of the occupied territories must reconcile themselves to the loss of their freedom and independence, betray the interests of their countries, submit to the whim of the Israel occupiers, obey the latter unconditionally, and renounce their sacred right to fight for their liberation. Israel's attempts to camouflage and justify its new acts of aggression against Jordan, on the grounds that these obviously aggressive acts were undertaken as retaliatory measures, were also decisively condemned and rejected.

54. The recognition of the rights of peoples to wage a just struggle for their freedom and independence against imperialist usurpers and aggressors is one of the outstanding advances of our time, and no one today can successfully question this right, no matter how the forces of imperialism and aggression may try to turn back the wheel of history.

55. Those who attempt to deny this right are really striking a blow at the sacred rights of all peoples who are selflessly fighting for the liquidation of racist and colonial régimes and against imperialist aggression. The colonialists and aggressors would prefer to call freedom fighters "terrorists and saboteurs". It is these offensive labels which the

¹ Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

imperialists are trying to attach to all those who are heroically fighting against colonial régimes in Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea and Southern Rhodesia. The same terms were at one time used by fascist propaganda to refer to the heroic partisans in the countries of Europe, and to the French *maquis* and other resistance fighters during the years of the Second World War. The same slanderous terms are now being repeated by the Israel aggressors with reference to the Arab patriots in the territories occupied by Israel.

56. It is perfectly clear that this "Israel doctrine", if it can be so called, has been invented and is being spread to disguise and justify new acts of aggression against the Arab countries. However, this will not help the present-day aggressors and colonialists, any more than it helped the fascist proponents of the "new order" in Europe.

57. The overwhelming majority of representatives speaking in the Council decisively rejected this "doctrine" of the Israel extremists, and rejected their attempts to justify their aggressive acts against Jordan on the grounds that they were retaliatory measures for specific, individual acts of disobedience by the Arab population in the occupied territories.

58. We cannot fail to note, either, that almost all the speakers acknowledged, and many of them emphasized, that the new premeditated acts of aggression committed by Israel against Jordan constitute a serious obstacle to the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the Middle East, Ambassador Jarring. Many of the speakers also recalled that Israel is a country which the Security Council has frequently condemned as an aggressor country. It was stated almost unanimously that Israel is still refusing to comply with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967.

59. In this connexion, we cannot fail to point out that the representative of Israel, in his many statements and replies at the Council's meetings, has never once referred to this resolution which, as is well known, defines the principles and conditions for a political settlement in the Middle East. This is no accident. It is further proof that the Israel Government is still unwilling to comply with the Security Council's resolution and is, by its aggressive policy towards the Arab States, deliberately creating difficulties and obstacles to the accomplishment of Ambassador Jarring's mission. The Security Council cannot disregard this important fact. It must take stricter and more resolute measures against the aggressor; it must force him to respect the Council's decision and comply with its resolution of 22 November 1967.

60. The fact that the majority of the speakers have condemned Israel for its new aggression gives us reason to hope that the Security Council will take appropriately strict measures in regard to Israel.

61. In this connexion we must also mention that during the debate in the Council there was a noticeable inconsistency in the statements of certain representatives who, while expressing regret at the new aggressive acts committed by Israel, were at the same time really trying to

defend the aggressor. They—and particularly the representative of the United States of America—made repeated use, like the Israel representative, of terms such as "saboteurs" and "terrorists", terms which are offensive to the Arab patriots, and tried to apply the same standard to the aggressors and the victims of aggression and to place individual acts of disobedience and resistance by the Arab population in the occupied territories on the same level of international political and military responsibility as the premeditated and barbarous bombing of peaceful towns and villages in Jordan by Israel air forces, resulting in death and injury to countless peaceful inhabitants of that country. It is easy to see that this sort of position is fraught with serious consequences. In fact, this position can only be considered an attempt to justify and camouflage the new acts of aggression by Israel, to give the aggressor moral protection and to mitigate his guilt for violating the cease-fire and failing to comply with the Security Council resolution. States which pursue this course assume full responsibility for the future development of events in the Middle East, in a direction quite contrary to the interests of consolidating peace. Any attempt, even indirectly, to justify and defend the aggressive nature of Israel's policy and action towards Jordan can only encourage the aggressor to commit further criminal acts, thereby further complicating the problem of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and creating still more obstacles to the accomplishment of the mission entrusted to Ambassador Jarring.

62. Under these circumstances, it is the duty of the Security Council to take resolute and effective measures against the aggressor, and not to allow any direct or indirect protectors and defenders of the aggressor to induce the Security Council to leave the aggressor unpunished. Unconditional condemnation of the aggressor and the adoption of decisive measures to prevent new aggressive acts will also contribute to the accomplishment of the mission entrusted to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the Middle East, Ambassador Jarring.

63. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel who has asked to be allowed to speak.

✓ 64. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I beg the Council's indulgence to make a few brief observations. At the outset I should like to say that it is difficult for me to conceal the admiration with which I listened to the Arab representatives deliver at the last meeting comprehensive exposés of their views, confining themselves at all times to the subject matter on the agenda, even when they found it inevitable to expound on Tamerlane, problems of races and internal politics of Member States, and all this without being interrupted even once by the faithful guardians of points of order.

65. I admire most profoundly this achievement, and am in fact encouraged to see in it a hopeful augury for the right of speech of Israeli representatives as well.

66. One after another, the Arab representatives came before the Council and revealed in unequivocal terms what the issue is from their point of view. The problem to them is not any particular Israeli action but Israel's very existence. The Arab representatives have explained that the people of Israel must "even inside their own country ... be

a minority", that Palestine "has been occupied in its entirety by an immigrant alien population", that El-Fatah, which, as we know, aims at Israel's liquidation, is "an organization dedicated to peace based on justice." The word "El-Fatah" itself, by the way, means conquest; and conquest is made up of the initials of "the movement for the liberation of Palestine", Palestine as a whole.

67. There is no longer any doubt about it; nothing has changed. As President Nasser declared on 28 May 1967, "Israel's very existence is aggression". As Radio Cairo repeated on 17 March 1968, "The real problem of Palestine is Israel's existence".

68. Starting from this premise everything that Israel does or does not do is automatically defined as wrong, unjust and illegal. How very far the Arab Governments still seem to be from readiness to work for a just and lasting peace as provided for by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 when they continue to embrace the idea that Israel's right to statehood must be denied.

69. How difficult it is to move towards just and lasting peace if the Arab Governments continue to claim that warfare by terror is justified today, in the period of the cease-fire, as it had been during the Armistice and during the Truce that preceded it, simply because it is Israel that this warfare is directed against. Where is this attitude going to lead us?

70. This has been the tragedy of the Middle East for years. Disregarding the Charter of the United Nations, disregarding United Nations resolutions and world opinion, the Arab States became so intoxicated with their lust for Israel's destruction that the concepts of right and wrong lost all meaning in their eyes, and the Middle East tumbled from one catastrophe to another. Now again, in utter disregard for their international obligations and world opinion, the Arab Governments pursue their war against Israel by terror and murder and refuse to see the criminality and dangerousness of their behaviour.

71. World opinion has never been firmer in its rejection of this Arab attitude.

72. The Stockholm daily *Goeteborgs Handels Tidningen* of 7 August justifies in an editorial Israel's air action against the bases of the raiders:

"How convenient it is for Arab States to shirk responsibility. . . . They believe that they have invented a method of war that creates no danger for themselves. However, these tactics are folly. When Israel strikes a blow the attacker should not be surprised, nor should Jordan that protects him. The only trouble is that in the world there are too many who hasten to blame Israel. Is there no state that could convey to the Arabs that the idea of a one way war without any risk is an idea without foundation whatsoever? "

73. The Oslo *Aftenposten* writes on the same day:

"The Security Council because of its composition has not yet addressed a sharp warning to Arab countries, which despite the cease-fire agreement with Israel actively

help guerrilla activities from bases outside Israel. . . . It borders on hypocrisy when Arabs now complain against reprisals and when the highest United Nations body overlooks provocations".

74. Another newspaper, the *Aftenbladet*, says about Israel's action:

"One can argue whether an action of this kind is proportionate to the terror incursions, but it is entirely clear that such incursions are a violation of the cease-fire arrangement and that Jordan is a party as they are carried out from its territory."

75. The Rio de Janeiro *Globo* carries a big headline: "Israelis repulse terrorists".

76. The Oslo *Dagbladet's* headline is: "Israel's attack on Jordan in self-defence".

77. In yesterday's *Figaro* of Paris we read:

"The endless incidents are not caused by the consequences of the six days' war and by Israeli occupation of certain territories. The provocations of Arab terrorists, as the entire world knows, have occurred one after the other, long before the six days' war.

"One cannot ask one party to abide by a rule if one is unable to demand that the other party respect it as well . . .

"It therefore seems unjust to blame Israel for having meted out justice . . .

"This is a simple question of equity and reason."

78. The *Washington Post* writes on 8 August:

"The Israeli policy has its own reason. Israel . . . is determined to protect its citizenry. No international rebuke, not even a one-sided one leaving Jordanian responsibility unscored, is likely to push it off this path".

79. The *New York Times* of 6 August declares:

"There can be no peace in the Middle East until the world organization moves to condemn with equal vigor militant acts on both sides . . .".

80. The United Nations has repeatedly rejected the Arab claim that incursions, terror and sabotage are acceptable. The 19 August 1948 resolution was specific in ruling out such acts of violence.

81. Allow me to read from the verbatim record of the meeting of the Security Council of 19 August 1948 and to quote a distinguished representative who said:

" . . . each party should be responsible for the actions of the individuals or groups on its territory or under its authority to ensure that their actions do not violate the truce or lead to a situation that would result in a resumption of military operations . . .

" . . . the Security Council should adopt a suitable resolution or issue a warning to the parties . . . so that the

Government and the authorities concerned may establish the necessary supervision over individuals or groups whose actions might contribute to a violation of the truce and a resumption of military operations.

"...the States which have undertaken to fulfil the Security Council's decision on the cessation of military operations... will certainly be able to find ways and means to punish and call to order or bring to justice the individuals or groups whose actions might contribute to violate the obligations imposed upon the various States involved...". [354th meeting, pp. 45 and 46.]

This was stated by Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union, the President of the Security Council, which adopted resolution 56 (1948) of 19 August 1948.

82. The Qibya resolution of 24 November 1953, to which the Jordanian representative referred at the last meeting in a selective manner, called on the Government of Jordan to take measures to prevent incursions. A similar reference is found in the Security Council resolution of 28 March 1955 regarding the Israel-Egyptian border.

83. Now, tenets of law do not change simply by virtue of the lapse of time or by the change of political views in the capital of a particular Member State. In his press communiqué of 11 May 1967 the Secretary-General states:

"I say that in the last few days El-Fatah type of incidents have increased unfortunately... That type of activity is insidious... All Governments concerned have an obligation under the Charter of the United Nations and in the interest of peace to take every measure within their means to put an end to such activities."

84. I do not think we would accuse the Secretary-General of imperialism or colonialism, as the Soviet representative has accused those who hold views such as those expressed in the Secretary-General's report. Surely the Security Council cannot ignore such violations of the cease-fire—such activities. For the sake of peace in the area, it must call for their definite cessation.

85. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Jordan, who has asked to be allowed to speak.

86. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I did not ask to be allowed to speak to answer the repeated charges presented by Israel, which have been answered time and again in the past. Suffice it to say that during this very period to which he referred 185 incidents took place. They were all committed by regular Israeli forces. I have referred to them in my letters of 8 April 1968 [S/8533], 6 May 1968 [S/8578 and S/8579] and 21 June 1968 [S/8649] and one which will be presented soon. These show clearly how frequent and how deliberate the Israeli attacks are. More than 185 were described in these letters. On the other hand, even according to the Israeli representative's letters of 8 April [S/8535], 24 June [S/8651] and 2 August 1968 [S/8716], only about 120 incidents were reported. It is of the utmost importance that, while the Israeli attacks are planned and executed by the regular Israeli army, with the authorization of the Israeli Government, the incidents which occurred in

occupied Arab territory were the result of confrontations between Palestinian individuals—over whom no government has power—and Israeli armed forces.

87. Therefore, on the one hand we have more than 185 incidents carried out by Israeli armed forces against Jordan, and on the other hand around 120 alleged by the Israelis for which the Government of Jordan has no responsibility whatsoever.

88. I shall not dwell on this at this stage. I should like to turn to another, more important aspect of what is before the Council.

89. I have come before the Council with a complaint embodying a clear case of aggression: one act committed against the people of Irbid, one committed against the civilian population of Salt. Both acts, both attacks, both aggressions were admitted by the authorities in Israel, and openly admitted here in the Security Council by Mr. Tekoah. Mr. Tekoah attempted to say that they were attacking terrorist bases. He said: "The terrorist bases in this area were destroyed in yesterday's action." [1434th meeting, para. 112.] I should like to say, as I have said in the past, that this is not true; that when Mr. Tekoah says that his army confined its attack to the bases for terrorism, he was not telling the truth. Today I would say that that was a lie. I am sorry to use this term, but I have the pictures here which expose this lie.

90. I present this picture of a child less than a year old, in the lap of his mother, bombed by the Israelis. This was not a terrorist, nor was he living in a base for terrorism. To mislead the Security Council is in itself an act which deserves condemnation. I have therefore requested the circulation of these pictures as a document of the Security Council—Mr. Chai has said they will be available sometime today—for every member to ponder and examine.

91. Mr. Tekoah said the other day that they did not burn or bomb the crops of the Jordanian civilians and farmers. That statement is belied by this picture, which you will have later today, showing the crops and the trucks and the people bombed by the Israelis.

92. Mr. Tekoah said that they had confined everything to the bases for terrorism. This again is a lie, because this picture shows a Red Crescent bus carrying the victims of the Israelis, the Red Crescent bus bombed by the Israelis, destroyed by the Israelis.

93. I also have here a sample of the means used to kill and murder my people. I have here a picture of a bomb. Its weight is 500 pounds. It is highly explosive. The extent of the damage done by such a bomb will be verified by the experts, and I hope the experts, who are quite familiar with this kind of bomb and with its production, will help us know exactly the extent of the damage caused by every single bomb of this type. This one was not exploded by chance.

94. I have other pictures. They are all going to be before you some time this afternoon.

95. So when Mr. Tekoah comes here with a straight face to say that they were bombing only—only—bases in isolated

areas, not civilians, he is misleading the Council and the Council should be aware of such deceit.

96. I now turn to the substance. I have presented my complaint. I have shown the extent of the damage caused to Irbid, with the scores of casualties, with the dead and the injured; the crops which were burned; the forests which were burned; the napalm which was used to burn the banana fields and the orange groves; the destruction of the irrigation project in Ghor, which is an area feeding a substantial part of Jordan; and, above all, I have shown in detail the crime which was committed last Sunday against Salt. Both crimes were admitted by Mr. Tekoah, right here, and by his authorities in Tel Aviv. Now I am coming before the Council for a remedy.

97. You have given us seven resolutions and we are grateful to you for every one of those resolutions. You have condemned Israel time and again. The sixth time, you emphasized to Israel, on the occasion of the Es-Samu' attack, that if Israel repeated such attacks, you, the Security Council, would take further measures as envisaged in the Charter. Then Israel again committed the same crime—I would say a more serious crime—against Irbid. While you were considering the crime against Irbid and before the termination of that debate on Irbid, another crime was committed against Salt; and while you were considering both of these crimes, against Irbid and Salt, a third one was committed, the day before yesterday. And you have emphatically warned Israel.

98. I now come here to ask: are we, the people of Jordan, a small Member of the United Nations, entitled to expect that you will now, at this stage, take action as promised, take serious action, since Israel continues to defy you? Is the Security Council now going to invoke Chapter VII, or is the Council, because of certain considerations—and this is not the time for exposing other considerations—going to be crippled, going to remain inactive?

99. Perhaps you do not want to help Jordan. This is your privilege. Jordan is a small Member. But I think you cannot afford—you, the Security Council—to cause an end to be put to the great hope placed in the United Nations. I need not remind you of what happened to the League of Nations after the Ethiopian affair, and you all know what happened to Ethiopia as a result of the inaction of the League of Nations vis-à-vis the Ethiopian affair. Is the Council going to show the same lack of action? I hope it does not, for I shall be worrying not only about Jordan, but about the destiny of every single small Member of the United Nations.

100. Last Saturday, I think, 3 August, there was an article in the *Economist*. This article is worth pondering by every single member here. It is an article which shows that Israel is now exporting destructive ideas. I am referring to the article which is entitled "In Dayan's Steps" in which the correspondent, writing from South Africa, said that the Defence Minister of South Africa, Mr. Botha, Dayan's counterpart, stated that he would do what Israel did. The correspondent said, "Significantly, the Defence Minister drew the analogy of Israel's raid against El-Fatah bases across the Jordan". He said, "South Africa was deeply impressed by the Israeli example and the feeling is growing that the forces of the white South could deliver a great

knockout blow against the guerrilla camps—an air raid, perhaps—and get away with it". The article concluded—and this is very important for the Security Council to ponder—"No doubt a lot of dust would be kicked up in the United Nations, but would anyone actually do anything about it?". "A lot of dust would be kicked up"—after South Africa attacks neighbouring African States Members of the United Nations. "A lot of dust would be kicked up in the United Nations, but would anyone actually do anything about it?".

101. An action by the Security Council would save the prestige of this great body, not only the security of Jordan.

102. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I shall be brief and shall merely offer some information. The representative of Israel quoted the words of the President of the Security Council, but the essence of that quotation is that each country and Government is responsible for everything that occurs in its territory and those it controls. The occupied territories of the Arab countries are controlled by the Government of Israel, and the entire responsibility for everything which occurs in those territories rests wholly and completely on the Government of Israel. Accordingly, the Government of Israel has no right whatever to shift onto other Governments the blame for everything which happens in these territories, and even less to take any measures of reprisal against the Governments of other countries and their peaceful populations. This is the essence of the Israel aggressors' crime. The responsibility for the territories under their control is theirs, not that of the Governments of neighbouring States.

103. Therefore, no quotations or verbal jugglery here will help the representative of Israel to relieve his Government of responsibility for its continuing acts of aggression against its neighbours.

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

105. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I would not like to pursue our exchange of views with the representative of the Soviet Union. At the last meeting I made an observation concerning geography and facts. I should like to refer him to that observation again.

106. I think it is not new that the respect by the representative of Jordan for the borderline between fact and fantasy is not much greater than his Government's respect for the cease-fire line. I should like to reject categorically the malicious allegations made here by the representative of Jordan. It is not the first time that he comes before the Security Council, refers to prefabricated documents, or photo montage pictures, in an attempt to prove his point. I reiterate in all firmness: Israel forces did not bomb the town of Salt. They did not bomb civilian installations. They did not even bomb the military camps of the Jordanian and Iraqi forces situated in the area. The Israeli air action was taken against the terrorist bases and only against the terrorist bases. It is not enough to come here and to make accusations of the kind which we have just heard without any foundation in fact.

107. Here is a description of an Arab eyewitness, a Press correspondent, reporting from Jordan and quoted in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 6 August:

"For nearly four hours on 4 August Israeli jets bombed, strafed, rocketed two large advance training areas of Arab *fedayeen* [guerrillas] south and west of the town of Salt, eighteen miles north-west of Amman.

"...

"Touma Hezzou, a Jordanian correspondent of an American television network, drove into the thick of the battle near Salt. He was slightly injured by a bomb explosion.

"Mr. Hezzou"—he was a civilian—"telephoned to this correspondent that the guerrilla areas were those hardest hit.

"Iraqi troops and anti-aircraft units stationed considerably to the north of Salt apparently [were not] involved. The *fedayeen* dispersed and took up defensive positions in caves and behind rocks. But some, probably about twenty-five"—about twenty-five *fedayeen*—"were caught under a bridge that was hit by a bomb".

If there were any civilian casualties they cannot but be regretted.

108. Those who insist on pursuing war must realize that responsibility for civilian casualties rests on them, not on those who defend themselves and call for peace and act in self-defence.

109. What are the facts about the casualties as a result of the Israeli air action? The Jordanian representative mentioned before the Council 34 Jordanians killed. Now, the Associated Press from Amman reports, on 5 August, the funerals of 28 Jordanian *fedayeen*, members of the terrorist organization, killed in the Israeli air strike, being buried in

Amman—28 of them. Baghdad Radio on the same day, 5 August, reports an officer of El-Fatah, an Iraqi officer of El-Fatah, killed in Salt, would be buried in Iraq. That brings us up to 29 casualties of the 34 reported by the representative of Jordan. The voice of El-Asefa broadcasting on behalf of El-Fatah reports on 4 August that 1 Jordanian officer and 4 Jordanian soldiers were killed as a result of the air raid. The total number of casualties as reported by Amman, by Radio Baghdad, by the radio of the El-Fatah organization is 34.

110. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan who has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

111. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I was hoping, before taking the floor, to have in my hands documents from the Israeli authorities. They were boasting on 5, 6 and 7 August about what they did. I shall be quoting this, I hope, at our forthcoming meeting.

112. But I should like to say, Mr. President, these are not fabricated things. We did not kill a child to prove a case, nor did we murder a woman to convince the Council or Mr. Tekoah, nor did we burn the fields to make a show out of it, nor did we cause the destruction of the Red Crescent bus to come and tell Mr. Tekoah: "This is it, we are doing this".

113. Mr. Tekoah knows the facts. I am sure the Council also, by now, knows all the facts. I did not say that we bombed military positions in August. No, Sir. But on 5 August, they came with the warning, saying: "This time civilians, next time military positions". And these are the words of the Israelis, not of Jordan.

114. Again, I will be bringing this to the Council in the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.