



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1467th MEETING: 27 MARCH 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1467)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 27 March 1969, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Károly CSATORDAY (Hungary).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1467)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113).
3. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken at this morning's meeting I now propose, with the Council's consent, to invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table in order to participate, without vote, in the discussion.

2. I should also like to inform the members of the Security Council that the representative of Saudi Arabia has submitted a request [S/9116] to participate in the Council's discussion of the items on the agenda. I accordingly propose, with the Council's consent, to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia, in keeping with the usual practice of the Council and in accordance with its rules of procedure,

to take a place at the Council table in order to participate, without vote, in the discussion.

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council will continue its consideration of the items on its agenda.

4. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council is again considering the question of the aggressive actions of Israel in the Middle East.

5. The distinguished representative of Jordan, Ambassador El-Farra, gave us a detailed factual description of Israel's latest attacks on his country. Jordanian villages, rest houses and other civilian objectives in the Es Salt area were barbarously bombed with napalm and heavy bombs and rockets. Many peaceful inhabitants were killed or wounded, mainly very young children, schoolchildren and elderly women.

6. The fresh criminal acts of the Israeli militarists—the latest in Israel's flagrant violations of the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council—were by no means chance occurrences. They were premeditated, planned acts of aggression carried out under decisions of the official authorities of Israel. They are an expression of the aggressive course which was consistently and deliberately pursued by Israel's previous administration and which, as is now obvious, is being continued by Israel's new leaders against the neighbouring Arab States. Israel's aggressive policy constitutes the main obstacle to the establishment of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East and to a political settlement in that region.

7. By its actions Israel has again demonstrated to the entire world that its policy is a policy of aggression. The ruling circles in Israel continue to attain their ends in the Middle East, not by the establishment of a just peace on mutually acceptable basis, in the interests of all States in the region but by the use of armed force.

8. It should be recalled that not so long ago [1462nd meeting] the Security Council unanimously condemned an aggressive act of Israel, the piratical raid on Beirut airport, and warned Israel that if such military acts were to be repeated the Council would take the appropriate further steps.

9. Subsequent events have shown that the Israeli authorities have chosen to ignore even this serious warning of the Security Council. They are continuing to carry out fresh criminal attacks on the neighbouring Arab States. The members of the Security Council have detailed information on this subject, presented by the mission of Arab countries to the United Nations.

10. The Council knows that on 24 February the Israel air force invaded Syrian air space and bombed population centres in the vicinity of Damascus, as a result of which there were numerous casualties among the civilian population.

11. The members of the Council were informed that Israel aircraft and armoured personnel carriers attacked Jordanian troops and civilian objectives in an area south of the Dead Sea. From documents of the Security Council it is known that Israel armed forces are systematically staging military provocations in the Suez Canal zone.

12. Israel's acts of aggression against Jordan reported in the letters of the Jordanian representative dated 16 and 17 March circulated as Security Council documents [S/9083 and S/9085],¹ and especially the latest attack of 26 March, are new links in the chain of Israel's uninterrupted attempts to heighten the already acute and dangerous military tension in the Middle East and to use it as a pretext for holding on to the Arab territories occupied by Israel troops and for consolidating Israel positions there.

13. In committing these acts of aggression, the Israel Government advances by way of explanation the concept of "active defence". To listen to the Israel representative, when Israel armed forces destroy Jordanian villages, kill women and children, sow terror and death among the civilian population, they are merely taking defensive measures.

14. First Israel unleashes an aggressive war against the neighbouring Arab States and occupies their territory; then, when a wave of popular wrath and indignation grows and spreads in these territories and a national liberation movement against the foreign occupiers and oppressors develops, Israel persists in directing fresh military blows at the territory of the very States which are the victims of its aggression. If these are defensive measures, what then must we call international gangsterism? But Israel and its leaders should bear in mind that Israel cannot count on going unpunished for bringing death and destruction to the territories of neighbouring Arab States.

15. Mr. Tekoah, do not invoke the sacred memory of the resistance fighters against Hitlerite Germany. Do not try to shield Israel's continuing acts of aggression against the Arab States behind references to the supreme law of self-preservation and self-defence. Look at the other side of the coin. Imagine yourself for a moment in the place of a peaceful inhabitant of an Arab country subjected to military terror by foreign aggressors, and apply the supreme law of self-preservation and self-defence to yourself.

16. Then you will easily realize that there is no difference whatsoever between the resistance and struggle of the European peoples against the Hitler invaders and the resistance and struggle of the Arab peoples against the Israel invaders. The supreme law of self-defence and self-preservation applies in both cases. In Europe then and in the Middle East today we have resistance and struggle against foreign invaders and aggressors.

17. In invoking the supreme law of self-preservation and self-defence for yourself, for your own country, you dare not—you cannot—logically deny the right of the Arabs living temporarily under Israel occupation to apply that same law.

18. The short-sighted politicians of Tel Aviv who place their hopes in military threats and blackmail should have realized by now that the struggle of peoples against aggressors and occupiers of foreign soil is not only just and valid from the standpoint of international law and the United Nations Charter, it is also ineluctable and irresistible. It cannot be stopped by means of intimidation or repression. The longer Israel's troops remain in the seized Arab territories, the fiercer and wider will be the growth of the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples against the invaders and the greater will be the support and sympathy for this sacred struggle among all peace-loving countries and peoples of the world.

19. The representatives of Israel, and particularly the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Eban, advance yet another concept in connexion with the persistent acts of aggression against the Arab States. They declare in the press, at news conferences and in official statements that these are all minor incidents of little significance, that on the whole there is peace and tranquillity in the Middle East, and no particular threat to the cause of peace.

20. I should like to ask how we are to understand remarks of this kind. The killing of children—is that tranquillity? The destruction of homes by bombing and the killing of peaceful inhabitants—is that security? Can the bombardment of Jordanian villages with rockets and napalm from aircraft be described as peace and tranquillity in the Middle East?

21. It is hard to view such statements by official representatives of Israel as anything but hypocritical and false words which challenge the conscience of any honest man. The reasoning behind the assertion that the situation is calm in the Middle East is obvious. If it is calm there, nothing need be done; no settlement is needed; everything can be left as it is. In other words, we can let Israel "assimilate" the seized Arab territories and close our eyes to the killing, the destruction, all the crimes perpetrated by Israel's military against the Arab population and against the Arab States.

22. But the representatives of Israel will not succeed in deluding anyone with their soothing words. Just as aggression cannot be passed off as defence, just as the killing of children and women and the destruction of peaceful villages cannot be presented as peaceable acts, so talk about an alleged tranquil situation in the Middle East cannot conceal the dangerous situation which really exists there. The

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1969.*

aggressive actions of Israel are creating a fresh threat to the peace in the Middle East, with all the consequences which that entails.

23. Israel's latest acts of aggression against Jordan take on an especially sinister character since they come at the very time when, as all members of the Security Council are aware, new active efforts are being made at the international level to find ways of settling the Middle East problem on the basis of the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, at the time when intensive preparations are being made for important negotiations which all those who sincerely wish to see international peace strengthened hope will produce constructive results.

24. If in these precise circumstances Israel commits one act of aggression after another against the neighbouring Arab States, this is indeed dangerous and fraught with serious consequences, primarily for Israel itself. Israel's actions can mean only one thing—that the Government of Israel wants to undermine the international efforts aimed at restoring peace in the Middle East and to jeopardize the success of the negotiations which are under way.

25. But this cannot be permitted. The hopes of millions of people who live in the region for lasting peace and a tranquil existence are bound up with a political settlement in the Middle East. All the peoples of the world bind their hopes for an easing of international tension and for general progress in the development of international relations towards the strengthening of peace and world security with such a task.

26. The representative of Israel has again spoken here today about Israel's desire for peace. But these are empty words. They do not carry conviction. What is needed is deeds, not words. What are the Israeli Government's protestations that it wants peace worth if at a time when many States, the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, his Special Representative Ambassador Jarring and the permanent members of the Security Council are making serious efforts to arrive at a political settlement by applying all the provisions of the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, Israel is working to disrupt such a settlement and is persisting in its policy of refusing to implement that resolution?

27. Behind these words about a desire for peace lies something quite different—a policy of protracted war against the Arab States, of delaying a settlement in the Middle East and of annexing the seized Arab territories. But it is time that the politicians in Israel realized that this is not only an unreal policy but a dream, a utopia.

28. Israel's conduct at this moment deepens its guilt as an aggressor and its responsibility for sabotaging the cause of peace in the Middle East and for seeking deliberately to prevent a political settlement. This policy cannot fail to arouse indignation and condemnation among the peoples of the entire world, who hate war, curse the warmongers, and want peace.

29. All of this enormously increases the Security Council's responsibility under the United Nations Charter for main-

taining peace and security in the Middle East and for achieving a political settlement in that part of the world.

30. Everything that has been said here leads us to a single conclusion—that the Security Council must rapidly, clearly and unambiguously condemn Israel's fresh acts of aggression against Jordan and demand of Israel that it unconditionally and unreservedly comply with the Council's earlier cease-fire resolutions and that it stop its actions aimed at disrupting efforts for a peaceful political settlement of the Middle East problem. The Council should warn Israel's leaders that if they intend to act in such a way as to disrupt the efforts towards a political settlement in the Middle East which are now being undertaken, they will be fully answerable for this to the Security Council, to the United Nations, to the peoples of the world and to their own people.

31. The Soviet Union is fully prepared to support a resolution by the Security Council which would so stipulate.

32. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): It was indeed with a profound feeling of sadness that we heard the statements made this morning by the representative of Jordan and the representative of Israel. We are sad because large-scale violence has again erupted in the Middle East. Repeated warnings given by the Security Council have gone unheeded; loss of innocent civilian lives and damage to property have occurred, and the cease-fire has been violated.

33. This new violence has taken place at a time when we thought that we had detected some positive signs indicating, we hoped, that progress was being made, slowly but steadily. All of those signs, in our view, augured well for a return to an atmosphere of sanity and understanding and, ultimately, for a settlement of the troubled situation in the Middle East.

34. First, we were glad that, after careful consultations and preparations at Headquarters, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, could at last return to the area to pursue his peace efforts actively.

35. Secondly, we were also awaiting with anticipation and hope the projected mission reportedly being carried out by the Jordanian monarch, His Majesty King Hussein.

36. Last, but not least, preparations were believed to be nearing completion for the Big Four talks, in which we have placed a great deal of faith and hope.

37. Now, all those hopeful signs—those careful preparations and the good groundwork for an essential settlement, which took a lot of time and energy—would surely suffer at the hands of this act of violence, an act which is ill-timed, premeditated and thoughtless. Moreover, we regard this act to be wholly inconsistent with the requirements of self-defence.

38. We regret this state of affairs. We sympathize with the dead and their families; we are sorry for the loss of property; and, above all, we deplore and we condemn all

violence, all violations of the cease-fire, all resort to the use of force, and all attempts at setting back the progress made towards our objective. And I submit that, in the question of the Middle East, we all know before hand what the objective is. It is not as though we did not know our goal. The Security Council, in its resolution of 22 November 1967, has set forth, very clearly and very objectively, the framework and the shape of a just and equitable settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

39. The solution lies not in the finding of a new formula, but in the implementation of an existing one, laid down by the Security Council by a unanimous vote.

40. The views of His Majesty's Government, as stated time and again since the outbreak of the 1967 Arab-Israel conflict, pre-date the adoption of the November resolution. Those views are motivated by a strong desire for peace and justice. Therefore, it is but natural that our views conform to the provisions of that resolution in all its essential parts.

41. His Majesty's Government has always maintained the view that a lasting peace in the Middle East is possible only through a settlement, negotiated either between the parties directly concerned or within the framework of the United Nations, which includes, first, the withdrawal of armed forces from occupied territories; and, second, termination of all claims or states of belligerency, and acknowledgement of and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in the area and of their right to live in peace and within secure and recognized boundaries. We envisaged the settlement as a further guarantee of the maritime rights of all States in the area and as a just solution of the refugee problem.

42. In the light of this position, His Majesty's Government has lent its full support to the November resolution and the Jarring Mission, as well as to the recent initiative taken by the Big Four Powers towards promoting a just and accepted settlement within the framework of that resolution.

43. It is a matter of satisfaction for us, therefore, that preliminary consultations have already started between those Powers. It is right that those Powers should start consultations. Under the Charter, it is the duty of the Big Four, as permanent members of the Security Council, to take rightful initiative in matters related to the maintenance of international peace and security.

44. I should also like to say that His Majesty's Government does not condone any attempt from any side to aggravate the situation, which would create difficulties for the establishment of a lasting peace. As the Foreign Minister of Nepal has recently stated, the commando activities carried on inside the territories under Israeli control from across the border, and the reprisals and counter-reprisals, cannot be approved of, in the interest of peace in the region. While we appreciate that the continued occupation of Arab lands by Israel does provide a cause for provocation, we also feel that such activities do not contribute to an improvement of the situation.

45. In these troubled times, an excessive show of bravado and a concern for short-term military and political gain are

often mistaken for genuine statesmanship. We appeal to the leaders of both sides to rise above the vicious cycle of violence, terrorism and retaliation and display statesmanship of which they are no doubt capable by controlling that cycle and helping to implement the provisions of the November 1967 resolution. By so doing, they would herald together a new and glorious era in the history of the Middle East.

46. As a distant and peace-loving country, Nepal cherishes its friendship with all the peoples of the Middle East, Arabs as well as Israelis. We hope, that they realize that their common destiny lies in friendship, understanding and goodwill. After three rounds of major conflicts and countless armed encounters, it is high time that they realized this. Theirs is a land made holy and sanctified by the lives and teachings of a great many teachers and saviours of mankind.

47. Mr. YOST (United States of America): Once again we have been summoned to a session of this Council because of the tragic results of continued violence in the Middle East. We have heard grim descriptions of death and destruction and accusations against one side or the other for causing it all.

48. The air attack that was carried out by Israeli Air Force planes yesterday in the area south of es Salt caused the death, we are told, of eighteen persons and the injury of twenty-five others—all unarmed civilians except for two local policemen. We deeply deplore this loss of life and the human suffering in this tragedy. In the face of this event, my Government wishes to make clear once again, as it has so often in the past, its firm opposition to attacks of this nature. We urge the Government of Israel once again finally to avoid such indiscriminate actions and all other violations of the cease-fire resolutions of this Council. This occurrence was a flagrant violation of the cease-fire, and my delegation deeply deplores it.

49. But we know all too well that this attack was not an isolated incident but must be seen in the total context of the continuing absence of peace in the Middle East. We know of other equally serious incidents as well. The hard, brutal, tragic reality is that violations of the cease-fire, from whatever quarter, act to stimulate answering violations of the cease-fire. Thus, while condemning yesterday's attack, we cannot refrain from condemning the other grave violations from the other side which have taken place. The roster is a long and sad one. UNTSO has provided us with numerous reports in recent weeks, particularly concerning the all-too-frequent exchanges of fire across the Suez Canal which show the continued fragility of peace throughout the area. These too are serious violations of the cease-fire which are to be greatly deplored and which should likewise be renounced. There have been other incidents: bombs in markets, attacks on civilian aircraft, an explosion in a university cafeteria. Arab *fedayeen* organizations have proudly proclaimed their responsibility for these. My Government equally deplores these actions and the Governments of Arab countries cannot completely escape responsibility for them. This violence must be stopped and all cease-fire violations brought to an end.

50. The pattern that we see before us is all too clear and, of course, it is not new. As violence increases on one side, it is answered by greater or more frequent violence on the other. It would be tragic enough if only military personnel or others who have armed themselves and seek battle were involved. But this, as we all know, is not the case. Nor can we expect it to be otherwise when a pattern of violence such as we have witnessed develops. Innocent civilians inevitably suffer. Those who would claim to be acting on their behalf, to be protecting them, become instead the indirect instruments of their death and injury. School-children, women doing their daily marketing, quiet picnickers—these are the ones who suffer most.

51. In spite of the gloomy situation on the ground, there are hopeful developments as well which we must not lose sight of. The Secretary-General's Special Representative is in the area actively consulting the parties and we were encouraged to learn that he has addressed a series of substantive questions to the Governments concerned. We very much hope that the replies to his questions will be positive and that, as a result, his efforts pursuant to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) will receive new impetus.

52. In addition, consultations among certain permanent members of the Security Council are in train on ways and means whereby Ambassador Jarring's efforts can best be assisted. In the not-too-distant future, it is likely that the bilateral exchanges now taking place will expand into four-Power consultations in support of Ambassador Jarring's efforts.

53. On the other hand, the kind of incidents which occasioned this meeting today, and which have all too frequently occurred in recent weeks, greatly hinder the achievement of the basic objectives set forth in resolution 242 (1967). What is urgently required, in addition to co-operation with Ambassador Jarring, is for the parties scrupulously to comply with the cease-fire arrangements. They must make every effort to see that all violations of the cease-fire are prevented and they must co-operate in strengthening the arrangements for the supervision of the cease-fire.

54. Once again, we call upon all of the Governments concerned to stop this senseless waste of human life, to abide scrupulously by the cease-fire and to devote themselves sincerely and whole-heartedly to the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The United States is determined to spare no effort in pursuit of this goal.

55. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Saudi Arabia.

56. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) Thank you, Mr. President, for granting me permission to speak on this expanded item of which the Council is seized. I must indeed thank my good friend the representative of the United States, Ambassador Yost, for having insisted that the two communications should figure under the title "The situation in the Middle East".

57. Members of the Council may recall one of my speeches of March 1968, when I repeated [*1406th meet-*

ing] that whatever incidents took place in the Middle East—or, more precisely, Palestine—would be merely links in an interminable chain of events that might one day lead to a world conflict. Since March 1968, the number of incidents, reported and unreported, is legion. I do not have to catalogue them; they are in the records of the United Nations, either in the records themselves or in the form of letters sent by the various parties to the dispute.

58. It seems that what I said bears repetition, because the work of this Council is becoming merely academic. There have been thirteen or fourteen—I have lost count of the number—condemnations of Israel; and to be fair, there have also been certain criticisms of the Arab States that were at war with Israel. But nothing has happened, and I dare say nothing ever will happen, that will be conducive to a just peace, because that edifice, that house, that State called Israel was built in contravention of the highest principles of the Charter of 1945. As we know from the lessons of history, any house built on sand will totter and fall. I do not feel at all happy that any house should fall. We do not, none of us, feel any satisfaction that any people, whether Jews or gentiles, should suffer and be killed. But the whole problem stems from an injustice. The Charter speaks of peace with justice. Need I repeat, from among the purposes and principles of the Charter, Chapter I, Article 1, paragraph 1 which states: "... in conformity with the principles of justice and international law"? Need I repeat, from among the purposes and principles of the Charter, Chapter I, Article 1, paragraph 2 which states: "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace"?

59. We adopted the Charter in 1945 at San Francisco, and my country, together with other countries, large and small, appended its signature to the Charter. Those of us who were contemporaries of the League of Nations know why the League of Nations foundered: because it did not respect the Covenant in so far as it spelled out the observance of justice and peace. Certain Powers, in the 1930s, flouted the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the League of Nations fell. And its fall was indeed great, because it led us to the Second World War. Two years after the Charter was adopted, none other than the President of one of the major Powers, through pressure, obtained three votes for the partition of Palestine. I do not wish to mention the names of the countries whose Foreign Ministers told me what pressure was brought to bear upon them to cast their votes in favour of the partition of Palestine. It was threatened that they would not receive aid—and everybody was in need of aid in the wake of the Second World War—if they did not vote for the partition of Palestine. It was only two or three votes that made the partition of Palestine the tragic reality with which we are still confronted twenty-two years later.

60. Why should I take the floor today, one might ask? All or many of the things I am going to say may have been mentioned not only by me but also by those who have spoken before. I have lived with this question since 1920, but a person like myself is not consulted because of his experience in this matter. People from various parts of the world who are thousands of miles from the area concerned

are supposed to decide the fate of Palestine, and of Israel for that matter. My prime reason, however, for asking to participate in this debate is nothing new: it is to correct the distortions of Mr. Tekoah and to go into the genesis of the problem so that not only the members of the Council but also people who read its proceedings may have a clearer view of the situation, and so that perhaps some trend may become visible in world public opinion and gather momentum so as to touch the conscience of responsible people all over the world.

61. Mr. Tekoah is very adept in his logical argumentation of the Israeli side. He resorts to rhetoric, he talks of the twenty centuries that it took his people, or the Jewish people, to be specific, to regain their homeland. For twenty centuries the Jewish people had to fight. He did not say "the Jewish peoples". He said "the Jewish people" had to fight to regain their homeland.

62. Who are the Jewish people? Is there one Jewish people? I ask again and again and again: Is there one Christian people? Is there one Moslem people? Or are there peoples? I shall cite quotations from Jewish writers and scholars as to who the Jewish people are—I mean precisely those who came from Eastern and Central Europe, those who carried the torch of Zionism and, under that torch, blasted their way through all kinds of atrocities to take the Holy Land of Palestine.

63. If you turn to volume IV, pages 1 to 5 of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, you will find that those Jews who held the torch of Zionism were no more Semites than you or I, Mr. President, are Chinese, ethnologically speaking. Sometimes I wish I were Chinese. I shall quote from the *Jewish Encyclopedia*:

"In the second half of the sixth century the Chazar moved westward. The kingdom of the Chazars was firmly established in most of South Russia long before the foundation of the Russian monarchy by the Varangians—that was in 855 A.D. At this time the kingdom of the Chazars stood at the height of its power and was constantly at war. . . .

"At the end of the eighth century of the Chaghan"—meaning the King—"of the Chazars and his grandees together with a large number of his heathen people embraced the Jewish religion.

"The Jewish population in the entire domain of the Chazars, in the period between the seventh and the tenth centuries, must have been considerable . . . about the ninth century it appears as if all the Chazars were Jews and that they had been converted to Judaism only a short time before. It was one of the successors of Bhulan, named Obadiah, who regenerated the kingdom and strengthened the Jewish religion. He invited Jewish scholars to settle in his dominions and founded synagogues and schools. The people were instructed in the Bible, the Mishnah and Talmud, and in the 'divine service of the hazzanim'.

"In their writings, the Chazars used the Hebrew letters. The Chazar language predominated. Obadiah was succeeded by his son . . ."

But here I must add the following from the *Jewish Encyclopedia*:

"... Nisi by his son, Aaron II."—I am referring to those Kings of the Chazars—"King Joseph himself was a son of Aaron, and ascended the throne in accordance with the law of the Chazars relating to succession."

64. And here, because many aspersions are thrown at the Arabs, I am quoting from the *Jewish Encyclopedia* in order to show whether there is any such thing as a pure people, as a people with pure blood, a concept which has been refuted by anthropologists and by ethnologists:

"The king had twenty-five wives, all of royal blood, and sixty concubines"—I do not know of what origin they were—"all famous beauties". He must have had an eye. "Each one dwelt in a separate tent and was watched by a eunuch." (This seems to have been the beginning of the downfall of the Chazar kingdom.)

65. Some went to Hungary, your country, Mr. President, when they were dispersed. That is from the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. But the great mass of the people remained in their native country.

66. None other than the illustrious Jewish scholar and Professor Graetz confirms what I say—and I do not know whether the Zionists would denounce him, because he shows that there was not one people. Those Jews from Eastern and Central Europe had nothing to do with the Semites; they were not Semites. I am quoting from the great Jewish Professor H. Graetz.

"The Chazars professed a coarse religion which was combined with sensuality and lewdness. After Obadiah came a long series of Jewish Shagans"—meaning Kings—"for according to a fundamental law of the State only Jewish rulers were permitted to ascend the throne. For some time the Jews of other countries had no knowledge of the conversion of this powerful Kingdom to Judaism. And when at last a vague rumour to this effect reached them, they were of the opinion that Chazaria was peopled by the remnant of the former ten tribes."

67. And Mr. Tekoah speaks of "my people", "my Semitic people" and of people being "anti-Semites". There are Jewish peoples just like there is an American people, which consists of various nationalities, but it is an American people. My Chinese colleague knows that when Kubla Khan took China, he and his dynasty became Chinese. They were Mongolians, but the Chinese are proud of Kubla Khan.

68. One cannot say that there is a Chinese blood. I cannot say that there is even an Arab blood, because we are all mixed. Many people who were Arabized embraced Arabism just as many embraced Islam and others embraced Judaism. Here I come to the word "Judaism" and must quote for the benefit of Mr. Tekoah a passage from another great Jewish scholar—and he must be familiar with him, unless he is too secular to delve into the origin of Judaism. From the photograph he really looks like a very honest man, as most genuine scholars are. The book he wrote is *Yahvism and Other Discourses*. This is by the late Rabbi Adolph Moses.

That book had an introduction by H. G. Enelow, D.D., Rabbi of the Congregation Adath Israel in Louisville, Kentucky. This book is sixty-six years old having been published in Louisville in 1903.

69. Why do I take the time of the Council to mention all this? Because of the words "my Jewish people" and because of the misuse of the word "Judaism". May I, with your permission Sir, read only short excerpts from his chapter on Yahwehism. I mentioned, I believe, in one of my interventions that the word Yahweh came from the name of the God of Moses' wife, the Midianite; and this was the God of ancient Israel. Here this great scholar tells us something about the origin of Judaism and how it had different connotations. In fact, it was Josephus the historian who lived seventy years after Christ and who was the first to use the word "Judaism". Then it was forgotten for a long time and came into current usage in the Middle Ages and more especially in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This is the scholarly rabbi who is speaking:

"Among the innumerable misfortunes which have been befalling the Israelites since they ceased to form a State"—meaning in Palestine, and that was 2,000 years ago—"and a nation, one of the most fateful in its consequences is the name Judaism. In the minds of the Gentiles this name indissolubly associates our religion, which is universal in its deepest sources and universal in its scope and tendency, with the Jewish race, and thus stamps it as a tribal religion. Worse still, the Jews themselves, who have gradually come to call their religion Judaism, are most of them misled to believe that their faith is bound up altogether with the Jewish race, that it is a religion for Jews alone and not for people of any other race or nationality."

70. The philosophy of Zionism is that all Jews the whole world over constitute one race and should possess one nationality. If so, and the Zionists succeed, 17 million Jews should become Israelis and their ingathering, according to Herzl's dream, should be in Palestine. Is it any wonder that the Arabs are afraid of Zionist expansion? Of course I do not believe that one per cent of American Jews have left for Israel, because they are proud of their American citizenship. But they are being brainwashed every day in the national press here. They are told "Your first duty is to Israel". And those American Jews, poor and rich, are proud of being Americans. But Mr. Tekoah and his Government will keep working and working here and in Western Europe—and also in the Soviet Union—to bring over the Jews and call them Israelis. Many Jews were part of the great Russian Revolution; they worked on principle and ideology. They did not identify themselves with Judaism; they identified themselves with Leninism. But they are told "No, you are not Russians, you are first and foremost one people, one blood, one race" even though anthropologists, sociologists and ethnologists have told us that there is no such thing as one blood and one race. We are all *homo sapiens*; we differ because of the geographical impact on people; where the sun was intense throughout the ages the skin became pigmented; but we all belong to one species—*homo sapiens*.

71. Everyone's religion is a private matter between the individual and his conscience. Some people do not believe in God; others do; others like the Buddhists believe in self-restraint; the Confucians believe in a code of ethics; the moral codes are there in religions. But the Zionists want every Jew all over the world to become Israelis and come to Palestine. At whose expense? Of the indigenous people of Palestine. Forget that they are Arabs. They are the indigenous people of Palestine. As I mentioned time and again, many of them may have been Jews originally. Some of them may have been pagans. But they have lived right there for centuries.

72. But this is not all. This attempt of the Zionists to carve for themselves a State did not apply only to Palestine. And here I want Mr. Tekoah to go back to his history, although in 1920 he may not have been born; I do not know how old he is; he may have been a child. When Russia expanded after Ruric, the Chazars were dispersed; some of them even went to Spain, and as I mentioned, Sir, some went to Hungary; others went to Poland. Remember that these Chazars were not of Semitic origin. By "Semite" I do not mean Semitic blood, because there is no such thing as Semitic blood. I mean Semites by culture, language, way of life and food.

73. This is what constitutes a culture, a people. The culture constitutes the people, the way of life, the language, the poetry, the literature, the music. Incidentally, some of the greatest German musicians happened to be of the Jewish faith, such as Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer. Their music has nothing in common with Semitic music. I know Semitic music when I hear it. Mr. Tekoah must now recognize Semitic music when he hears the music of the Oriental Jews and the Arabs there. Mendelssohn wrote in the German tradition; so did Meyerbeer; so did Offenbach who wrote in the French musical idiom; so did Heine the literator, so did the philosophers who were of the Jewish faith, but were Europeans. And these Chazars who helped the torch of Zionism are Europeans from eastern and central Europe. Herzl put that idea into their heads because of the persecution of the Jews in the Middle Ages. We never had any persecution of Jews in the whole of the Middle East. Our brothers in the Ottoman Empire had some Ministers who were Jews, as they also had Ministers who were Christians. They were a Moslem State, one of the most tolerant empires in that respect, the Ottoman Empire.

74. "My people have fought for twenty centuries to regain their homeland"—those are the words of Mr. Tekoah, as paraphrased by me. I have proved time and again that they were not Semites, that they had embraced a Semitic religion as a Scotsman or a Scandinavian may have embraced Christianity, or an African from dark Africa may have embraced Islam. And both Christianity and Islam, like Judaism, are Semitic religions. There are Jewish peoples, I submit; there are Christian peoples, and there are Moslem peoples. It so happens that there are Arab peoples—nationalities, various nationalities. But they have more or less a common culture and language, the same language and the same way of life, more or less.

75. I started to mention something about how the Zionists wanted to carve out a state for themselves even before they

succeeded through pressures of the Western world, more specifically from the United Kingdom in 1917, because they succeeded in railroading the United States into the First World War. I read the documents on this matter and do not want to encumber the Council with more quotations. However let me say that they succeeded *inter alia* in railroading the United States into the First World War and the price was paid by the indigenous people of Palestine—6,000 miles away from the United States, 3,000 miles away from the United Kingdom.

76. Where is justice? Peace with justice? What happened in 1947 is a mockery. Peace with justice? After the First World War they wanted to carve out a state, first, on a federal basis, in Poland. There happened to be remnants of those Chazars who became very active in Polish life. Many of you come from central Europe. I do not know how many millions of Jews there were in Poland and the surrounding lands. And none other than Mr. Woodrow Wilson sent over Mr. Henry Morgenthau Sr. who happened to be of the Jewish faith, but he was one of the most loyal Americans in this country, one of the most loyal American Jews, loyal to America because he decried Zionism. He said that our loyalty—we Jews in America—should be to America, as he repeatedly mentioned in his memoirs. Thus, Mr. Woodrow Wilson sent out Mr. Morgenthau Sr. Incidentally, during the First World War he was the American Ambassador to Turkey. This is from Mr. Morgenthau's book, published in 1922 by Doubleday Page Company. He was at the head of a commission sent by Mr. Woodrow Wilson, who enunciated the Fourteen Points and the principle of self-determination, which later, in this very United Nations, was elaborated by colleagues and myself into a right. And it figures in both Covenants of Human Rights. I quote from Mr. Morgenthau's book:

"We found that, among the Jews, there was a thoughtful, ambitious minority, who, sincere in their original motives, intensified the trouble by believing that its solution lay only in official recognition of the Jews as a separate nationality."

They did not want to be considered Polish. They had lived there for many years and the Poles were generous to them. And rightly so because most of them, he says, identified their interests with the interests of the Poles. He adds:

"They had seized on Zionism as a means to establish the Jewish nation. To them, Zionism was national, not religious; when questioned, they admitted that it was a name with which to capture the imagination of their brothers whose tradition bade them pray thrice daily for their return to the Holy Land.

"... Meanwhile, they wanted to join the Polish nation in a federation having a joint parliament where both Yiddish and Polish should be spoken: their favourite way of expressing it was to say that they wanted something like Switzerland where French, German, and Italian cantons work together in harmony."

I can quote other passages to show how Mr. Morgenthau decried that plan and, being a loyal American, he reported to Woodrow Wilson that that was one of the maddest schemes he had ever heard of.

77. Now, they did not succeed in Poland, because Poland is a European country; there are forces to contend with there. I am not going to mention all the political factors that went into the picture and stood in the way of the realization of such a scheme. But where did they go? Having not succeeded in Poland, those Chazars wanted to carve out a national home, which became a state in Palestine. At whose expense? At the expense of the Arabs.

78. But let us forget that they are Arabs. They are the indigenous people of Palestine. It so happens that the Arabs had been ruled for 400 years before, and in between the two world wars, for twenty years, by High Commissioners of European Mandates. It fell to the British Mandate to introduce those people of Chazar origin into Palestine. This is not a Jewish, Semitic movement. This is a Chazar, European, alien movement to the Middle East.

79. If you decide in this Council—although you are not scholars you can ask scholars, Jewish scholars for that matter—that there could be only one Jewish people, even then they have no title to Palestine because the Jews at one time happened to be there 2,000 years ago. The Indians were here 500 years or so before Columbus came. Would the United States give back the whole continent to the Indians? Why should the Arabs give back the Holy Land of Palestine to some tribes, who are Semites like ourselves, who had vanished from the scene or had converted to Christianity or Islam? Who was St. Paul? Who were the Apostles around Jesus but Jews? Forget about the Arab invasion of Palestine. The Arabs came and the people of the whole fertile crescent rebelled against Byzantia because of the tyranny of Byzantia in that period, not only because of the might of Arab warriors from the peninsula. Many of the indigenous people of Palestine and the fertile crescent may have been Jews, then Christians, and many then became Moslems. Whom are you fooling here, Mr. Tekoah, in saying "our people", "my people"? There are Jewish peoples—and many of them I salute for their loyalty to their countries of birth and adoption, including the United States, including the Soviet Union, including Lebanon, including many other countries, Arab and non-Arab, where there are Jews, notwithstanding all the insults that have been thrown since the Zionists created a Jewish world problem.

80. All those Jewish people in Palestine do not want to be gathered in Palestine. This is a movement that has used Judaism, a noble religion, for political and economic ends to exploit the Middle East. They even play on the sentiments of their own citizens. The leaders are hardboiled secular men—and lately, a woman. At whose expense? At the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine. Theocracy: they do not mention it. At one time, I remember, in the forties, it was said here in our debate that theocracies were anachronisms. Now our colleagues from Israel do not mention that the State should be based on religion or that religion should be based on the State. It is by force of conquest, a fait accompli: here we are and we have all the means of establishing ourselves; whether you like it or not, we are here, the Zionists assert. And they defy the four Big Powers by saying: "If you bring out something which is in consonance with what we want, then we will listen to you." They defy the four Big Powers.

81. And then Mr. Tekoah says that Israel has no choice but to defend itself. What about the indigenous people of Palestine? He mentioned the Fatah, an organization which is a Palestine liberation movement. There are other liberation organizations as well. Why does he not put himself in their place, in the place of those who had homes there, whose ancestors are buried in the soil of Palestine? Why does he not put himself in their place, in the place of those who are trying to retrieve their homeland, objectively speaking? Had they not lived there for centuries? Do they not have to retrieve their homeland? No; the French have the right to retrieve their homeland from the Germans in Alsace and Lorraine. The British have the right to crush anybody who trespasses on them. The Dutch, the Belgians, in Europe, by underground fighting, have that right, but not the Palestinians; they are a second brand. No, Sir; they consider themselves as having a right like every human being. I deplore the fact that they have to kill and be killed.

82. And what is the policy of Israel? The policy of Israel is to compel—at least they think they can compel—the Arab countries to crush those Palestinians. I submit that the Arab countries would neither want to crush nor dare to crush them, this is more important—because they would be shot.

83. A courageous King is coming here in a few days. I knew his grandfather. I used to meet with him, King Abdullah, in London at the Hyde Park Hotel where there were conferences on this Palestine question thirty-two years ago. He was shot by Mousa Hussein, a member of one of the illustrious families of Palestine. Hussein is related to the Mufti, whom Mr. Tekoah tried to—to what shall I say? I should use a polite word—whose reputation he tried to blemish. Where would he have wanted the Mufti to have gone? In taking refuge where during the Second World War? In Paris? Or in Vichy? They would not have wanted him there. He would have been hounded. Of course he went to Germany. But as if the Germans would have paid him so much attention, even in their strategy, as to ask the Mufti what should be done with the Jews. Go and see what Rosenberg said—he may have been a Jew, I do not know! Rosenberg was that racial writer who wrote about nazism. He had it all planned. I do not know what Rosenberg was; he may have been a Chazar and then turned into a Christian. He was a racist—the Mufti was not. The Mufti was trying to defend Palestine, his country. He took refuge in Germany because the Allies would have put him in prison. There is nothing wrong in taking refuge somewhere where one may feel safe.

84. What about Mr. Churchill when they asked him: "How come you, the arch enemy of Zionism"—no, not Zionism; he was a Zionist himself of a sort—"the arch enemy of Communism, ally yourself with Stalin?" He said: "I will ally myself with the devil in order to win the war." And had it not been for Russia, I believe—leave the devil aside—there would have been no United Kingdom.

85. Why does Mr. Tekoah not mention these things? He picks on the Mufti every now and then. The Mufti is a personal friend of mine. I have known him since 1925. He told me several times, when I remonstrated with him about having a population of two-thirds Arabs and one-third Jews in Palestine, and both peoples living side by side: "My

brother, you are off the tangent. The Zionists want to establish a state. Do not waste your breath."

86. When I used to speak with the Zionists in London, in the thirties—not only myself, but others—and tried to explore the possibility of establishing a binational state, one-third Jewish and two-thirds Arab—that was the racial make-up in 1939—they would not listen to us. We were called the moderates among the Arabs. They would not listen to the moderates.

87. And when none other than Mousa Hussein met with Mr. Ben Gurion in Europe to see whether something could be worked out—and it was intimated to me what went on—Ben Gurion put his hand on his shoulder and said, "Look, you could be as old as my son. We will settle for nothing less than a Jewish State in Palestine"—a Zionist State in Palestine.

88. When somebody like myself has known all these facts since 1920—and here we talk in platitudes of how this problem should be solved—I tell you that this problem will not be solved in the Council; and even if the four Big Powers mean business I do not think they will scratch the surface of a solution—with all due respect to their representatives sitting here and to their Governments in their capitals—because there happens to be a Palestinian people that has been aroused. The Israelis thought that within twenty years the old folks among those refugees would have died and that, then, their children and grandchildren would have had no association with their homeland, and that they would be dispersed in the Arab lands. I warned this Council even before the war, in 1966, you may recall—and you can go back to the records—in this and other organs of the United Nations that the Palestine question was no longer the sole dispute between the Arab countries contiguous with Israel. Of course, there is a dispute; there is a problem. But the core of the problem is the Palestinian people, which has awakened like the Algerian people before them, and which will not be restrained until it retrieves its homeland.

89. I warned this Council, and I warned other organs of the United Nations; but not until three or four years ago did I realize that there was going to be continuous trouble, when I ascertained that the Palestinian people was ready to die to retrieve its homeland.

90. If somebody is ready to die to retrieve his homeland and you come and tell him, "Never mind; go and live somewhere else", he will kill any Arab who tells him that—or the Governments, for that matter. And the Arab Governments know it. So what does Israel's policy revolve around? "Let there be anarchy in the Arab world; we will hit Jordan; we will hit Egypt; we will hit every country that harbours those terrorists"—freedom-fighters, as we call them. They have improved their terminology: now they call them "commandos" and "*fedayeen*". Perhaps they are trying to get in touch with some of them; I wish they would, instead of getting in touch with Arab countries. If they talked sense, maybe they will talk to the Israelis. They are the people who have lost their country. Egypt and Jordan have lost parts of their territory, but the freedom-fighters have lost their homeland.

91. Why do the four Powers not think of something constructive, instead of just revolving in circles, and try to send some of their representatives to interview the freedom-fighters of Palestine and see what they want, or invite them to come here and appear before the Council? Why not? We have asked many representatives from Africa whose people were fighting—the Rhodesians, the South Africans and others—to appear before organs of the United Nations. Why do the four Powers not ask some of the representatives of those Palestinian freedom-fighters to attend a conference—in camera first—and after that, let them appear here and present the case of Palestine, rather than me or my brother from Jordan. Of course, my brother from Jordan has to bring this dispute before the Council because many Jordanians are being killed. But there will be no end to this fighting at the rate we are going now, because the entire Arab people, from the land of Morocco to the confines of Iran, down to the heart of the Sudan, is enflamed. And you expect the Arab Governments to tell the four Powers, “Oh, we will overlook those Palestinians, we have to settle the problem, one way or another.” They would not; they dare not.

92. Well, none other than an illustrious President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, who had one of the greatest Secretaries of State, I should say not only in grasping the principles of the United Nations but how these principles should be applied to the Middle East—Mr. Eisenhower—may God prolong his life, although he is in bad shape now, as far as his health is concerned—delivered a radio and television address on the situation in the Middle East to the American people twelve years ago on 20 February 1957. This address is published in pamphlet form, my dear Mr. Buffum, by the United States Department of State, and it is as if he were still speaking here. I am not going to read the entire speech—only a relevant excerpt:

“Israel seeks something more. It insists on firm guarantees as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion.” I am quoting from President Eisenhower’s speech. “This raises a basic question of principle: Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its own withdrawal? If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order. We will in effect have countenanced the use of force as a means of settling international differences and, through this, gaining national advantages. I do not myself see how this could be reconciled with the Charter of the United Nations. The basic pledge of all Members of the United Nations is that they will settle their international disputes by peaceful means and will not use force against the territorial integrity of another State. If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the Organization and our best hope of establishing a world order. That would be a disaster for us all. I would, I feel, be untrue to the standards of the high office to which you have chosen me if I were to lend the influence of the United States to the proposition that a nation which invades another would be permitted to exact conditions for withdrawal.”

93. Let us see what Mr. Nixon is going to do. I wish you, my dear friend from the United States, would bring this speech to his attention. He was Vice-President then; now he holds the highest office.

94. But what about the Palestinian people? Shall America leave them in the lurch, America which, through the principles enunciated by Woodrow Wilson, opened up a new chapter in the history of the world by giving the right of self-determination to many peoples under the colonial yoke? Will the United States unwittingly abet, by providing arms to Israel? Do they expect the Palestinian people to be crushed either through the Governments of the countries where they have taken refuge or by any other means? I do not believe so because there is still a conscience in the United States, a collective conscience which will bring to task any administration that tries to crush a people that is fighting for its self-determination and for retrieving of its usurped homeland. Will the Soviet Union having itself fought a revolution, consent to see a people crushed like the Palestinian people and only deal with this question in a peripheral manner? Only France has finally realized the just cause of the Palestinian people in recent pronouncements of its illustrious leader. And what treatment he is getting from the international press which to a large extent is controlled by Zionists!

95. Even one of his compatriots, Mr. Cassin, who should be a Frenchman first and foremost rather than a Zionist in disguise—I discovered him in 1950 or 1951 in the Palais de Chaillot when many of us were defending the right of self-determination; he stood against us in the Social and Humanitarian Culture Committee, against those of us who were fighting for the right of self-determination. That man associated himself with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and he was given such publicity in the newspapers as if he and two or three others had actually invented human rights. I wish I could have corrected that notion without mentioning him by name, but now I have mentioned him; all we have done in the United Nations is to codify human rights, not invent them. These rights have been enunciated by prophets, by reformers and by teachers throughout the ages in all parts of the world. Mr. Cassin has been using his office, using his Nobel prize, time and again in newspapers in Nice and now in newspapers in Paris and he has been quoted by none other than Mr. Tekoah to bolster his argument that the Palestinian people should be crushed, of course through all the modalities and sophistries of dialectics.

96. I hope I will be excused if I speak with emotion on this question because emotion is part of the human self. We harbour no hatred or rancour towards our Jewish brothers, even though they may be Zionists, if they do not hurt the Palestinian people. We are all brothers under the skin, but it is high time we leave aside platitudes as a means of endeavouring to settle questions in the United Nations. There is the International Court of Justice to which in 1947 we asked that the question of self-determination of the Palestinian people be referred, and I do not have to tell you all that happened as you can find it in the records. We were assured that the United Nations was created to bring about peace with justice. What kind of justice is that when in 1919 the Palestinian people made up 94 per cent of the

population and there were only 6 per cent Jews and when that land is transferred to them? We are now dealing with a fait accompli, you may say. We do not accept that fait accompli. If we Arab Governments accept the fait accompli, the Palestinian people will not accept it. A secretary of mine, originally a Palestinian, was in tears the other day. He is a Saudi now. He has been with me for twenty years. I said, "What is the matter?" He said, "I received a letter from my sister who is in one of the Arab lands. She found a piece of paper scribbled by her fourteen-year old son. He said, 'I have left with my friends to join the freedom-fighters to retrieve our homeland'." He is fourteen years old. His mother did not want him to go but the fire of the love for his homeland made him and others go. Who are the fighters? Are they old fogies belonging to the old régime? No, most of them are between the ages of fourteen and thirty and there are several hundred thousand of them; there will be more.

97. What do you want us, the Arab Governments, to do with them, crush them? What does Mr. Tekoah want us to do? The only way, I submit, is for Israel to concede that if its citizens want to have life in the Middle East—in the long run; I am not talking about the short term or the intermediate term—it has to recognize that we are living in the twentieth century and that it is not possible to rob a people, which has awakened, of its own homeland, but to find a way whereby the Jewish people in Palestine will not ultimately perish, as I am afraid they might do—perhaps not in my lifetime—or be assimilated for that matter, in which case they would lose their identity. But if they want to survive in the future, it is up to them to admit that it was a mistake to establish a State by causing the indigenous people of Palestine to leave their homeland by such violence as was perpetrated by the Stern terrorists, by the Irgun Zvai Leumi terrorists and by the Haganah terrorists.

98. Mr. Tekoah talks of terrorists. His leaders have a psychosis of the wrong cause or rather they had a psychosis of their cause in the wrong land because it was a land that was already populated. Now the Palestinians have a psychosis of retrieving that homeland. They could live side by side in peace only under the aegis of the United Nations, if there were no such thing as an Arab State in Palestine, no such thing as an Israeli State, but a State in which both communities could live in peace without one dominating the other—and if they were wise both of them would hoist the flag of Palestine. Incidentally the name "Palestine" came from the Philistines and the Philistines came from Crete and the Cretians lived at the time of King David of the Bible in Gaza.

99. That is the only solution. Otherwise, whether I am around here in years to come or not, it is not far-fetched for me to say that there may be a miscalculation whereby the coexistence that now prevails among the four Powers may perhaps turn into a period of irritation, whence a miscalculation which, with the diabolical weapons now at the command of the Big Powers, might well spell a third world war and the end of humanity.

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

101. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I should like to bring to the Council's attention two reports that may throw additional light on the nature of the terrorist bases at Ein Hazar. It has become known from authoritative sources that in the course of the Israeli action carried out yesterday, at least fifteen members of the terror organization were injured. Some of them were hospitalized in the Salt Hospital. Among them there were two commanders of the terror organization. A certain Yusuf Ali Mahmud Abu-Jamil, a member of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, captured by an Israeli patrol in the Dead Sea area on 27 February 1969 during an encounter between his unit and the Israeli patrol, told his interrogators the following: At the end of December 1968, he spent a few hours in one of the houses which Ambassador El-Farra described today as "cafés" or "rest-houses", at Ein Hazar. He was not alone, however, in that "rest-house"; there were thirty other saboteurs, dressed in uniforms of the terror organization and armed with rifles. Abu-Jamil also gave a detailed description of the El-Fatah bases at Ein Hazar.

102. Whatever changes may occur from time to time in the policies of the individual Governments, they cannot affect the validity of fundamental principles of international law. I trust that this is a tenet accepted by all, including the Soviet Union. All definitions of aggression, whether incorporated in international instruments or in the works of recognized authorities on international law, establish the sponsorship of acts of terror against another State as aggression. This is also true of the 1937 Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, and it is true of the definition we find in Oppenheim, volume I, pages 292 to 294. It is true also of the Soviet draft submitted to the General Assembly on 25 August 1953, and of the latest Soviet definition of aggression, submitted at the end of February to the Special Committee on the Definition of Aggression.

103. There has never been any doubt that this concept applies to the situation obtaining between Israel and the Arab States. At the 354th meeting of the Security Council, on 19 August 1948, the President of the Council, speaking in his capacity as representative of the Soviet Union, 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". [Page 45.]

And as recently as 31 December 1968, the representative of the USSR declared in the Security Council, in a debate concerning Israel's action against terror warfare from Lebanon:

"... if a State helps armed bands which are being organized on its territory and which then proceed to the territory of another State to attack it, that kind of action must be regarded, from the point of view of international law, as aggressive action". [1462nd meeting, para. 51.]

Then he continued:

"But the Israeli side has not shown any evidence which could prove the responsibility of the Government of

Lebanon for the attack against the Israeli airplane in the Athens airport. The Government of Lebanon, on the other hand, denies any participation in that act."

104. We submit that the open sponsorship of, and assistance to, terror organizations operating against Israel, and the maintenance of their training bases, recruitment offices and other installations on Jordanian territory fall within the Soviet representative's definition of helping armed bands to enter another State. Jordan cannot be absolved of responsibility for continued aggression against Israel. It would require a complete reversal of legal principles to disregard the fact that Jordan has waged war against Israel since 1948 and that it openly pursues warfare now by means of terror operations. It is therefore regrettable that the Soviet Union should refuse to apply its own concepts of aggression to the Middle East situation. It is regrettable, but perhaps not surprising, that the USSR, contrary to international law and opinion and contrary to United Nations jurisprudence, has given blanket approval to Arab terror warfare waged against Israel. The Soviet representative has made this clear again today, and his spurious attempt to legitimize, terror warfare is open encouragement to the Arab States to continue to violate the cease-fire and undermine further the prospects for peace, through the initiation of, and support for, the terror operations. With the terror operations that are being directed against Israeli civilians, statements such as the one we heard today from the Soviet representative could be interpreted as an open invitation to murder for murder's sake.

105. As I had the honour to mention at this morning's meeting, associations of European anti-Nazi resistance fighters, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1968, René Cassin, as well as the world press and other nations have condemned Arab terror warfare as similar to the Nazi murder of Jews. Yet, unfortunately, the Soviet Government has associated itself with this despicable movement directed against the liberty and the lives of the Jewish people in Israel.

106. It is a matter of common knowledge that the proclaimed objective of Arab terror warfare is the destruction of Israel. All this throws light on the persistently grim role the Soviet Union has been playing in the continuation of Arab belligerency against Israel and in the adamant refusal of the Arab States to join with the Government of Israel in the quest after a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

107. Had the Soviet Union a desire to see the termination of the Arab war waged against Israel since 1948 and had it favoured the promotion of peace agreements between Israel and the Arab States as called for in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, it would not have come out in support of one of the principal factors which are today endangering the achievement of that objective.

108. It is proper to recall all those facts as one hears these days, and as we have heard again today from the Soviet representative, that the Soviet Union aspires to play a role in the quest for a settlement in the Middle East. Now as long as the Soviet Union does not modify its policy of blind

support for Arab aggression against Israel and for Arab terror warfare against Israeli citizens, that Soviet role can only be a destructive and sinister one.

109. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Jordan.

110. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Mr. Tekoah challenged the statement of Jordan this morning about the places that were bombed yesterday by the Israeli jet fighters, and I should like to put the following before the Council. What I said this morning has been corroborated and emphasized by a reporter of *The New York Times*, who said in today's issue: "The raid by Israeli jets killed a number of Arab taxi drivers and passengers who were relaxing at this traditional and picturesque roadside rest near Salt."

111. What is more, I referred this morning to Mr. Sullivan, who was another eyewitness. He went to the scene to examine the place, met people and then reported to New Yorkers at 9 o'clock this morning on CBS. I quoted what he said this morning. But I should like to emphasize one thing which he said: "There were no signs of commandos in the area attacked by Israel." Not only were there no commandos, but there were no signs of commandos in that area.

112. Mr. Tekoah can try to distort facts, but facts are stubborn. He cannot distort the truth. The facts are there; the eyewitnesses are there.

113. Yesterday we invited the Red Cross to visit and examine the area and to see what is going on there, to see the results of the cruel and brutal Israeli attack against civilians. What is more, we invited the embassies not only of the permanent members of the Security Council, but of all members with accredited embassies to Jordan, to go there, to see and to report. I hope they will report the truth and I hope the truth will also be reported by my colleagues around this table as it is received by their representatives in Amman in Jordan. These are the facts, and no distortion, no campaign of deceit or misrepresentation can cover the truth.

114. Mr. Tekoah mentioned the arrest of Abu Jamal. I do not know who Abu Jamal is. But I do know that I presented before the Council the testimony of students who were arrested within the occupied area, of the way they were tortured to make confessions. They made all kinds of confessions in order to be relieved of Israeli torture, persecution and oppression. Torture is familiar to all members around this table, and I need not mention confessions that were made on other problems not by civilians, but by navy personnel, because they were under torture, they had said. Even if this Abu Jamal does exist, which I doubt—Israeli fiction can create many Abu Jamals, and we are used to that—whatever is related by Mr. Tekoah is the invention of Mr. Tekoah or of his authorities. It may be signed by Abu Jamal, but it is really the work of another member of the same gang, the Israeli gang of terrorism within the occupied area.

115. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should just like to make one comment.

116. The second statement by the representative of Israel makes me even more convinced—and I dare say this also applies to many other members of the Security Council—that his statement today and the position he has taken in the discussion of this question are directed towards undermining efforts to achieve a peaceful political settlement of the situation in the Middle East. This is quite obvious from his statement.

117. In its statement, the Soviet delegation showed that the commission of an aggressive act by Israel at a moment when sincere efforts are being made to find ways of achieving a political settlement in the Middle East, can only be interpreted, from the political point of view, from the international point of view, and from the point of view of the United Nations Charter and international law, as a premeditated attempt to undermine those noble efforts. And however much he may quibble, the representative of Israel cannot conceal that fact.

118. As for the references to international law and the draft definition of aggression, no formula can be found anywhere in international law, in any text-book on international law, or in the commentaries of the most authoritative international jurists, which states that the population of a territory which seized by the enemy is deprived of the right to hate the invader. There has never been and, I imagine, never will be such a principle of international law. Only Israel is attempting to introduce this principle that the Arab population, suffering under the jack-boot of the Israel invaders, should kiss that boot. Such a principle is quite impossible and no principles of international law can justify the aggressive and terroristic acts perpetrated against the population of the Arab territories occupied by Israel's forces. The sooner Israel embarks upon the path of co-operation with those who are sincerely striving to achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, the sooner the people of Israel and the people of the neighbouring Arab countries will be able to live peacefully.

119. That is the only political conclusion and one which should have been drawn long ago by Israel's leaders, both the previous leaders and those who have recently come to power. Yet judging by their official statements, the new leaders who have come to power seem to be determined to pursue no less hawkish a policy than the former leaders. The sooner they renounce such a policy, the better for the Arab people and for the people of that whole troubled and dangerous region.

120. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Israel.

121. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): It is not the first time that the Soviet Union has demonstrated that when it comes to Israel the laws generally applicable are not to be applied insofar as Israel is concerned. He refers to the presence of Israeli forces in certain territories held today under our control without referring, however, to the question now of how the Israeli forces reached those territories in the course of a war which has been continued by the Arab States against Israel since 1948, a war of defence by Israel, a war which the Soviet representatives in 1948 described as an Arab war of aggression against Israel. I wonder whether the excuse

which the Soviet representative has put forth for terror warfare directed by the Arab Governments against Israeli civilians would have applied equally to his own country and to the presence of his country's military forces in Germany after World War II and to the German movement of the so-called werewolves who were fighting and acting by the same methods then as the Arab terrorists are acting today against Israel?

122. As for the question of peace in the Middle East, I should like to emphasize that I pointed out that had the Soviet Union desired to see the termination of the Arab war waged against Israel since 1948, and had it in fact favoured the promotion of peace agreements between Israel and the Arab States, as called for in the 22 November 1967 resolution, it would not have come out in support of one of the principal factors which are today endangering the achievement of that objective. That factor is Arab terror warfare against Israel, warfare which is being waged with the proclaimed objective to achieve not peace but the destruction of Israel and the annihilation of its people.

123. The representative of Jordan, in quoting a report by Mr. Sullivan omitted two simple words which, I believe, were in that report—the words “I heard”. Mr. Sullivan “heard” from the Jordanian authorities what he reported—the same authorities which claimed that Israel took action on 15 March against civilian villages at the very same time that the terror organizations themselves were announcing that their bases were struck and their commandos hit. Mr. Sullivan “heard” from these Jordanian authorities. We heard otherwise.

124. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Jordan.

125. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): If Mr. Tekoah does not want to accept the article of the eyewitness of *The New York Times*, and if he also does not want to accept the radio dispatch of Mr. Sullivan—I do not have the tape of that dispatch, it is difficult to get it now—may I refer this august body to the words of Israel itself so that it can see to what extent this campaign of distortion is continuing. What did the Israelis say before attacking and after attacking these civilian centres? Again I will quote the statement of the Israelis in *The New York Times* of today, 27 March 1969. They said:

“Israeli jets crossed the cease-fire line today in what is now becoming a routine military operation to attack what were described here”—described by whom? By the Israeli authorities—“as suspected Arab commando bases in Jordan.”

“Suspected”. Does mere suspicion warrant a campaign of murder? Does it warrant an act of genocide? They are “suspecting” the presence of commandos. Supposing that even this statement is to be accepted—not *The New York Times*, nor the radio dispatch, but the Israeli statement—is it enough to “suspect” to send jets to murder and kill and destroy?

126. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In clarification, I should like to

reply briefly to the question of the representative of Israel. He asked how the Israeli forces came to be on Arab territory. My answer is clear: as a result of Israel's aggression in June 1967. And the sooner they leave Arab territory the sooner the problems will be solved. The sooner Israel officially declares before the whole world that it recognizes Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and is prepared to implement all its provisions, the sooner will the problem of the Middle East be settled in a peaceful political manner. The question is clear.

127. And it is high time the representative of Israel stopped slandering the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union provides the best example in the middle of the twentieth century of the unity of a multinational State, since more than 100 nationalities in the Soviet Union live as friends and brothers in a single State, a fact of which we are proud. We consider that to have thus turned our homeland into a truly fraternal family of more than 100 nationalities is one of the greatest achievements and victories of the Great October Socialist Revolution in our country.

128. And you slander the Soviet Union by saying that we support the destruction of States, including the State of Israel. That is a slander, a malicious base slander. It is high time to put an end to this, especially in such a forum, for it is a complete fabrication by those who have nothing to say. That is why they resort to slander. The way to a peaceful settlement is very clear. The Soviet Union has said this repeatedly. We are sincerely striving towards that end together with all those who sincerely wish to see a speedy political settlement in the Middle East, without the use of force, without propaganda for the imposition of a solution. We are not concerned with the imposition of a solution, but with the question of peacefully settling this problem which is a very dangerous one and which is creating a dangerous hotbed of international tension. The world has still not heard a clear and definite statement from Israel either about the resolution or about its agreement to implement the resolution, or about its agreement to participate sincerely and seriously in the efforts now being made on this very important question by, among others, the four great Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council.

129. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Israel.

130. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I agree entirely with the representative of the Soviet Union that slander and abuse will not make us move in the constructive direction that we should be moving in at the present stage in our quest for peace. I have not said that the Soviet Union supports the idea of the destruction of the State of Israel. We would have never thought that a Member State of the United Nations, a permanent member of the Security Council, one of the States that were among the first to give recognition

to Israel's independence, would harbour such ideas. What I indicated, however, is that today again the representative of the Soviet Union expressed unreserved support for Arab terror warfare. It is this Arab terror warfare which is being carried on under the banner of the destruction of Israel and the annihilation of its people. Consequently, the Soviet Union's support for this warfare is sinister and grim, and cannot be a constructive contribution to the efforts that are being made today to reach a peaceful solution in the establishment of just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

131. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I apologize for speaking once again. I should like to refer to an official statement of the Soviet Union. Only recently I had the honour to address to you, Mr. President, a letter transmitting a Tass statement which included the following passage:

"As regards the statements by Tel Aviv politicians concerning 'massive reprisals', they should bear in mind that the struggle of peoples against invaders and occupiers is justified and legitimate from the point of view of international law. The longer the Israel forces remain in occupied Arab territories, the stronger and more extensive will the Arabs' struggle for liberation become. This should be kept in mind by those shortsighted politicians who are heading for a protracted war while professing their readiness for talks." [S/9073.]²

132. This is the truth, this is logic, these are the rules of international law. No rules of international law can justify the occupation of the Arab territories.

133. In the Tass statement, the following is said about the position of the Soviet Union:

"The Soviet Union declares itself to be firmly in favour of an immediate peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, in conformity with the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The States and peoples of the Middle East must finally have the opportunity of living in a fair and lasting peace, free from violence and no longer at the mercy of aggressive forces." [Ibid.]

This applies to the peoples of all States in the Middle East both Israel and the Arab States.

134. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I have no more speakers on my list. I therefore propose to adjourn this meeting. As a result of consultations with members of the Council, and with their agreement, I propose to convene the next meeting tomorrow morning at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

² Ibid., page 118.