



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1468**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 28 MARCH 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1468) .....	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-EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 28 March 1969, at 10.30 a.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/1468)

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 French*): In accordance with the decision taken at earlier meetings of the Council, I propose to invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel and Saudi Arabia to take seats at the Council table in order to participate in the debate, without the right to vote.

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

2. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): At the request of Jordan, the Security Council has again been convened to consider the question of the blatant aggression perpetrated by the Tel Aviv authorities against the village of Ein Hazar, where scores of innocent people met their death.

This is of course just one of the violent manifestations of the explosive situation prevailing in the Middle East.

3. This aggression by Israel against Jordan is, however, part of a strategy which has been carefully worked out by the Tel Aviv authorities to destroy the economic resources of the Arab countries and to compel them to accept a settlement foisted upon them. The fact that, twenty years ago, Israel intruded in a region of the Arab world is confirmed by facts and principles which are inspired by colonialist ideology.

4. The magnitude of the damage recently inflicted on the property of the Jordanian people, which was the fruit of several generations of work, and the terror and oppression, are aggravating a situation which is already precarious and fraught with danger. Today as yesterday, Israel is profiting with impunity from experiences and methods which we thought to be no longer current but which it continues to develop to the nth degree. These methods reveal the expansionist ambitions of Israel. The international community cannot remain impassive in the face of a process which is proving to be more aggressive than all the colonialist systems from which Israel took its cue.

5. The daily bombing of the territory of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is part of the escalation theory practised in other regions of the world and is designed above all to cover up the failure of an occupation policy and to justify something which, by its very nature, constitutes permanent aggression.

6. For over twenty years the Israeli aggressor has been oppressing, plundering and massacring a people unjustly deprived of its right to self-determination and national existence. This is the origin of the tragedy and of the crises which rack the Middle East and periodically produce tensions likely to threaten international peace and security.

7. Today a people which has long been ignored is rising up against its aggressor and is resolutely demanding justice and recognition of its rights.

8. It is this resistance to a twenty-year old occupation and Israel's inability to overcome it which have led Israel to cease to seek the source of its failures within the territories that it occupies illegally, but to attribute them to the support coming from outside, without which, we are told, the "pacification" process would be almost completed.

9. In fact, the whole world is witnessing the implementation of a strategy designed to secure military occupation of the territory of sovereign countries, States Members of

the United Nations, and to break down all resistance by the Palestinian movement and the Arab peoples. The struggle of the Palestinian people has assumed international dimensions and cannot therefore be disregarded as a political fact and an irreversible phenomenon of the liberation struggle.

10. The repeated attacks on Palestine's neighbouring Arab countries are due to the fact that this reality, which is essential to an understanding of the Middle East problem, is deliberately ignored and provides Israel with a convenient pretext for putting into operation what it hypocritically christens the policy of "active defence".

11. It seems to the Algerian delegation that Israel's systematic practice of its aggressive policy calls for decisions by the Security Council, decisions which should be designed first of all to put an end to the occupation of Arab territories.

12. Whether in the case of the Middle East, of Southern Rhodesia or of Namibia, it is only a firm determination on the part of the Security Council to ensure the implementation of its own decisions that will enable the repeated aggressions by those well versed in the use of force to be brought to an end and will spare us the necessity of meeting regularly to try to find solutions to this problem, for which no solution can be found.

13. The only solution worthy of the name lies in the application of the general principles of law and of the United Nations Charter.

14. Time and again, we have drawn the Council's attention to Israel's probable intentions with regard to the territories east of Jordan. We have pointed to the active complicity that Israel enjoys. It is to be feared that Israel might show that it has additional designs on other territories besides those which were seized during the war of 5 June.

15. Following a plan that has now become accepted, certain Powers are obviously more concerned to restore peace in the Middle East on the basis, of course, of an allegedly realistic point of view which would leave Israel in possession of the greater part of its conquests than to see the Council effectively fulfil its mission, namely, to find a solution for the Middle East problem which would take into account all the interests involved, and particularly the restoration of their rights to the Palestinian people.

16. The Members of the United Nations and the Organization itself can certainly not be guided by an attitude based on a permanent compromise to the advantage of the powerful, for the United Nations was in fact created in response to the need to protect the weakest nations against the greed of the strongest.

17. With regard to the case now before the Security Council, to countenance such acts of aggression on the part of the Tel Aviv authorities, after they have clearly defined their strategy of so-called "active defence", which consists in establishing armed aggression against sovereign States as a political programme, would amount to authorizing the escalation which has already reached alarming heights. It is the duty of the Security Council to condemn Israel

unequivocally for the aggression committed against Jordan. To that end, it must work out the steps which are necessary, in accordance with the Charter, to put an end to the daily aggression of Israel.

18. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Once again an act of violence has prompted the Security Council to meet to consider the situation in the Middle East. The representative of Jordan told us that Israeli jet planes have attacked a defenceless civilian area, causing death and destruction. The representative of Israel, charging the Government of Jordan with responsibility for the activities of the Palestinian commandos, claims that this was an act of legitimate self-defence. For the Security Council, which has the responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the area, motives and intentions count for less than the act itself. The Council cannot accept as valid any arguments put forward to justify unilateral military action that constitutes a breach of the cease-fire arrangements established in the area.

19. Yet, neither this nor the many other incidents the Security Council has previously dealt with can be considered in isolation. They must be seen as part of the unbroken cycle of violence that is undermining and eroding the cease-fire arrangements. The fighting continues intermittently not only along the cease-fire lines, as for instance between Israel and the United Arab Republic along the Suez Canal in recent days, but also on a different level, inside the countries involved, in a deadly dialogue of violence and reprisal, adding constantly to the tragic losses suffered by the civilian populations throughout the Middle East area.

20. The Security Council, in our view, must reject the use of force whenever and in whatever shape it occurs. It cannot ignore an act of violence. It must insist that all the parties to the conflict strictly observe the cease-fire and refrain from any action likely to increase tension in the area.

21. A cease-fire by its very nature is a temporary arrangement. The Security Council resolutions of June 1967, calling upon the parties to stop the fighting, said this was "a first step" [resolutions 233 and 234 (1967)]. It was intended to be the first step toward making peace. But the next step still remains to be taken. One thing clearly emerges from all the conflicting claims we have heard here, and that is that the only effective way to put an end to the use of force and to the continued violence in the Middle East is to take that next step and remove the state of insecurity that has existed in the area not only since June 1967 but for much longer. The latest incident with which we are dealing today only serves to underline this fact.

22. The Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] sets out the principles on which a just and lasting peace can be established. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, is continuing his contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement. At the same time, as we all know, the major Powers, four permanent members of the Security Council, are moving toward joint talks on the

subject of the Middle East. This development should be welcomed, we believe, by the international community as a whole, for it gives rise to hope that we may see progress toward creating stable and permanent conditions of peace for all the States in the Middle East area.

23. The question before us should, in our view, be considered in this wider international context. It would be unfortunate indeed if we now were to proceed in a manner that might make the forthcoming negotiations more difficult. The overriding interest of the Security Council must be to promote unity among its members, and particularly among the four major Powers, in the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

24. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): Brutal force was used at Salt on 26 March in a clear breach of the cease-fire. The end result of the Israeli attack was a pitiful toll of innocent victims of both sexes and all ages. My delegation deplores profoundly this indiscriminate attack.

25. Mr. President, for nearly two years we in the Council have had brought to our notice in one form or another an appalling list of violent acts committed in the Middle East. The victims of Salt were far from being the first innocent civilians, Arabs or Israelis, to suffer maiming and death, and they will not be the last. Bombing, shelling, laying of mines—these are now almost daily occurrences. The violence of this bitter feud has even spread to peaceful international civilian airports. My delegation condemns all acts of violence and breaches of the cease-fire by both sides.

26. Three things are clear. One is that while it is right and proper for the parties to bring to the notice of the Council serious individual incidents and to ask us to focus our attention on them, we are only tinkering with the problem if we concentrate on individual incidents. Each side invokes passionate justification for the use of violence by their side and the legitimacy of reprisal. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the case, violence inevitably leads to counter-violence. There is no end to this argument except by getting to the root of the situation itself.

27. Secondly, it is clear that the time has come when action to settle the problem cannot longer be delayed. The incident now before us and the many other incidents brought to our notice by letter and in the speeches of the representatives of Jordan and of Israel show a highly dangerous and critical situation. In the world of today with horrific weapons of mass destruction lurking in mankind's arsenal for misuse if the Middle East conflagration spreads, the dangerous situation in that area cannot be allowed to go on as it is.

28. Thirdly, the outside world cannot afford to stand by and treat this as a local quarrel. The parties have had long enough to try and resolve it on their own. It is right and proper that there should now be new initiatives for peace involving in particular four permanent members of this Council with particular responsibility for international peace and security.

29. Mr. President, in the minds of all Council members today, when they consider how to deal with this particular

incident, is the knowledge that hopeful new peace initiatives are in train. Four-Power talks are expected to commence before long and the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, is again in the field, pressing the parties to clarify their terms for settlement. The Council must condemn any action which damages the prospects of success of these peace initiatives. Furthermore, we are entitled to demand, in the strongest terms, sincere co-operation by both sides. Amongst many discouraging words yesterday we heard some phrases which may give us hope. "We want peace", said Ambassador El-Farra. "It is high time for peace between Israel and Jordan", said Ambassador Tekoah. And I need hardly say that my country would not have agreed to take part in the forthcoming four-Power talks if we did not believe that all the Powers concerned were sincerely committed to a continuing and constructive search for a just peace.

30. What are we to do now in the Council? I can understand fully the powerful emotion of the Jordanian people as they bury their dead countrymen and countrywomen, but I would beg Ambassador El-Farra to keep his eye on the basic long-term national interest of his country which must lie in a just peace, and I would ask him to reflect on the need at this vital juncture to preserve the unanimity of the Council. A serious public split now, just when we are entering on an important new stage of the joint search for peace, would be a setback to the interests of the Jordanian people, as well as to those of all the peoples in the Middle East and indeed the world.

31. Mr. President, the policy of my country is the same as that expressed by Ambassador Malik as the policy of the Soviet Union. If I may use his words, "We sincerely want to find a peaceful settlement together with all those who want a speedy political settlement, without resort to force, without propaganda, without imposing anything."<sup>1</sup>

32. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): The present meetings of the Security Council have been convened at the request of Jordan, following the bombing of the Jordanian village of Ein Hazar by Israel jet fighters. Reports that seem to be quite impartial indicate that eighteen civilians were killed and twenty-five wounded, several of them seriously. The targets hit were primarily residential and civilian establishments. Other letters sent to the President of the Council show that this was not an isolated bombing attack. Other attacks have been carried out during the last few weeks and they too have claimed many victims. Serious damage has been done to villages and to crops.

33. From the purely humanitarian point of view, such deliberate operations, carried out without any warning, call for outright condemnation. They victimize the innocent. They spread the ravages of war and destruction in a country which has already suffered cruelly. Jordan has been deprived of a substantial part of its territory since June 1967 and is experiencing the greatest difficulty in ensuring the subsistence both of its population and of the hundreds of thousands of refugees to which it has given shelter and which live on its soil in highly precarious conditions,

<sup>1</sup> Cited from the interpretation given at the 1467th meeting. See para. 128.

despite United Nations assistance. Raids like that on Ein Hazar disrupt their lives even more.

34. If we are to believe statements made by Israel, these repeated air raids represent a new tactic of carrying out preventive attacks on dwelling places and villages where there are thought to be *fedayeen*. But that reasoning could never justify such operations as these, which constitute a new stage in the escalation of military action about which we have every reason to be disturbed.

35. In his counter-charge, the representative of Israel emphasized the fact that they were countermeasures to commando activities, blows and attacks which had been considerably stepped up of late and which also caused civilian casualties. He accused the Arab Governments of supporting or condoning *fedayeen* activities. We have repeatedly stated here that we condemn all violations of the cease-fire and demand its strict observation. We wish to repeat this once again today. In our view, the artillery duels which have taken place recently along the Suez Canal are equally regrettable.

36. Even if the air raids which Israel is now carrying out are aimed at crushing terrorist activities and eventually eliminating them, are they not in fact having the opposite effect? Far from bringing about any lessening of the attacks and blows, they can only increase the animosity among the people who suffered them and strengthen the reaction of which the *fedayeen* are a manifestation. They can only deepen the gulf separating the Arabs and the Israelis, and rule out, or at least delay, the possibility of a settlement which the Government of Israel itself is seeking.

37. What we are in fact witnessing is the intensification and strengthening of the infernal and hopeless cycle of acts and reprisals, to the danger of which the French delegation has often drawn attention. It is with the greatest concern that today my delegation notes an increasing deterioration in the situation, which only serves to justify its fears.

38. During the months of May and June 1967, the French Government did everything in its power among the various States concerned to prevent the outbreak of an armed conflict. Unfortunately, its efforts were unsuccessful. In the months which followed, it did all it could to limit the consequences of the conflict and to bring about conditions conducive to appeasement. At meeting after meeting of the Council, the French delegation pointed out that as long as there was no settlement, as long as the occupation lasted, there was the danger that the incidents would continue and inevitably increase in number. That is why, on every possible occasion after the unanimous adoption of resolution 242 of 22 November 1967, my delegation has called for the rapid implementation of the resolution. Unfortunately our efforts in that direction have produced no result. The mission entrusted to Mr. Jarring—to whose intelligence, energy and loyalty we wish once again to pay a tribute—has not so far had the desired results. On various occasions he has been faced with the argument that the best way to achieve a settlement was through direct negotiations between the parties. It seemed, however, that in the present circumstances it would not be possible to conduct such negotiations and that it was therefore not realistic to hope for such a course of action.

39. Faced with the deterioration in the situation, the gravity of which, after these new incidents, cannot escape any of us, and in order to make headway towards a peaceful settlement, towards the just and lasting peace desired by all, the French Government has suggested that four permanent members of the Security Council should combine their efforts to seek a way of implementing the resolution of 22 November 1967 which will be acceptable to the parties.

40. My delegation feels it its duty to voice once again and most emphatically the concern caused by the present developments and the obvious escalation in the military action. They confirm it in its conviction that the deterioration cannot be allowed to continue, that the four Powers must, as soon as possible, show themselves equal to the special responsibilities which their position in the Council confers on them and that all nations of goodwill should join together to support all those who are working towards a peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis.

41. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Once again the Security Council finds itself confronted with the tragic situation caused by another grave attack by Israel on civilian targets in Arab States. According to impartial descriptions in the press, this attack has been one of particular severity. Even if the air attack on rest-houses and winter resorts in Ein Hazar had been an isolated incident, it would have called for condemnation. But that it is part of a systematic pattern of acts by Israel, to exploit its complete air superiority in the region and inflict so much indiscriminate destruction, is clear from the abundant evidence before us.

42. Let me mention some of these attacks which were reported to the Security Council. I limit myself to those which were not the subject of debate in this forum. On 1 December 1968 Israeli armed forces using aircraft attacked centres of civilian population in the northern part of the Jordan valley.<sup>2</sup> Two days later, on 3 December 1968, Israeli forces heavily shelled the city of Irbid and bombed some villages in Jordan, killing fifteen civilians and seriously wounding seventeen others, most of them elderly people, women and children. Large-scale destruction of property was also caused.<sup>3</sup> On 24 February 1969 Israel launched air attacks on the suburbs of Damascus. At Al-Hameh, Zebdani and Maysaloun, civilian casualties amounted to fifteen dead and forty wounded. Women and children were again the main victims [see S/9028]. On 16 and again on 17 March, Israeli aircraft launched attacks using rockets and even napalm, according to reports, on Jordanian villages and areas [see S/9113].

43. I need hardly recount here the repeated large-scale attacks by Israel on civilian installations and other targets in the Suez Canal sector. The enormous loss caused by these massive attacks to the economic life of the people of the United Arab Republic is well known. The Security Council will recall that when military actions of this kind on the part of Israel in March, August and December of last year were discussed in the Council, Israel pleaded the right of

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-Third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1968*, document S/8911.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/8916.

reprisal. Mindful of the basic principle of the Charter of the United Nations in regard to the use of force, the Council rejected that plea. It could not but consider that the theory advanced by Israel, if accepted, would destroy the rules of law embodied in the Charter.

44. Resolutions 248, 256 and 262 of 1968 condemned the military attacks by Israel. Paragraph 3, of resolution 248 (1968), explicitly declared that:

“... such actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts.”

45. If this was the Council's stand in regard to actions which, according to the Israeli argument, were taken in retaliation against specific acts directed against it, it is obvious that a much more forceful stand by the Security Council is called for in a case where even such a pretext cannot be advanced.

46. The significant feature of the attack which occurred on Wednesday is not merely that it was one of the worst air raids on Jordan since the 1967 war but that Israeli jets selected as their target a place where, according to the testimony of survivors, there were no military installations and where no anti-aircraft fire had been directed against Israeli planes. That this was not a fortuitous occurrence is clear from the fact that the Israeli Government has recently proclaimed the doctrine of “active defence”. The nature of this so-called doctrine can be understood from a dispatch from Jerusalem, datelined 16 March, in regard to another recent Israeli air attack on Jordan which was published in *The New York Times* of 17 March. The relevant extract from this dispatch reads:

“This morning's raids were the first in which no effort was made by Israeli officials to cite specific Arab border or infiltration activity as a basis for the attack.

“The new policy goes beyond the earlier concept of conducting what were generally considered to be reprisal raids for Arab actions.”

47. In regard to Wednesday's attack, the Israeli version is that the target was a suspected commando base. Two questions arise here. In the first place: can men and women and children be killed and property destroyed merely on the basis of suspicion? Secondly, how can one tell a *fedayeen* from anyone else? It can thus be seen that the Israeli doctrine of self-defence is nothing but the assertion of an unlimited right to attack the territories of Arab States and inflict cruel punishment for their offence of having given refuge to the uprooted people of Palestine. Such a doctrine completely disregards the rules of civilized behaviour. Nor is it likely to prevent the increase in strength and activities of the resistance movement.

48. The added significance of the timing of the latest major attack has already been commented upon by some of our colleagues in this debate. This attack came precisely at the time when some hope was being aroused by the efforts

of four permanent members of the Security Council to promote a just solution of the Middle East conflict.

49. Confronted with this situation, the Security Council cannot disregard its own obligations under the Charter. It must keep in view the clear provisions of the resolutions to which I referred a moment ago. It must not absolve Israel from the restraints imposed on States by the rules of international conduct. It must remain mindful of the necessity of injecting an element of restraint and responsibility into the conduct of Governments.

50. Above all, the Council has to remain faithful to its commitments in the earlier resolutions. The very nature of Israel's proclaimed policy of active defence makes it incumbent on the Council to take a stronger stand than it took in regard to earlier acts.

51. With these considerations in mind, the least the Council can do is to make a pronouncement containing the following two elements: first, it should condemn this attack as a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions; second, it should issue a final warning to Israel that the repetition of such attacks would result in the adoption by the Security Council of the necessary measures under the Charter.

52. Such a pronouncement will serve to arrest a further deterioration of the situation if it is supported by the permanent members in the discharge of their special responsibilities. The great Powers certainly can ensure that such a pronouncement is heeded. They have the resources and the means; what is required is the will.

53. We fully realize that the dictates of realism, balance and restraint cannot be disregarded. But it is not balance to equate the grave violations of the cease-fire committed by Israel with the actions of Arab resistance organizations. It is not balance to forget that popular resistance is the inevitable result of, and response to, alien occupation. It is not balance to impose on the Governments of Arab States the impossible task of suppressing the legitimate struggle of the people of Palestine for a return in freedom to their own homeland. For twenty years they have waited; nothing has been done to redress the wrongs inflicted on them. Is it surprising that in the present situation they should be acting as they do?

54. My delegation is firmly convinced that the element of balance required in the present situation can be provided only by a scrupulous regard for the principles of the United Nations Charter and the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council. The condonation, by omission to act, of Israel's attacks on Arab States, the disregard of the principle of the inadmissibility of territorial conquest, the relegation to oblivion in the name of realism of frontiers changed and people subjugated by military occupation, the assumption that solemn international agreements can be considered to have lapsed because one party has unilaterally violated them—all these are the direct antithesis of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

55. In the present situation, they not only militate against the legal and moral norms of the Charter; they also

undermine the very basis of any realistic quest for a peaceful settlement. Resolution 242 (1967) emphasizes the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, and calls for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict.

56. We should like to reiterate once again in this forum that the task of promoting a solution of the Middle East conflict has little chance of success if this basic principle is in any way compromised.

57. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Israel.

58. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): My delegation has listened with attention to the statements made by members of the Security Council. The views of Governments, Members of our Organization, are always of interest. Their effect and validity, however, are irrevocably dependent on their relationship to the fundamental concepts of international law, the United Nations Charter, equity and justice. Thus the political views of certain Governments cannot affect the basic right of self-defence.

59. Israel has been in a state of self-defence since 1948. It will remain so until the Arab Governments agree to end the war waged against Israel and conclude peace. The methods of self-defence employed by Israel cannot be prescribed by the aggressor States or by their supporters. The criminal cannot complain that the victim of his attack has seized his arm and holds it in firm grip until there is certainty that he will not attack again.

60. The story of the denial of the rights of nations to the Jewish people is a long one. Jewish sovereignty was restored only twenty-one years ago, but it is time to understand that the Jewish State will not acquiesce in any attempt to curtail its rights or to apply to it precepts different from those applicable to others. If there are generally accepted concepts on what aggression means, those concepts must be applied to the war waged by the Arab States against Israel for two decades. If terrorism against another State is generally recognized as aggression, then Arab terror warfare against Israel is aggression, whether in 1949, or 1956, or 1969. If it is clear to all that the attacked has the right to defend himself, then Israel must maintain its right to defend itself against open, relentless Arab belligerency. If a cease-fire implies reciprocal, scrupulous observance by both sides, Israel cannot but insist on such observance on the part of the Arab Governments. If war normally ends by peace agreements negotiated between parties to the conflict, if all Members of the United Nations have the right to live in peace and security, Israel will not accept deals which aim at denying it this right.

61. The effect and validity of the views expressed by Member Governments in this Council are also related to the regard those views accord to facts. Those views become of dubious value when, for instance, they ignore the basic fact that the Arab terror warfare is not a result of the June 1967 hostilities, but has been employed by the Arab States as a method of war for years: in the fifties and sixties, whenever war by regular armies was considered by the Arab Governments too risky.

62. Those views become dubious when they disregard the fact that the targets of the terror operations are innocent men, women and children, and when they fail to recognize terror warfare for what it really is: murder for the sake of murder. True, we do live in a period when Bonnie and Clyde are sometimes glamourized, but this cannot change the fact that Bonnie and Clyde are criminals.

63. Yesterday [1466th meeting, para. 107], I referred to a resolution adopted at the Seventh International Conference of the Associations of Resistance and Deportation in April 1968. I should now like to bring before the Security Council another decision adopted by the International Organization of Resistance and Deportation Associations in January of this year. The resolution reads:

“The Seventh International Conference of the Associations of Resistance and Deportation has already taken a stand regarding the Arab commandos who claim to be acting as the resistance did in the territories occupied by the Nazi armies during the Second World War. Yet, the resistance never deliberately attacked the lives of innocent women, men and children; no member of the resistance would ever tolerate that the character and the aims of his struggle should be so hideously distorted—a struggle in which took part thousands of men and women who now live in Israel, where they found a haven, and in a desire to achieve nothing but peace and tranquility.

“The International Union of Resistance and Deportation hereby reiterates the condemnation of terrorism in the Middle East, as was expressed first by the Seventh International Conference of the Associations of Resistance and Deportation. No one can compare the spirit of resistance with terrorist activities and odious and blind crimes intended to provoke fear and insecurity, to give rise to violence, when all possibilities are openly offered for an open discussion, or try to compare with the resistance against Nazism the fanatics surrounded by former Nazi criminals who merely prolong the Hitler genocide and thereby offer an insult which is felt deeply not only by the citizens of Israel, who courageously fight for their right to life, but by all those who resisted and who remain true to themselves.”

64. A resolution in a similar spirit was adopted recently by the French Action Committee of Resistance, a body which represents the French resistance groups against Nazi occupation. I would respectfully suggest that those representatives who find it possible to draw a comparison between the heroic European resistance movements and thugs who kill innocent civilians should allow the resistance movements to speak for themselves.

65. Finally, one cannot but question views offered by members of the Security Council who *a priori* identify themselves with positions inimical to Israel irrespective of the merits of those positions. One cannot but question views of States which, in defiance of the United Nations, deny Israel's right to independence and security or States which have found it possible to impose unilateral measures against Israel contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. There is one way and one way only to attain a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict: ensure the faithful



observance of the cease-fire and proceed towards agreement between the parties concluded by the parties on a just and lasting peace. Israel will pursue this road. It hopes that Jordan and the other Arab States will do likewise.

66. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

67. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Yesterday [*1466th meeting*] we heard Mr. Tekoah speak about twenty centuries, twenty years of peace, security and what-not. Yesterday we heard Mr. Tekoah lecture the Council about the jurisprudence of the United Nations. Today, after hearing the condemnation of the Israeli act which came from every member around this table who spoke, Mr. Tekoah has again attacked the Security Council and has told the Council, "We will continue our stand" and that the views of the Council's members cannot affect the basic Israeli right of self-defence—self-defence not as declared by the jurisprudence of the United Nations, which he championed yesterday, but as defined by him:

68. This is not the first time that Mr. Tekoah has attacked the Council. During the debate of last December in connexion with the attack on the Beirut airport, it was Mr. Tekoah who called the Security Council "morally, politically and juridically bankrupt" [*1462nd meeting*]. It was Mr. Tekoah's people, leaders and Government which attacked the Security Council in different ways and in different slanderous statements. I will not take up much of your time to quote them as I am sure that we are all familiar with the behaviour of Israel towards this august body. What I do want to bring to the attention of the Council is that those statements made by Mr. Tekoah should not divert the attention of the Security Council from the dictates of the Charter and from the jurisprudence of the Security Council. The Security Council has taken many decisions deploring the acts of Israel, condemning its behaviour, censuring the Government of Israel and warning it, and I think that it is about time that this body saw to it that Israel put an end to this complete arrogance, to this utter defiance, to this intoxication with the arrogance of power.

69. The Security Council took a decision in 1951 condemning a violation of the cease-fire and a violation of the Armistice Agreement. That resolution was sponsored by France, the United Kingdom and the United States, three of the big Powers sitting around this table.

70. On 24 November 1953 the Security Council condemned Israel on the question of Qibya as being:

"... inconsistent with Israel's obligations under the [*General*] Armistice Agreement... and the Charter" [*resolution 101 (1953)*].

The Security Council strongly censured Israel for that action. Again this resolution was presented by three big Powers, France, the United States and the United Kingdom.

71. The Security Council condemned Israel on 29 March 1955. It said that this was an act committed by Israeli regular armed forces against the Gaza people on 28

February 1955. Here again we had a condemnation sponsored by the three big Powers, France, the United States and the United Kingdom. And all those decisions were all adopted unanimously.

72. The jurisprudence of the Security Council that was referred to yesterday shows that Israel was condemned by the Security Council for the fourth time on 19 January 1956 for another attack by the army of Israel—against Syria this time. That resolution [*III (1956)*] expressed grave concern at the failure of the Government of Israel to comply with its obligations and warned that the Security Council "... will have to consider what further measures under the Charter are required to maintain or restore the peace". The same three Western Powers sponsored this resolution which was unanimously adopted by the whole membership of the Security Council.

73. The Security Council also condemned Israel in 1962 [*see resolution 171 (1962)*]. It reaffirmed resolution III (1956) from which I have just quoted an extract, and which not only condemned Israeli military action, "whether or not"—in the words of the resolution—"undertaken by way of retaliation," and again warned Israel that it would have to consider further measures under the Charter to restore peace.

74. In the case of Es Samu, the Security Council condemned Israel on 25 November 1966. Here again the Security Council censured "Israel for this large-scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan" [*resolution 228 (1966)*].

75. The other condemnations of last year are still fresh in the memories of all of us. I need not mention the attack on the Beirut airport nor refer to the attack on Karameh nor the attack on Shuna. The condemnations in those cases too are part and parcel of the jurisprudence of the Security Council.

76. Mr. Tekoah referred again this morning to resistance. I am glad that the Security Council is making a distinction between a crime committed by the Israeli armed forces and a reaction to the occupation that is taking place in the west bank of Jordan, in the Gaza Strip, in Golan and in Sinai. This distinction is very important, because it also reflects the jurisprudence of the Security Council and the stand taken by the members of the Security Council on every previous case of a similar nature.

77. I listened carefully to the statement made this morning by my friend and colleague, Sir Leslie Glass, in which he asked me very kindly to assist in maintaining and preserving the unity of the Council, because that would also be in the interest of my Government. I am paraphrasing what he said. I am grateful to Sir Leslie Glass for his advice, which I shall take and which will certainly guide my stand, because it is always good to take the advice of friends. And my colleagues around this table are the friends of the victim, the friends of Jordan. I am for the unity of the Council. Of course, unity is needed and unity can only stem from the jurisprudence of the Council. That is the criterion for the unity of the Council. The representative of the

United Kingdom has in the past given us the criterion for dealing with a situation of this kind. I shall quote what the representative of the United Kingdom said with reference to a similar situation at the 635th meeting of the Security Council:

"Her Majesty's Government has, in any case, already stated that in its view there was no possible justification for such action"—the Israeli attack on a village in Jordan—"and, through Her Majesty's Ambassador in Tel Aviv, it has informed the Israel Government of its horror at this apparently calculated attack."

A similar attack had taken place earlier and what I quoted was the stand of the representative of the United Kingdom. The quotation continues:

"The further information that has come to hand and the increased toll of life can only confirm my Government in condemning it and reinforce its opinion that it has constituted a threat to the security of the entire area." [635th meeting, para. 49.]

78. The United Kingdom told Israel, first, that there was no justification whatsoever for its attack and that it should not raise the question of reprisal or retaliation, and, secondly, that the attack did threaten peace in the whole area. Then the United Kingdom at that time rendered advice to Israel, stating:

"The unfortunate thing is that this kind of wholesale and indiscriminate reprisal should be indulged in at all.

"The trouble about such a reprisal raid as that at Qibya"—a village in Jordan which is now occupied by the Israelis—"is that it will, probably only result in a growth in the number of persons who decide to cross into Israel to revenge themselves by taking life for life." [Ibid., paras. 50 and 53.]

79. That was the advice of the United Kingdom to Israel. Thus, the United Kingdom said that that reprisal raid may bring upon Israel the very thing which it had hoped to stop.

80. There is a distinction between a violation of the Armistice Agreement and the Charter and the cease-fire and previous resolutions, and acts taken by people under occupation resisting the occupier. I should now like to turn to occupation and resistance.

81. Mr. Tekoah raised the question that resistance in Europe was separate and different. He tries to make a distinction between liberation movements in Europe and liberation movements in Africa, Asia or some other places. Occupation is occupation everywhere. It has no colour. Domination is domination everywhere. It has no colour. Liberation from domination is part and parcel of the reaction which is expected from every people subjected to foreign domination. Why should we make a distinction between resistance in Europe and resistance in Palestine, or in Angola, or in Rhodesia or in South Africa? It is the same. Colour is not involved here. What did the allies do during the war? Mr. Tekoah spoke about resistance in Europe and said there was a difference. Here is a message

that was conveyed, an appeal inviting the people in occupied Europe to resist Hitler and Hitlerism. The appeal was sent from outside to the occupied people urging them to resist. It states:

"Dear brothers! Dear sisters!

"We remember you,

"We think of you,

"We are with you with our hearts,

"In this serious hour, do not despair! We are coming soon.

"We shall return to you under the banners of victory.

"Await each day the victory.

"Do not spend the time idly, suffering, quietly and asleep."

"Holy hatred and pure reason will show you the right way."

I underline "holy hatred"—hatred of the occupier is holy. It is holy in Europe and it should be holy everywhere, because no one likes occupation and occupiers.

"Strike! Strike the enemy in the rear, without pity,

"Destroy the houses, trains, stations and trucks!

"Burn the grain, the forests and the warehouses!

"Blow up the tanks! Tear down the wires! "

I can continue with this long message sent by some leaders of the allied forces to the people telling them to resist. It concludes:

"We shall overcome all difficulties.

"The hour of revenge is coming!

"Dear brothers! Dear sisters!

"We remember you. We think of you."

82. If this body is to live as the light of hope for mankind, this body must have one criterion for all. The intimidation by Mr. Tekoah and the attacks on this body should strengthen its will to take the right action.

83. Of course we want the big Powers to succeed in their efforts for peace. I have said that we are for peace. We stand for peace, peace with justice. But for efforts to succeed, they have to check the deliberately planned Israeli crimes designed to frustrate and dynamite the efforts of the Big Four. We wish to see the Big Four succeed in their efforts, but we should check the reasons that may affect their efforts. My good colleague and friend Ambassador Shahi of Pakistan brilliantly put his finger on the problem:

the Big Powers have the resources and the means; they can make their weight felt and play an effective role. More than any meeting, what is needed is effective action right here which will prepare the ground for fruitful results to come from the forthcoming meeting of the Big Four.

84. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Israel, in exercise of his right of reply.

85. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to make only one brief observation, to call terror warfare "resistance" or "liberation movement" is mockery. When did it become a liberation movement? When the *fedayeen* were organized by Egypt and sent to kill innocent Israeli citizens in violation of the Armistice Agreement in the 1950s? Or now, when they are being sent to kill innocent Israeli civilians in violation of the cease-fire? The name "liberation movement" is a mockery. This is not a liberation movement; this is an anti-liberation movement, this is an attempt to annul the liberation which the people of Israel have won. Israel was the first people to raise the standard of national independence and the end of colonialism after World War II. The terrorist organizations are anti-liberation organizations, they are anti-sovereignty organizations. They seek by intimidation to limit the right to sovereignty and independence and security of the Jewish State.

86. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Algeria, who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

87. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I think that Mr. Tekoah holds fast to the entire Zionist philosophy, which was well defined by its creator, Theodor Herzl, in *The Jewish State*. I shall confine myself to quoting an excerpt which was used by Mr. Maxime Robinson in one of his articles entitled "Israel, a Colonial Fact", page 41. In that passage, Herzl said:

"If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. We should"—and this is the most important passage—"there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence."<sup>4</sup>

88. If we understand correctly, resistance is a privilege recognized exclusively for Europeans, and outside Europe, the rest of mankind, the barbarians, have no right to resist. The representative of Tel Aviv, faithful to this philosophy, asks us the same question daily: "What resisters?". He thinks only of the European resistance movements, as if there had never been any resistance anywhere else in the world, as if the Viet-Nameese people had not been resisting for twenty-five years, as if the Algerian people had not resisted for eight years, as if the South African people had not been resisting for decades, as if the peoples of Angola and Mozambique had not been resisting for years!

<sup>4</sup> Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State*, English translation published by the American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946, p. 96.

89. As for the liberation of the Promised Land by the chosen people, I shall confine myself to quoting what Mrs. Golda Meir, the present Prime Minister of Israel, has written. In a letter written on 24 August 1921 from Palestine to her brother-in-law in America she said:

"If we dig in here"—she was speaking of Palestine—"England will come to our aid. The English will not choose the Arabs to colonize Palestine; they will choose us."<sup>5</sup>

90. We think and believe that, in this second half of the twentieth century, when the United Nations has been established and when universality is beginning to have a meaning, people cannot allow themselves to be classified into primitive races and superior races, according to the words of Dr. Ribot, who was, moreover, a contemporary of Theodor Herzl and who defined psychology at that time as being "the science of the white, adult and civilized man".

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Israel has the floor to exercise his right of reply.

92. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It seems that the entire tragedy of the Middle East conflict has been compressed into the brief statement we have just heard from the representative of Algeria. There are sixteen sovereign Arab States, stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf; but the Jewish people should have no right to its own sovereign State. All nations in the world have a right to resist foreign occupation and domination and to live in liberty and independence; not the Jewish people, according to the Algerian representative. All peoples of the world have a right to self-determination, but not the Jewish people.

93. It is high time for the Arab Governments and the Arab leaders who have brought so much tragedy to the Middle East, so much catastrophe to their own nations and their own States, to realize the fallacy, the immorality, of these views and to recognize and grant to the Jewish people the same rights they claim for themselves and their own nations.

94. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I shall limit my remarks to a single sentence, in the light of the debate taking place here between the representatives of the Arab States and Israel. Nobody denies the right of Israel to exist, but nobody can recognize that Israel has any right to aggression.

95. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Israel has the floor to exercise the right of reply.

96. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I think the time has passed when Members of the United Nations accept the truth that comes from the Kremlin as infallible. I think the time has passed when even Communist parties accept that truth as infallible. Therefore, I shall allow the Chairman of the Israel Communist Party to respond to the last statement made by the representative of the USSR.

<sup>5</sup> Quotation from Marie Serkin, *Golda Meir*, Paris, Gallimard, 1966, p. 6.

97. On 5 November 1968, the Chairman of Israel's Communist Party said:

"We shall not be taught about the nature of the six-days war by the invaders of Czechoslovakia. We shall not learn about morality and Communist conscience from leadership which developed an anti-Semitic campaign against Jewish old-time members of the Communist Party and against the remnant of Jewry in that country. We shall not learn anti-racialism and brotherhood of peoples from leaders who for years have been engaged in inciting the Arabs against Israel."

98. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Comrade President, the state-

ment quoted by the Israeli representative is the statement not of an Israeli Communist but of an ultra-chauvinist who supports aggression.

99. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no further speakers on my list for this morning. As a result of informal consultations with the members of the Council, it has been decided that, in order to allow more time for private consultations, the next meeting will be held at 3.30 p.m. this afternoon.

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*