



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1409th MEETING: 30 March 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1409)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 29 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8516);	
(b) Letter dated 29 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8517)	1

16p.

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 NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 30 March 1968, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Ousmane Socé DIOP (Senegal).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1409)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 29 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8516);
 - (b) Letter dated 29 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8517).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council has been convened because of two urgent requests, one from the Permanent Representative of Jordan [S/8516] and the other from the Permanent Representative of Israel [S/8517].

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 29 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8516);
- (b) Letter dated 29 March 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8517)

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the usual practice of the Security Council and with the agreement of members, I propose to invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table and to participate in the Council's discussion without the right to vote. If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Council will now begin its discussion of the question which is before it and which is on its agenda. Before calling on the first speaker on my list, however, I wish to inform the Council that the Secretary-General is going to submit to the Council a report which will be circulated in a few moments.

4. I now call on the first speaker on my list, the representative of Jordan.

5. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): My Government requested this urgent meeting in order to put before the Council another grave situation resulting from the renewal of the Israeli aggression. That this meeting was requested should not be surprising to the members around this table; we had already warned the Council that a new Israeli attack against Jordan lands and positions was contemplated. On 27 March 1968 [S/8505], we referred the Council to a statement made by the Israeli Prime Minister in which he declared, in no ambiguous terms, that any Council decision would not be heeded. He attacked the Council for what he called failure "to show full understanding of the situation"; he declared that the state of tension in the area would be perpetuated, since, in his own view, no Council decision could make a tangible contribution to the peace in the region.

6. As anticipated, the Israeli Prime Minister and his delegation in the United Nations in effect rejected the Council's decision. Their response to the Council's decision was to concentrate more troops in the cease-fire area and prepare for a new aggression.

7. Yesterday's happenings should not surprise the members around this table. They did not surprise us. We knew that the Israelis were looking for further pretexts for violence and bloodshed.

8. At 11.30 a.m. local time on 29 March 1968, the Israeli forces opened fire without provocation and shelled Jordanian positions on the northern part of the east bank of the Jordan; they used tanks and mortar fire. Later, Israeli armoured units, using heavy artillery, moved towards the river and all along the northern part of the Jordan valley.

9. At 1300 hours local time, the Israeli air force went into action and indiscriminately bombed Jordanian frontier villages inhabited by civilians. Al Baqurah, Al 'Adasiyah, Shuna Shamaliyah, Tall al Arba'in, Umm Qays, Al Mashari, Kuraymah, Deir Abu Said and At Tayyibah all were subjected to heavy bombardment and intensive shelling.

The Karameh refugee camp, which had already been the target of several Israeli attacks in the past few weeks, was also attacked, mercilessly shelled and intensively bombed.

10. At a later stage, the Israelis extended their aerial bombing to Jordanian positions far beyond the cease-fire area.

11. The Israelis justify their aggression against my country on the untenable ground that so-called terrorists receive support from Jordan. The Jordan Government cannot be responsible for the safety and security of the Israeli forces which occupy Jordanian territory. We have already stated that the Jordan Government most emphatically denies that it has any connexion whatsoever with the incidents alleged to have taken place in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories. We have therefore rejected the Israeli warning to Jordan. We knew, and that must have been obvious to all fair-minded people, that it was only a pretext for further acts of aggression.

12. So-called reprisals are not the answer. Occupation invites resistance, and the only remedy is the withdrawal of the forces of aggression. On 22 November 1967, the Security Council called [*resolution 242 (1967)*] for the "Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict".

13. In his letter of yesterday Mr. Tekoah alleged that we had started the shelling of Israeli-occupied positions. But the whole world knows by now that our actions were confined to defensive measures. It is the Israelis who are intoxicated by their military might, which is steadily and rapidly increasing thanks to the generosity of other nations and powerful States. The Israeli acts of aggression are a result of Israeli arrogance of power. The Israelis, through intimidation, use military power and sheer brutality; they endeavour to impose a solution to problems of security. They believe that they are capable of humiliating our citizens, weakening the morale of our army, and breaking the will of our people so that surrender may follow. They are mistaken. It has been shown in our area and in other parts of Africa and Asia, and at various times throughout history, that the will of a nation determined to live in freedom and dignity cannot be broken.

14. Yesterday's Israeli attack was directed against the East Ghor Canal area, which, together with the West Bank of the Jordan, now under Israeli occupation, forms the most productive agricultural area in Jordan. The villages of Al 'Adasiyah, Shuna Shamaliyah and Al Baqurah which are situated in that part of the East Bank, were subjected to concentrated Israeli aerial bombing and artillery shelling for more than seven hours. One can imagine the extent of the damage and destruction deliberately inflicted on a fertile area rich in different crops, including all kinds of cereals and vegetables, and noted for many irrigation projects. The East Ghor Canal project alone irrigates 120,000 dunums in the Jordan Valley. The Yarmuk Valley project, one of the most promising agricultural projects, is also located within that same area. This area provides vital water resources for the East Bank, and it certainly constitutes an important objective for Israeli planes which attempt to enforce Israel's will in the area.

15. Although the targets may have been different on various occasions, the Israeli objective is the same. In bombing the agricultural lands and destroying the crops and irrigation facilities, the aim of the Israelis is clear: they want to deprive the people of those lands of their only means of livelihood, they want to terrorize them and create more difficulties for them, and thus force them to move further east, creating a new vacuum for Israeli aggressive designs.

16. On the question of the resistance of the Palestinian people, we have said time and again that we are not responsible for the Israeli security dilemma posed by the struggle of the Palestinian people. But let me say this to the Israelis. The answer to the struggle of the people now under Israeli occupation should be an understanding of their legitimate rights and withdrawal from their territories. You cannot break the will of the Palestinian people; and if you look at the history of Palestine you will find the answer. The Palestinian struggle against the British Empire is well known. For thirty years the Palestinians were in armed revolt against the British. Many of our people in Palestine lost their lives fighting the British in the sacred cause of liberty and freedom. Let the Israelis understand that the Palestinians—Christians and Moslems alike—are determined to continue their struggle until justice is ensured to them. The Israelis cannot weaken their morale, for they have experienced numberless hardships and they have enough endurance to overcome any future ones. Neither hardship, nor oppression nor acts of repression have in the past weakened their determination, nor will they do so now.

17. How can any member at this table expect Palestinians to respond passively when Israeli troops remain in occupation of territories that admittedly are not theirs and to which their only claim is that of military conquest? What the Israelis are seeking is, in effect, that the Palestinians should abandon their lands, forget their homes, and allow the Israelis to continue their acts of aggression, expelling people, bulldozing property, annexing lands, bombing, shelling, destroying and looting, and what not.

18. The acquisition of land by aggression and the subjugation of people should not be tolerated. If you condemn these acts, do you in all earnestness expect the Palestinians to react passively and accept the oppressor? The other day Ambassador Goldberg, the representative of the United States of America, reminded us that violence breeds violence. We all know that the presence of Israeli forces in Arab lands is, in and of itself, an act of violence. Is not the Council expected, as advised by the Justice of the United States, to take effective measures to put an end to this violence which breeds violence?

19. The Council should ponder another important question. The Council is expected to take more effective measures to bring about the immediate and complete withdrawal of all Israeli forces from territories forcibly occupied. Any further delay would lead to the further deterioration of an already explosive situation. Additional delay will result in intensification of the resistance movement. Today this movement is confined to the Palestinians. But through any inaction on the part of the Security Council it is certainly apt to grow in the entire Arab

homeland. It will have the complete support of all freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples in the world. It can never be wholly repressed or suppressed. Today the Israelis are becoming repressive not because Jordan is shelling their positions, but because their occupation—rather than their bringing peace—has brought about a new dilemma. The answer, the key to this dilemma does not lie in Jordan's ensuring security for the Israelis, but in the Israelis withdrawing and heeding the will of the United Nations.

20. Only this morning, Mr. Moshe Kol, the Minister for Tourism, claimed that the Israelis had confined their attacks to a limited area, and threatened that next time, so he said, the attack would be wider in scope. It is clear that if no immediate action is taken by the Council, the Israelis intend to continue their wilful violation of the Security Council resolutions. For the last three days they have been massing and concentrating troops in the north in order to invade that part of the East Bank. Yesterday's attack was another link in the chain of intimidation against Jordan. Israel is intent on pursuing a course contemptuous of the authority of the world Organization, contemptuous of its decisions, contemptuous of the wishes of the Council members, and contemptuous of world public opinion. We are, therefore, entitled to expect the Security Council, the highest organ of the United Nations, should take more effective measures to cope with the problem.

21. We hope that the invocation of Chapter VII will not be delayed any further because it has been demonstrated that delay will not serve the cause of peace, nor ensure stability and security in the Middle East.

22. The arrogant and merciless attack against Jordan yesterday was preceded by a conference of the chiefs of the Israeli Defence Ministry missions in Europe. The conference is now discussing the armament programme for 1968, with regard to the acquisition of arms and military equipment from various countries as well as the expansion of the military industry in Israel. The chiefs of mission were recalled from the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy and other European countries.

23. We feel that the first essential step which the Security Council can take at the present time, on this complaint of Jordan, is to call for an immediate halt to any shipment of arms to Israel. Certainly those Member States that continue to arm Israel, despite its repeated aggression against my country, are assuming a great responsibility. It is their bullets, their guns, their artillery, their tanks and their other offensive weapons which make it possible for Israel to take the law into its own hands, and it is those weapons which encourage Israel to continue its crimes.

24. Hardly a week has elapsed since the Security Council condemned Israel for a wide-scale attack against Jordan, my country, and once more we find ourselves before you complaining of a new aggression. As it did in the previous case, Israel has tried in this one, too, to distort the facts and confuse the issue with a complaint of its own. We are confident that the Security Council, in this instance also, will see its way clearly.

25. Last week this body did not stop at a condemnation of Israel but issued a solemn warning that grave violations of the cease-fire could not be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts.

26. A new act of aggression took place yesterday, and we are asking the Council to be true to its word. The only way to deter Israeli aggression is by applying and invoking Chapter VII of the Charter.

27. Too many warnings have been issued and certainly none have been heeded. Any additional warning or mere condemnation would only put an additional page on the dark record of Israel. It would not deter Israel. The Israelis have not taken your repeated warnings seriously. They have shown contempt for your decisions. In our view, Chapter VII is the only way open now to the Council. There is no other course for stopping further Israeli aggression.

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

29. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It was only last Sunday, 24 March, that the Security Council completed its deliberations on Israeli and Jordanian complaints [*1407th meeting*] and adopted a resolution [*248 (1968)*] which, *inter alia*, deplored all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire and declared that violations of the cease-fire could not be tolerated.

30. At the closing meeting of the debate I stated:

“Two States appeared before the Security Council. Jordan told the Council that it will persist in warfare, that it will take no action to prevent violations of the cease-fire by raids, terror and sabotage, that it does not intend to do anything to prevent the situation from deteriorating even further.

“What was the response given by the proponents of the Arab cause to this Jordanian attitude? . . . They would have given sanction to the war machine of terrorism to mount its offensive against Israel. They would have promised Jordan and the terrorist organizations to which it grants sanctuary immunity from Israel's defence measures and from international censure.

“On the other hand, there is Israel, subjected to war for twenty years, asking nothing of its neighbours but to be left in peace. We have had our dead and wounded. Our houses are being dynamited, our roads are being mined, our children are not safe in their movements.

“What did Jordan and its supporters propose? That all this should be of no concern to the Council, that the Council should be interested in one thing only: that Israel should not react, that Israel should not defend itself, that Israel should remain inert and wait passively for the slaughter.

“Any resolution on the Middle East which would not have censured terrorist activities would have been most unfortunate. I said yesterday and I repeat today: Do not belittle the dangers and the threats and assaults the people of Israel are facing. Do not disregard the warfare that is being carried on against us openly, defiantly,

persistently. Do not ignore the armed attacks, the incursions, the mining of roads, the killing of innocent civilians. Understand that the people of Israel love its land, its hearth, its brothers and sisters like any other people in the world. Every stone in our land is a witness to thousands of years of Jewish tenacity, devotion and sacrifice. Every blade of grass is permeated with Jewish blood, of those who fought the Romans, the Crusaders, the Ottomans, the British and the Arabs. We shall not yield, we shall defend our rights with all the strength within us.

"Jordan's reaction to this debate and its conclusion may well determine whether we will have to do it again on the battlefield or at the peace table." [1407th meeting, paras. 120-125.]

31. What has been the Jordanian reaction to the Security Council's deliberations and resolution? No sooner was the resolution adopted than the Permanent Representative of Jordan announced: "The Council has in effect rejected all Israel's claims and allegations concerning so-called individual incidents of terrorism."

32. I made clear our misgivings about the Security Council's resolution of 24 March 1968. I had not expected those misgivings to be confirmed so rapidly. The day after the Security Council's action, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan declared: "The condemnation resolution is directed against Israel. The paragraph on cease-fire violations does not concern Jordan."

33. Jordanian aggression continued. On 22 March at approximately 1030 hours local time a tractor working in the fields of Ashdot Ya'agov was shot at from across the river.

34. On 22 March again, at 1930 hours, an Israeli patrol encountered a band of marauders south of Kibbutz Gesher, and an exchange of fire ensued. Jordanian positions on the East Bank opened fire across the river Jordan on the Israeli forces to cover the retreating marauders.

35. On the following day at 2030 hours mortar fire was directed against a number of Israeli villages in the Beit She'an area.

36. On 24 March at 1410 hours Jordanian artillery fire was opened on Israeli forces in the Beit She'an Valley as well as on a civilian tractor working in the fields.

37. On the same day a tractor working in the fields of Ashdot Ya'agov was blown up by an anti-vehicle mine, and the driver was wounded.

38. Also on 24 March, at 2015 hours, an Israeli patrol encountered a group of marauders near Um Tzutz in the northern sector of the Jordan Valley, west of the river. In the ensuing clash two of the saboteurs were killed.

39. At approximately the same time another Israeli patrol clashed with a marauder band near Newe Ur in the Beit She'an Valley. In the exchange of fire one Israeli soldier was killed and three wounded.

40. On 25 March, at 0730 hours, an Israeli patrol detected an anti-vehicle mine on the road 500 metres from Ma'oz Hayyim in the Beit She'an Valley. The mine, of Chinese manufacture, was removed.

41. On 25 March, at noon, Jordanian army positions opened artillery fire on Israeli forces in the Beit She'an sector.

42. On 27 March, at 2030 hours, the pumping station at Kibbutz Hamadya, in the Beit She'an area, was seriously damaged by high explosives. Clear tracks of five infiltrators led to the Jordan River.

43. The next day, 28 March, at 0940 hours, Jordanian machine-gun fire was opened on Israeli forces on the western bank of the Jordan River in the Beit She'an Valley.

44. Yesterday, 29 March, at 0800 hours local time, a trailer drawn by a tractor was blown up by an anti-vehicle mine placed in a track near Kibbutz Shaar HaGolan south of Lake Kinneret. Four Israeli farmers were killed, and a fifth civilian was seriously wounded. A second mine was detected in the same area and deactivated.

45. At approximately 1130 hours local time yesterday, the Jordanian military positions on the East Bank of the Jordan River opened fire on Israeli villages and posts across the river in the Beit She'an and upper Jordan Valley areas. Fire was returned. Twenty minutes later the Jordanian forces intensified their fire, employing mortars and artillery. The shelling was directed in particular at the villages of Gesher, Beit Yosef and Yardena. Fire was returned.

46. At 1230 hours, the Jordanian forces resumed their artillery fire on Gesher. At that point it became necessary, in self-defence, to order Israeli aircraft to silence the Jordanian artillery positions.

47. Between 1300 and 1750 hours Jordanian fire continued intermittently. It was aimed in particular at the villages of Kefar Ruppin, Gesher, Ashdot Ya'agov, Massada, Shaar HaGolan and Tel-Qatzir. Considerable damage was caused to property, including the children's homes at Shaar HaGolan and Tel-Qatzir. Four persons were wounded in that sector.

48. At 1345 hours Jordanian artillery fire was extended southward along the lower Jordan Valley, as far as Jericho. Fire was returned. One Israeli soldier was killed and three were seriously wounded in that sector. One Israeli aircraft was hit and was abandoned over the Israeli side of the cease-fire line.

49. At 1800 hours the exchange of fire stopped along the entire line.

50. The Beit She'an area, which in recent days has become the objective of deliberate, concerted attacks from Jordan, is a densely populated area, a domain of villages in which farmers and workers seek nothing but the opportunity to follow their pursuits unmolested. This is a valley region dominated by the highland and hills on the eastern bank of the Jordan. On these hills facing the Beit She'an sector the

Jordanian army has concentrated a formidable force of ten artillery batteries, including Long Tom guns with a range of 24 kilometres, 155-millimetre guns with a range of 17 kilometres, 25-pounders, self-propelled guns. In addition there are eleven batteries of 81-millimetre and 120-millimetre mortars. This concentration of firing power is well protected by specially constructed fortifications. They keep the Israeli villages in the constant shadow of death. When they attack, as they have repeatedly been doing in the past few days, there is no way to reach them and to silence them except from the air. That is what it became necessary to do yesterday.

51. The intensification of Jordanian aggression appears to have been well prepared, militarily and politically. In a letter to you [S/8505], Mr. President, the Jordanian representative attempted on 27 March 1968 to create a smoke-screen that would conceal Jordan's intentions and try to shift on to Israel responsibility for any renewed attacks. That stratagem was unmasked yesterday morning in all its macabre stealth.

52. What happened yesterday and in the preceding days is not new or surprising. Jordan makes no secret of the fact that its war against Israel begun in 1948 continues. The Permanent Representative of Jordan came before this Council on 21 March [1401st meeting] and informed it defiantly that the war was not over and that it would be pursued. No linguistic acrobatics about Jordan's alleged attitude will be able to becloud that fundamental fact. Jordan still proclaims that it is at war with Israel. Jordan still proclaims that it does not intend to terminate the acts of aggression, the raids, terror and sabotage against Israel.

53. The Jordanian representative, in a bold reaffirmation of Jordanian belligerency, made clear to the Security Council on 21 March that his Government does not recognize any Israeli territory. He explained that the armistice only froze a certain military situation. Obviously the cease-fire is not a final settlement. To employ Jordanian terminology, it did not fix boundaries, it did not fix borders, there is no territory; the cease-fire only froze the situation. But today, as in the past, Jordan apparently thinks that this freezing should apply only to Israel, that it should mean paralysing Israel while Jordan continues its acts of aggression. It is high time for the Jordanian Government to be disabused of such thoughts. If the situation is frozen it must be frozen on both sides. If Israel is not to take military security measures, Jordan must cease its warfare. If Jordan continues to wage and encourage aggression, the Government of Israel, like any other Government in the world, will not remain passive and will not forgo its right to self-defence.

54. The representative of Jordan referred to a statement^v made by the Prime Minister of Israel on 25 March in reaction to a declaration by King Hussein on 23 March, in which the King had said that he cannot guarantee Israeli security in Israeli-controlled areas. Mr. Eshkol stated:

"We never asked King Hussein to guarantee Israel security in Israel-controlled areas. That is up to the Israel Defence Forces. All the King must do is to observe the cease-fire commitments he assumed and stop giving direct or indirect aid to terror organizations. But if Jordan is

ready to put up with continued acts of warfare from its territory and particularly if it carries on aiding terror organizations to conduct their policy of belligerency, then it has assumed a heavy responsibility. The Karameh operation should be a warning to saboteurs and to those who do not prevent them from doing their murderous work. It should be proof to Arab rulers that no warlike operation against Israel can succeed. The realities of the past ten months show that the only way to bring stability to the region and peace to its people is through peace. We are ready to assist in any constructive effort to this end. However, until peace is achieved, we shall remain on our guard."

That statement speaks for itself.

55. The resolution adopted by the Security Council on 24 March referred expressly to the Israel complaint arising out of acts of terrorism and violence from Jordan territory. It recalled resolution 236 (1967) of 12 June 1967, by which the Security Council condemned any and all violations of the cease-fire. It considered that all violent incidents and other violations of the cease-fire should be prevented, and that past incidents of this nature should not be overlooked, and it deplored all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire, declaring that they could not be tolerated.

56. The Jordanian Government and its representative in the Security Council cannot openly misinterpret the resolution, mislead public opinion and try to shed responsibility for the continued acts of aggression under whatever guise they might be conducted.

57. Members of the Security Council have made their position on this matter clear in the course of our previous deliberations and in particular following the adoption of the 24 March resolution [248 (1968)].

58. The current wave of violence and murder is the work of armed organizations openly based on and operating from Jordanian territory. The Government of Jordan and its armed forces are openly continuing to give such raids political, moral and military support.

59. The concept that Governments of neighbouring Arab States, which are bound by their obligations under the cease-fire, remain free to aid and abet armed attacks on Israel through organized infiltration, terrorism and sabotage is inadmissible. Such activities constitute a continuation of warlike action under cover of the cease-fire. The responsibility of the Government concerned can on no account be evaded or obscured.

60. Attempts have been made here to describe the raiders as enjoying the support of the Arab population in areas under Israeli control. This is contrary to the facts. Local Arab inhabitants do not support these aggressive activities. The Arab population, like its Jewish neighbours, is weary of the twenty-year war. What characterizes the situation in areas under Israel control is, above all, the atmosphere of normalcy and coexistence between Jews and Arabs.

61. The raiders, whether they be called marauders, terrorists, saboteurs, are simply messengers of hate and death

who come from the outside and whose aim is to undermine the possibilities of understanding and agreement between the two peoples. Today it is public knowledge that these raiders are organized in para-military units, appear in military uniform, undergo military training with the armies of Jordan, Egypt, Syria and Iraq, receive their weapons from those armies and are commanded by regular army officers. Jordan would like Israel to acquiesce in this type of warfare. Does Jordan really believe that any State in the world would do such a thing? By attributing different names to the marauders, does Jordan expect that it can change their character and status and the nature of their activities? What may be a game of names and words to Jordan is a matter of life and death to Israel. By whichever way Jordan prefers to describe them, these are raiders and saboteurs bent on deliberate and indiscriminate killing of men, women and children. Jordan has a choice: either it will put an end to their aggressive activities or Israel will have to do that in self-defence.

62. For the second time in ten days the Security Council is discussing an Israel complaint. For the second time in ten days Israel appeals to the Security Council not to turn it away, to grant it redress and relief from the warfare by stealth pursued against it. Last time the Council failed Israel. It failed to raise its voice strongly and unequivocally in favour of ending war by whatever means it is conducted. Today we are already tasting the fruits of this failure.

63. We trust that the Security Council will not fail again. We hope that the Security Council will overcome the grave disability created by the fact that a third of its members have no diplomatic relations with Israel, that more than a third identify themselves unreservedly with the Arab position, whatever it be. We hope that the Security Council realizes that in the outcome of this debate the forces of war in the area will either see further encouragement, as they did after the 24 March resolution, or find in it a clear warning not to persist in their acts of aggression in violation of the cease-fire.

64. To the Arab Governments we say today: look what the twenty-year war has brought the Middle East and its nations. The people of Israel remain beleaguered and embattled. Egypt has been plunged into the abyss of a catastrophe. Jordan is in turmoil. Syria has withdrawn into stagnation and international claustrophobia. For twenty years Arab Governments have mobilized their energies for war and bloodshed, ignoring the welfare and happiness of their peoples. The continuation of this policy can only bring even greater disaster. Is that what the Arab people want, or is it being imposed upon them by irresponsible leadership? Has not the time come to do some soul-searching and mending of ways?

65. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States Government is gravely concerned and distressed by the new eruption of violence in the Middle East, the second within a period of two weeks, that has made it necessary for this Council to meet again on an urgent basis. We are distressed by the tragic loss of life and the suffering on both sides that this violence has caused, and we are profoundly disturbed by the inevitable damage that this recurring violence is doing to the peace-keeping efforts and

peace-making efforts which this Council set in motion last November.

66. In commenting on the most recent incidents, those of yesterday, I wish to reaffirm the long-standing position of the United States, which I expressed most recently in our meeting on 21 March [*1402nd meeting*]. The United States Government opposes violence in the Middle East from wherever it comes and whatever form it takes. We oppose military actions in violation of the cease-fire and we likewise oppose acts of terrorism in violation of the cease-fire. In this connexion let me express emphatic agreement with the wise observation which our friend and colleague, Lord Caradon, made during the debate last week when he said [*1407th meeting*] that "To attempt to deal with last week's events in isolation . . . would be to fail to recognize the realities of the situation as a whole".

67. Now, once again, our experience demonstrates that calumny or name-calling or striving to put somebody else in the wrong in the forum of this Council is not the answer. It is time for the members of the Council, whatever our various views on underlying issues may be, to work together urgently to prevent what could be a catastrophe: the collapse of Ambassador Jarring's peace-making efforts and another round of war and bloodshed in the Middle East. Last Sunday evening this Council adopted resolution 248 (1968), expressing its concern, in the gravest terms, with all violations of the cease-fire resolutions of June 1967 and declaring that such violations cannot be tolerated. Yet, yesterday, only days later, that new resolution was already grossly violated and so were the cease-fire resolutions of 1967 which it explicitly recalled and sought to reinforce.

68. The statements from the parties which we have just heard give very different accounts of these latest incidents of violence. In evaluating them, this Council, as well as the Secretary-General and his representatives in the area, and indeed the cause of peace itself, are severely handicapped by the absence of impartial international observers at the time of the trouble. We have just been handed the report of the Secretary-General, of which we should take note and with respect to which we are obligated to take appropriate action. The Secretary-General recites in his latest report, of 30 March 1968, that accounts have been presented by both sides, and he says:

"This new outbreak of fighting, coming so soon after the Security Council resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968, is greatly deplored. Mindful of paragraph 5 of that resolution, calling upon the Secretary-General to 'keep the situation under review and to report to the Security Council as appropriate', I especially regret my inability to submit to the Council a helpful report on yesterday's fighting. Reports by me on incidents of fighting must be based on verified information from objective sources. As I have previously pointed out to the Council"—and he cites the document numbers of past reports which likewise made this wise observation—"no UNTSO observers are stationed in the Israel-Jordan sector. Therefore, with regard to this most recent fighting, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, Lieutenant-General Odd Bull, has had to advise me that 'it is practically impossible for me to report on the developments in the Israel-Jordan cease-fire sector

due to the fact that no United Nations observation is operating in the area'.

"I may take this occasion to point out that the presence of United Nations observers in an area can be helpful in preserving a cease-fire in ways other than reporting. The mere fact of their watchful presence can be something of a deterrent to military activity. They can be in position to report on indications of the build-ups which often precede military action. When fighting does break out they can quickly intervene on the spot with the opposing local commanders to arrange immediate cease-fires. It may be noted that, largely because of the presence of United Nations observers, the Security Council cease-fire resolutions are better served and maintained in the Suez Canal and Israel-Syrian sectors than in the Israel-Jordan sector." [S/7930/Add.66, paras. 1 and 2.]

69. There is nothing one could add to this pertinent and wise report by the Secretary-General, except to give it some effect, as he has previously indicated it is vitally necessary to do. Now, for ourselves and for my Government, I wish to make these observations.

70. The first point is that neither side can find security in violence. It has been true from time immemorial that those who live by the sword are in danger of dying by the sword, that violence involves no problems but simply feeds on itself. The history of the Middle East conflict for a whole generation is a tragic demonstration of this bitter truth. Yet, the violence still goes on. It continues to inflict its steady toll of death and injury and desolation on combatants and on innocent civilians as well. This is not only pertinent to our consideration of the problem, but, as I have said, it is damaging the all-important peace-making work of the able United Nations emissary, Ambassador Jarring.

71. My second point is that the Security Council has not yet by any means exhausted the possibilities of practical action to curtail, if not stop, these tragic events. In last Sunday's resolution [resolution 248 (1968)], which we adopted unanimously, the Council served notice not only that actions of military reprisal and all other violent incidents in grave violation of the cease-fire are intolerable, but also that the Council would have to consider effective steps to ensure against their repetition.

72. In the judgement of my delegation, the time is manifestly at hand for the Council to heed the Secretary-General's wise advice and to consider and adopt such a step. Despite the conflicting claims made by the parties, we believe this new eruption of violence has made clear the step that now is most immediately required: the stationing, as soon as possible, of United Nations Observers in the Israel-Jordan cease-fire sector.

73. Again as the Secretary-General points out, this is the only sector governed by the cease-fire where there are no such Observers. The opposing sides in the Israel-Jordan sector confront each other directly, with no impartial authority between them, no one to patrol the cease-fire area, investigate charges and counter-charges, establish disputed facts and take immediate steps to stop incidents if they occur and prevent them from snowballing.

74. Surely the lesson cannot be lost upon this Council or upon the parties that the violence of yesterday might well have been brought to an earlier end and prevented from reaching the proportions it did if there had only been United Nations Observers on the spot available for immediate action. United Nations Observers have time and time again rendered such services in other cease-fire sectors, and we believe arrangements should be made so that they can render such services in the Israel-Jordan cease-fire sector, to the benefit of both parties, without prejudice to their positions, and to the benefit of peace.

75. There is, in short, a serious deficiency in the cease-fire machinery. But it is within this Council's power to remedy that deficiency.

76. We are all aware that both parties have not welcomed this type of initiative. But this Council has its responsibilities, and this Council ought to take an action which is in the interests of both parties and in no way, as I have said, prejudices the respective positions of the parties on fundamental issues between them. In the discussion last week, my delegation was prepared for the Council to take this necessary action, and we are prepared today, in any appropriate manner—by resolution, consensus or otherwise—to call upon the parties to co-operate fully with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in making arrangements as rapidly as possible for the placing of United Nations Observers in the Israel-Jordan cease-fire sector.

77. In making that proposal, we are very much concerned about the recurring nature of the violations of the cease-fire which have taken place. Indeed, it is surely in the interest not only of the parties but of every nation represented in the Security Council that does not want another war in the Middle East—and I believe no nation here wants another war in the Middle East—and whatever may be the differences that divide us, to unite on this necessary action.

78. There is another thing we ought to do. Ambassador Jarring's mission is imperilled by what has been going on. In our discussion last week my delegation proposed that we indicate our confidence in Ambassador Jarring and that we call upon the parties to co-operate with him in the conduct of his mission. All concerned must rededicate themselves to the principles of the 22 November resolution 242 (1967), unanimously adopted by this Council. All the parties must co-operate with Ambassador Jarring in his important mission, and to hasten the achievement of a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security. It is in the fulfilment of the Jarring mission rather than by a succession of acts of violence that the way to peace can be found.

79. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The explosion of bombs over Jordanian villages, artillery bombardment across the river Jordan, and machine-gun and tank fire against Jordanian positions, sowing death and destruction, have once again brought us to the Security Council room. Neither the Security Council's demand for strict compliance with the cease-fire, nor the Council's condemnation of Israel's acts of aggression committed against Jordan a week ago, nor the

severe warning issued at that time to Israel that the Council would be forced to consider further and more effective steps, as envisaged in the Charter, to ensure against such acts, have had the desired effect. Israel continues its aggression. The pharisaical statements of the Israel representative in the Security Council, which amount to nothing more or less than a complaint against Jordan, the victim of Israel aggression, can mislead no one. Today's statement by the representative of Israel was designed to play on the feelings of the Security Council by references to a threat to Israel children—a clear attempt to divert the attention of the Security Council from realities.

80. After all, Israel is repeatedly committing aggression from occupied Jordanian territory. As a result of that aggression there is a threat to the lives of Arab children living in the occupied territory, not to the lives of Israel children. Well, that is how it is. For the second time in ten days we are hearing from the Israel representative facts that are clearly designed to distort the situation. The Israel aggressors are once again arrogantly and flagrantly defying peace-loving States, the United Nations and the Security Council. Instead of co-operating in the search for a political settlement of the problems of the Middle East on the basis of the principles of the Charter, the principles of peace and justice and the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, Israel is repeatedly igniting the flames of war against the Arab States. Instead of withdrawing from Arab lands seized as a result of last year's piratical attack on the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, Israel troops are endeavouring to entrench themselves in those lands, which have never belonged and will never belong to Israel. Instead of accepting and fulfilling the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 on the elimination of the consequences of Israel aggression, the Government of Israel is disrupting the efforts of the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, undermining the possibility that his mission may succeed, and dashing the hopes of the peoples for the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

81. The new acts of aggression by Israel against Jordan have made it inevitable for the Security Council to give urgent consideration to the dangerous situation which has arisen and which confronts us with three basic facts.

82. First, Israel, disregarding the repeated decisions of the Security Council on a cease-fire in the Middle East and on the elimination of the consequences of Israel aggression, is continuing its policy of armed aggression against neighbouring Arab States.

83. Secondly, this means that the decisions so far adopted by the Security Council for the purpose of halting Israel aggression have not been effective enough to restore peace in the Middle East region.

84. Thirdly, it follows that the Security Council is faced with the necessity to take more effective measures with regard to the aggressor, as provided for in the United Nations Charter and in the Security Council resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March.

85. The provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter state that, should the Security Council consider

that measures which it has taken for the maintenance of international peace and security—in this case, the condemnation of Israel's aggressive acts and the warning against a repetition of such acts in the future—have proved to be inadequate, then the Council is empowered to take the more effective measures necessary, namely, sanctions against the aggressor State.

86. Either blinded by its military successes of last year, successes resulting from a number of specific and transient circumstances at that time, or counting on the support of certain Western States, which the representative of Jordan, Ambassador El-Farra, mentioned in his statement today, the aggressor is clearly counting on its impunity.

87. It is the duty of the Security Council strongly to condemn the aggressor and to take measures which will put an end to these calculations. In the preparation of such measures the Soviet delegation is ready to co-operate with all members of the Security Council.

88. I have listened with attention to the statement by the representative of the United States. One could not fail to be struck by the stress which he laid on the quoted words of General Odd Bull.

89. But what a fine thing it would be if everyone here in the Security Council, including the United States representative, laid stress on the need for Israel—which has committed its second act of aggression within the space of ten days—immediately to implement the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. Such emphasis on the part of the Security Council would be more useful in the cause of peace and a political settlement in the Middle East, and also for the success of Mr. Jarring's mission.

90. The Soviet delegation confirms that, in the event of the adoption by the Security Council of a decision to take more effective measures—sanctions against Israel for the purpose of calling a halt to its acts of aggression—the Soviet Union will be ready to take part in the implementation of these measures.

91. Permit me to remind you, Mr. President, in conclusion, that, as was pointed out in the statement of the Soviet Government on 22 March of this year [S/8495], as long as the leaders of Israel take advantage of the support they receive from outside to maintain their position of annexation of Arab territory, the Soviet Union and other countries that are friendly to the Arab States and advocate a durable peace in the Middle East will help the victims of aggression because by so doing they would be fulfilling their duty under the United Nations Charter and acting in the interests of the maintenance of peace.

92. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): On 24 March the Security Council adopted a resolution [248 (1968)] condemning Israel and warning it that it would not tolerate any policy based on military reprisals. Yet five days later that policy of reprisals and aggression is reactivated, with the use of the same script that was presented to us at the time of the aggression against Karamah. That policy is being pursued, we are told,

in order to cope with the resistance of the people in the occupied zones.

93. This morning, Zionist propaganda is still harking back to the same theme, moreover it is itself drawing the obvious parallel with the action of 21 March. Thus, reports from Tel Aviv state that the incidents of Friday occurred three hours after the explosion of a mine at the Massada kibbutz, south of Lake Tiberias. They also stress that, in addition to the Karameh camp, the Israel air force and artillery bombed and bombarded four Jordanian villages in which, according to the Israel army spokesman, bases of the El-Fatah liberation organization were located.

94. It is indeed curious to note that, still according to reports from the Tel Aviv authorities, fuel depots near Manshia were bombed by the Zionist air force. Are we to suppose that in the judgement of the Zionist army those fuel depots constituted bases for liberation movements?

95. On 26 March, right after the adoption of resolution 248 (1968), at a press conference held at The Hague, the head of the Zionist diplomacy indirectly informed the Council that Israel did not intend to take any account of the Council's resolutions, when he declared that the Security Council was incapable of taking constructive action in the Middle East. Nevertheless, the *de facto* authorities at Tel Aviv have never concealed the fact that they meant to make use of the Security Council whenever its resolutions or debates were such as to favour their plans.

96. That clearly is no longer the case and the Zionists now intend to apply their own methods in order to bring their own kind of peace to the Middle East. That artificial creation, the product of a political situation born of a chance combination of circumstances—I mean Israel—like its protectors, has for many years been assured of an automatic majority in this Organization. Today, numerous States in Africa and Asia, thanks to their peoples' struggle for national liberation, have regained their independence and are taking up their international responsibilities in all the organs of the United Nations. The natural result of this transformation has been to change the composition of the Security Council, in which those States are represented. Thus it is easy to understand why the Tel Aviv authorities intend from now on to snap their fingers at the Council's resolutions.

97. Of course, the Zionists' contempt for the Security Council does not prevent them from deriving such advantages from it as they can. For example, some of the explanations of vote given after the adoption of resolution 248 (1968) on 24 March more or less constituted, or at least could be interpreted as, a direct encouragement of their aggressive policy.

98. The confusion deliberately fostered by certain Powers regarding the proper interpretation of resolution 248 (1968) gave the Zionists reason to believe that they would be assured of a more understanding attitude in the future. But the source of the aggressive Zionist policy is to be found in the programme of territorial expansion which they intend to pursue come hell or high water. Their attitude is, moreover, quite logical in its own way.

99. Using the active resistance of the people of Palestine as their excuse, the Tel Aviv authorities are stringently carrying out massive military operations, supposedly as a reaction to the local liberation movement. From that standpoint, all measures are acceptable, including the brainwashing of public opinion, that being the purpose of the orchestrated propaganda to which we are treated every day.

100. Thus, at a press conference held in Jerusalem on 25 March, the chief Zionist spokesman, recognizing that the so-called terrorism could not be crushed at one blow, stated that many more operations would be needed to weaken Palestinian resistance. It is hardly necessary to add that the operations in question are in fact large-scale military operations requiring considerable technical resources, which the Zionist authorities are not niggardly with.

101. It goes without saying that the facts of the case would, if that were necessary, disprove the allegations contained in document S/8510 of 29 March 1968, which says that on that same date Jordan opened a large concerted attack on the territory under military occupation. One does not need to be a military expert to appreciate the cynicism of such an accusation. It would be a never-ending task to cite all the intemperate statements—that is the least that can be said about them—of the Zionist leaders. If we are to believe a commentary on Tel Aviv Radio last night, the events of 29 March were set in motion because the Jordanian Government was no longer able to control the Palestinian resistance fighters. But this is tantamount to a shameless admission that Israel's military operations, the pretext for which is the resistance of the Palestinian people, are an integral part of a plan of intimidation and destruction worked out in cold blood and closely controlled by military strategists using the latest techniques. Indeed this seems to have been confirmed by General Barlev, who said that his country would respond to any acts of resistance with operations sometimes more and sometimes less massive than those carried out last week against Karameh.

102. We, for our part, doubt whether these specialists in so-called preventive actions are capable of understanding the deep-seated reasons for the tragedy being experienced by the Palestinian people in all the occupied territories.

103. If Zionist logic were to be applied to the predictable course of events, it would seem that the Security Council may have to convene on many more occasions, for it is obviously most unlikely that the liberation movement in the occupied territories should ever cease—not, at least, until the occupied lands have been reconquered.

104. The eruption on to the international scene of the Palestinian resistance movement, which some had thought annihilated for ever, is certainly an embarrassment and a source of concern to those who are evolving a system of spoliation and destruction; but it would be a mistake to think that the rebirth of the Palestinian nation can be prevented any longer, and neither mass repression, so-called preventive action, nor allegedly graduated retaliatory measures will stop a struggle that has been generated by the occupation itself.

105. The Zionists have invented nothing new, and Algeria is not alone in knowing exactly how to evaluate what they wrongly call "counter-terrorism" and boldly make it a matter of policy.

106. Need we repeat that the blustering attitude of the Tel Aviv authorities is drawing us into a new strategic deadlock? Their simplistic policy, made plain in countless declarations, reveals the state of euphoria currently prevailing in Zionist circles. But that euphoria will vanish of its own accord on the day when, caught in the straits of a reality which no propaganda can alter and confronted by the inevitable success of the harsh struggle in which the Palestinians are now engaged, the international community finally comes to grips with the substance of the problem.

107. With all due respect to the leader of Zionist diplomacy, who asserted that the issue in the Middle East is the existence of the State of Israel and not that of the other nations there, the substance of the problem is actually the existence of the Palestinian nation in full integrity and sovereignty. We for our part are certain that the population of Palestine will successfully carry out its mission of reclaiming its national identity, and that the day will come when those who now seek to oppose this will have to accept it as a fact.

108. For this reason my delegation believes that it is time for the Council to try to solve the problem posed by the usurpation of Palestine. That is the only way to put an end to the aggression, the nature of which, as we know, is to perpetuate itself indefinitely, and also to create the necessary conditions for a real and stable peace.

109. Only two possibilities are open to the Council in this matter. Looking at the problem from one angle, it could take the line of least resistance, tolerating, accepting and permitting the continued occupation of the territories and the continued subjection of their peoples to the yoke of the occupation policy, which is like any other occupation policy. Such an attitude might well encourage certain people to think of building a wall, an impenetrable barrier, which would for ever separate all the occupied territories from the rest of the country. Such an attitude would mean giving a blessing to the annexation and legitimizing the expulsion of the local inhabitants. Its end result would be to reward the aggression and the aggressor. There are some contradictions which none of us can accept, lest a system which is, after all, based on a certain balance and harmony should founder.

110. Looking at the problem from another angle, the Security Council can and must, in conformity with the Charter and with its own decisions, consider taking measures which will be both practical and effective and will inspire renewed confidence in its authority and capacity for action. Those measures must necessarily take account of two circumstances, first of all the one which confronts us now, namely, that occupation gives rise to resistance and to an active struggle for liberation. That legitimate struggle furnishes the aggressor a pretext for further reprisals and annexations which present a standing challenge to our faith in the Charter, besides being prejudicial to the integrity of this Council.

111. The second circumstance is our unshakeable loyalty to the Charter and to the spirit which gave it birth. If we bear these two factors in mind, our action must be aimed above all at putting an end to the occupation and to the repressive measures taken by the occupying Power; and it must stress that the struggle for liberation is legitimate and justified, as are all practical and effective efforts to halt and disarm those who are proving their aggressive intentions by their deeds and raising reprisals to the level of policy and law.

112. The responsibility incumbent upon this Council has now become imperative. The Council must act, and act quickly, to ensure respect for its resolution 248 (1968). If it fails to take a resolute stand and proceeds in a dilatory fashion it would give the impression in some quarters that it has become incapable of action. The Council might do well to adopt the credo proclaimed, on 26 March last, by President Léopold Senghor:

"The trials of the Arabs are our trials; their defeats are our defeats; their hopes are our hopes and their duty to be reborn and to resist is our duty."

113. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation wishes to make a few comments on the problem before the Security Council.

114. The Hungarian people learned with the greatest indignation of the most recent act of aggression committed by Israel against Jordan. This aggression is the most recent in a long series of attacks by Israel on the neighbouring countries. It was a prepared, premeditated and deliberate attack, displaying an arrogant disrespect for the Charter, for international agreements and for international law. It was a challenge to the whole world. It was an expression of a military policy of conquest, domination and expansion aiming at rule over other peoples by ruthless and violent force.

115. The duty of the United Nations is to stop this kind of activity, to stop this series of aggressions. The duty of the Security Council is to call upon those members of the Council and those Members of the Organization that support the Israeli Government by supplying it with the offensive weapons that are used in its attacks against other peoples—those States that supply capital and economic assistance to Israel to strengthen that country's ambitions, and that are even supplying volunteers to participate in its aggressive activities—to call upon those supporters of Israel to cease their assistance and co-operation with the aggressor in the Middle East.

116. The representative of Israel said that his people is facing a great danger, and that if anyone in the world is yearning for peace, it is his people. In a way we agree with that statement—but not with the explanation that was given with it. The danger which the Israeli people is facing is created by the aggressive policy of the Government of Israel, by its series of attacks against the neighbouring countries, by its oppression of the population in huge occupied areas and by its engaging every day in warlike actions. Such actions and such a policy cannot but lead in the end to the destruction of the aggressor. Arrogant domination, as history has proved so many times, only

breeds growing resistance, creating as a result the means of the destruction of the conqueror.

117. The representative of Israel seems to be forgetting certain facts. He stated that it is their homes and their people which are being destroyed—and that is why they condemn these incidents. May I remind him and those of his allies which are unwilling to consider the real facts as they are, that the West Bank of the Jordan River is still Jordan territory, that the Sinai Peninsula is United Arab Republic territory and that the Golan Heights are Syrian territory. It would be much better if those representatives did not forget those facts and did not attempt to make the world accept these military attacks and acts of aggression as normal events.

118. It was astonishing to hear the representative of the United States, Ambassador Goldberg, state in this debate that we should not try to put someone in the wrong, because that is no solution to the problem. It is strange indeed to hear such a distinguished lawyer state that he does not wish to distinguish between the attacker and the victim.

119. In this case, as on many previous occasions, a serious attack has been committed; people have been killed and homes have been destroyed. This is clearly a criminal act for which the guilty should be exposed and should be held responsible, as well as for all the consequences connected with it.

120. The Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that for those reasons Israel should be condemned for its repeated aggressive activities and should be called upon to desist from further attacks against its neighbours.

121. Secondly, the Security Council should recognize the right of the Arab peoples to self-defence—which is fully justified—in the Arab territories. The Hungarian People's Republic strongly supports the victims of aggression. We fully agree with the statement of the representative of Jordan that Jordan cannot be held responsible for the safety of the Israeli occupying forces in Arab territories. I should like to add that the United Nations cannot be held responsible either for the safety of the aggressors. The duty of the United Nations, based on the Charter, is to protect the interests of the victims of the aggression. We should not recognize annexation of foreign territories. We should not condone the stabilization of the occupation of foreign territories.

122. Thirdly, in the view of the Hungarian delegation the Security Council should impose the strongest sanctions against the aggressive policy of the Government of Israel. The Council cannot tolerate the contemptuous refusal by Israel to implement resolutions 242 (1967) and 248 (1968). This attitude of Israel constitutes a very clear violation of Article 25 of the Charter, which, as my delegation states now and has stated so repeatedly, calls for strong measures against the Government refusing to implement the resolutions.

123. In the view of the Hungarian delegation those considerations should prevail if we sincerely want to

strengthen peace in the Middle East and if we want to contribute to the effectiveness of the mission of Ambassador Jarring, the Representative of the Secretary-General in the area, to implement resolution 242 (1967) of the Council.

124. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish to speak briefly today on three issues: first, the need to recognize the futility of force; second, the need to break out of the political impasse; and third, the desperate need for speed.

125. It is on the basis of those three propositions that I would wish to appeal to the Council and to all those concerned in the face of the confused and continued conflict.

126. I believe that we all recognize the futility of any attempt to settle the problem before us by violence. The vicious circle of violence escalates. One outbreak of violence leads to more and worse violence—all of which we would all most strongly condemn. We all see and must accept the hopelessness of force. The Jordan Valley has become a desolate waste of fire and suffering. Anyone who imagines that the situation can be saved or restored by more violence must be blind. Surely we all have to recognize, as it has so often been recognized elsewhere, that there is no military solution for this particular problem. If we concentrate only on the military factors we shall surely fail.

127. Secondly, we must do everything we possibly can to ensure that the cease-fire is made effective and we must all most carefully consider the implications and the necessities of the report which the Secretary-General has placed before us this morning; but I believe that no one imagines that to maintain the cease-fire is enough, important though it obviously is. If we had no course before us but to attempt to stop the violence, we might well be very nearly powerless. If we had no positive course open to us, the outlook would indeed be miserably hopeless; we could look only to a descent into greater confusion so dangerous that we might despair of ever emerging from it. However, as we all know, we have no need to be negative. We have a clear course open before us. We have laid down the framework of a settlement. We understand that that framework is acceptable to everyone concerned. We have voted unanimously in this Council. We see the way we must go. We have every reason to be positive and to insist that we proceed in accordance with the positive policy which we ourselves have laid down.

128. Had all the parties come forward at once and openly stated their full acceptance of the whole resolution, the situation would have been at once transformed. No one can pretend that such acceptance of the resolution could be given without two clear obligations being created: first, to carry it out in full and, secondly, to co-operate with the United Nations and with Ambassador Jarring for that purpose. It was not done before. Why should it not be done now? What was desirable in the interests of everyone concerned in November has become essential and desperately urgent in March. We are all obsessed by the thought that bloody confusion threatens to take over, bringing suffering to countless innocent people. Surely there can be no escape except by political action.

129. If those propositions are regarded as self-evident, I go on to say something else which also is surely obvious to us all. The third proposition I wish to emphasize is the urgency of political action. When I was speaking in reply in this Council last Sunday I attempted to emphasize the fact that there is so little time to take the political action required. With your permission, I should like to state again what I said then:

“How much harm delay has done already. Only the devil would advocate delay now. Delay has been and is on the side of conflict. Delay has been and is on the side of the suffering of the innocent. Delay has been and is on the side of violence and bloodshed. Delay is on the side of condemning another generation in the Middle East to hopeless hate. All of us, as we come to the end of our debate, must surely be anxiously aware that there is no time to be lost. Now is the time and great is the urgency to turn from what divides us to what unites us in practical advance.” [1407th meeting, para. 45.]

What was urgent last Sunday is still more urgent now. It is with that thought in mind that we would make an appeal that this Council at once and urgently call on all concerned to co-operate immediately and unreservedly on the basis of the resolution for which we all voted last November.

130. The more we hear accounts of the violence which has intervened, the more we hear of the intensity of feeling, and the more we look into the abyss of confusion and violence which now opens before us, the more necessary it is to get back on to the road we charted, which is surely the only way to escape from the vicious circle which each week, each day, seems more and more to control the situation. I trust that we shall never lose sight of the necessity for that political solution and we shall throughout our debate urge on everyone concerned that the only escape now before us is the escape by positive political action.

131. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Jordan, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

132. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I have a few observations to make on the points raised by Mr. Tekoah. He began his statement by saying that every stone in Palestine belonged to his fathers and his grandfathers and so on. We wish to point out that Mr. Tekoah is a newcomer to Palestine: he comes from eastern Europe. Neither Mr. Tekoah's father nor his grandfather, nor his great-great-grandfather, ever set foot in Palestine.

133. My second point concerns the question of who first started the firing. This is an old record by now. Every time we bring a complaint here we find a counter-complaint and we find an attempt to impute to us the crime committed by Israel. Mr. Tekoah said that my letter warning the Council that there would be an attack on Jordan was a smoke-screen.

134. This is not the first time that I have warned the Council and it is not the first time that Israel has committed aggression after the warning. I did warn the Council three times about the contemplated aggression. I

met with the President and I communicated this information to him. The following day, within twenty-four hours, the Israelis attacked and the Council condemned that attack.

135. So when I come here and warn the Council and they again attack on the following day, I think that they are in no position to deny it, because they do not come to the Security Council with clean hands.

136. The question of children was raised. We deplore any attack on children. We are human and we do not believe in inhuman behaviour. But if there is any inhuman behaviour, it is in the history of Zionism and Israel. When I referred to Karameh I mentioned that I had been there and had brought back pictures from Karameh, pictures which are now contained in a Security Council document [S/8419]. Here you see the children and here are the fragmentation bombs. These are the victims of the Israeli fragmentation bombs. This is a crime admitted by Israel. It is not hearsay evidence.

137. So when Mr. Tekoah comes here and says that we fired first and speaks about children, I reply: here you see the children. I shall not mention napalm bombs and other things which were used in the most inhuman manner last June; I shall not dwell on them now, as I know the hour is late.

138. Mr. Tekoah referred to my statement that the war was not over. I am not the only one saying this. You—the Security Council—are saying this; you have adopted a cease-fire resolution. Did you adopt anything more than a cease-fire resolution? Does a cease-fire mean peace, peace with occupation, coexistence with aggression? That is not your decision. It is a cease-fire—nothing more, nothing less.

139. Then we heard the statement made that I had said that the cease-fire was not a final settlement. I should hope so. That explains why Mr. Tekoah keeps mentioning the cease-fire agreement—not the resolution—and why I continue to hear some members referring—either intentionally or in good faith—to the cease-fire line. That proves what the motive is. A cease-fire agreement, a final settlement: was that your resolution? I know that you all adopted a cease-fire, and that that is the stand of the Council.

140. A reference was made to the Karameh operation. Mr. Tekoah said: “The Karameh operation should be a warning to all Arab rulers”. No, this is a warning to every single member of the Security Council around this table. After the Council adopted a resolution condemning the attack, it is Mr. Tekoah who is telling you, not Jordan, that this operation is a warning to all Arab leaders, that reprisal pays and that “we will do it again and again and again”. That has no other meaning. So the warning is not to us: it is to the dignity and prestige of this great body, to the great values enshrined in our Charter.

141. Another point raised here was the question of turmoil in Jordan. But that is a good sign, it is a sign of awakening, of more alertness and more realization of Zionist expansionist aims and aggression. We welcome our awareness because with awareness there comes under-

standing, and with understanding we know that our problem will be solved on the basis of what is just, what is right and what the Charter inspires, not what it might inspire. I said this in my statement today. Everywhere in the Arab world, not only in Jordan, there is turmoil, there is unrest. People refuse to accept this type of illegal and immoral occupation. So when Mr. Tekoah says that there is turmoil, it belies his very statement that everything is all right in the West Bank. The West Bank is part of Jordan, and this realization exists on both sides of the Jordan River, the West Bank and the East Bank.

142. I now come to a point raised by the representative of the United States. He placed some emphasis on the question of observers. Let me make this very clear. Israel expelled the machinery of the United Nations just as it expelled 450,000 citizens of Jordan from the West Bank. Is it now in the interest of the Security Council to look for new machinery with a new status and a new mandate, or should the Council insist that its same machinery should be stationed in the same area and in the same building—the building used by the United Nations—and should work for the very same aim—not the aim of freezing a cease-fire resolution or what some members call a cease-fire line, but the aim of implementing the only existing United Nations mandate, which is the Armistice Agreement? The Armistice Agreement is still there. Our Secretary-General very ably said that this machinery is still valid, that no one whether Jordan or Israel has a veto concerning revocation of this Agreement. That being so, the Agreement is still binding on both and it should be the machinery of the Council. But if the United Nations machinery is expelled by Israel, should it look for a second front and go backwards? And if it is expelled again, should it go backwards to a third line? No, that would not be in the interest neither of peace in the area nor of the Security Council. The machinery exists.

143. I am glad and delighted to note that our distinguished and able Secretary-General is not saying that “we want observers on the cease-fire line or in the cease-fire area”. He is simply saying: “I may take this occasion to point out that the presence of United Nations observers in an area can be helpful” [S/7930/Add.66], leaving the door open for the armistice machinery to be revived and reactivated.

144. I hope that those points will be taken into consideration by the members of the Council who are concerned about peace. I know that they are concerned about peace, but it should be a peace based on what is right, not a peace of accommodation.

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

146. Mr. TEKOAHA (Israel): The representative of Jordan found it appropriate to make a personal remark concerning me; I shall not reply to it. I shall only say that it reminded me of a well-known and ancient story about Rabbi Gamliel who one day asked his servant to go to the market and get the best food available. The servant went to the market and came back with a piece of tongue. The next day the Rabbi asked his servant to go to the market again and to find and

purchase the worst food available. Again the servant came back with a tongue. The Rabbi asked for an explanation and the servant gave a very simple one: “there is nothing better than a good tongue, nothing worse than an evil tongue”.

147. As regards the situation in Karameh, I would refer the representative of Jordan to the statement made by King Hussein in which he explained whom the Israelis engaged and whom they did not engage in their defensive action. King Hussein, when asked whether the Israelis fought the Fedayeen, the raiders and marauders at the Karameh camp, answered “probably”.

148. Again I listened with amazement to the flood of abuse in the statement of the representative of Algeria. It does not deserve to be commented on. The Algerian Government has made its attitude abundantly clear. It is at war with Israel. It does not accept the cease-fire. The Charter obligations are of no concern to Algeria. Its membership in the Security Council imposes no responsibility on it. I think Algeria's attitude is more of a problem for the Security Council itself than for Israel—

149. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Algeria on a point of order.

150. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): It is not the habit of the Algerian delegation to interrupt speakers in this Council. The spokesman for Zionist diplomacy in the United Nations is entitled to make all the comments he feels it is his duty to make. But that he should cast a slur on the integrity of the Algerian delegation, and of Algeria, is something we will not allow.

151. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Israel will please continue.

152. Mr. TEKOAHA (Israel): At a previous meeting I already suggested, respectfully, to the Soviet representative that he avoid accepting at face value information from Arab sources [1405th meeting, para. 76]. Today the Council is discussing a grave situation that has arisen as a result of Jordanian aggression against Israeli territory, Israeli villages, the Israeli population in the Beit She'an Valley—not in areas under Israel control on the West Bank of the Jordan River, as the Soviet representative and some other representatives have alleged.

153. A reference was made here by the representative of the USSR to aggression. I have before me a document containing a Soviet draft for the definition of aggression. It states *inter alia*:

“1. In an international conflict that State shall be declared the attacker which first commits one of the following acts:

“... .

“(f) Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invade the territory of another State, or refusal, on being requested by the invaded State, to take in its own territory any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection.

"2. That State shall be declared to have committed an act of indirect aggression which:

"(a) Encourages subversive activity against another State (acts of terrorism, diversionary acts, etc.)."¹

Does the Soviet representative suggest that this definition should apply to all States except the Jewish State? I cannot believe that this is an attempt to vindicate the old Russian saying: "to all except the Jews".²

154. The problem of crossings of truce demarcation and cease-fire lines by marauders is not a new question. It has been dealt with before the Security Council in the past. In an earlier discussion an important statement was made by a distinguished representative, and I quote him:

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

"..."

"... the Security Council should adopt a suitable resolution or issue a warning to the parties . . ."—to the parties—"so that the Governments and authorities concerned may establish the necessary supervision over individuals or groups whose actions might contribute to a violation of the truce and a resumption of military operations . . .

"..."

"The States which have undertaken to fulfil the Security Council's decision on the cessation of military operations . . . will certainly be able to find ways and means to punish and call to order or bring to justice the individuals or groups whose actions might contribute to violate the obligations imposed upon the various States involved in the Palestine problem and the decisions of the Security Council."³

That statement was made in the Security Council on 19 August 1948 by the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik. I agree with Ambassador Malik.

155. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I was about to call on the representative of Jordan, but I see that

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Annexes, agenda item 51, document A/C.6/L.332/Rev.1.*

² Quoted in Russian by the speaker.

³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 107, 354th meeting, pp. 45 and 46.*

the USSR representative is raising a point of order. This has priority, and I therefore call on him.

156. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I shall be very brief. I should like to satisfy the curiosity of the representative of Israel and explain that the proposal of the Soviet Union on the definition of aggression envisages not a national approach, whether Jews, Arabs, Americans, Russians or others are concerned, but an international political approach, and relates to all aggressors, regardless of their nationality. The representative of Israel should understand this by now.

157. A few days ago Israel was formally condemned as an aggressor by a decision of the United Nations Security Council. Therefore no verbal rhetoric here on the part of the Israel aggressor can change the situation or justify repeated acts of aggression against Arab States.

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

159. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I do not know why Mr. Tekoah was upset at my referring to his origin. I think everyone should be proud of his origin. I do not know why, when Mr. Tekoah speaks about his home and I tell him "This is my home and your home is in East Europe", he calls this a personal remark. This is a statement of fact. He speaks about the souls of his fathers. This should guide him to where they are.

160. With regard to the question of the sweet tongue, I certainly agree that Mr. Tekoah, like every single Zionist, is well trained to use his tongue properly. I think it is this which is creating the big lie in many big cities. It is because of this kind of misinformation—I repeat, misinformation—designed to mislead and distort. Yes, we are not good at public relations at times, but they are very good at distortion and at misinformation.

161. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no more speakers on my list. I therefore propose that the meeting should be adjourned and that the time of the next meeting should be fixed after consultations with members of the Council. However, in view of the seriousness of this situation, I would request members kindly to hold themselves available for a possible emergency meeting of the Security Council.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.