

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1411th MEETING: 2 APRIL 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1411)	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

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 ELEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 2 April 1968, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Y. A. MALIK
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

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/1411)

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.

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. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): We have today received requests from the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Iraq to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the agenda item now before the Council. If there are no objections, I shall consider that the Council agrees to invite the two representatives I have just mentioned, in addition to the representatives of Jordan, Israel and Syria, who have been previously invited.

2. There being no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

3. In view of the fact that there are more requests to participate in the meeting than there are places at the Council table, I would propose that we follow the previous practice of inviting the representatives who requested that this item be included on our agenda to take places at the Council table for the duration of the discussion on the question before us, and that we invite the remaining

representatives who wish to participate in the debate to take the places reserved for them in the Council Chamber, on the understanding that when they wish to address the Council they will be invited to take places at the Council table for that purpose. If there are no objections we shall proceed accordingly.

4. Since there are no objections, this proposal is adopted

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra, representative of Jordan, and Mr. M. Y. Tekoah, representative of Israel, took places at the Council table; and Mr. G. J. Tomeh, representative of Syria, Mr. M. A. El Kony, representative of the United Arab Republic, and Mr. A. Pachachi, representative of Iraq, took the places reserved for them at the side of the Security Council Chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council will now proceed to consider the item on the agenda. The first speaker on my list is the representative of India, on whom I now call.

6. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Mr. President, I should like first of all to welcome you as President of the Council for this month. My delegation is confident that under your wise and statesmanlike guidance the Council will be able to discharge its duties satisfactorily and expeditiously.

7. We should at the same time like to express our sincere and whole-hearted gratitude to the outgoing President. During his outstanding Presidency, Ambassador Diop of Senegal made a very valuable contribution to the work of this Council in most trying circumstances. His wisdom, judgement and diplomatic skill never failed during delicate and very often prolonged negotiations which resulted in the adoption of unanimous resolutions in two critical areas of our work. Our regret is that Ambassador Diop's departure has deprived us of the benefit of valuable advice from an experienced colleague. We should like to take this opportunity to wish him all success in his new field of activity.

8. Only a few days ago the Security Council held a series of meetings to consider the grave situation in West Asia resulting from the Israeli armed attack on Jordanian villages east of the Jordan River. After four days of debate and intensive, almost round-the-clock consultations, the Council unanimously adopted a resolution condemning Israel for that attack and deploring violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire. Less than a week after the adoption of that resolution, the Council is again confronted with a serious violation of the cease-fire which took place on 29 March. It is clear from all available reports that this major military

clash, extending to the use of aircraft with its attendant loss of life and its damage to civilian property, was against the injunction of Security Council resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March.

9. It has been maintained that violent incidents in occupied Arab territories are the cause of the recent aggravation of tension. My delegation finds it difficult to reconcile itself to this view. We must clearly state that Israel's recent measures affecting the civilian population of occupied Arab territories and resulting in the uprooting of many thousands of Arab inhabitants from their homes are not permissible in terms of various United Nations resolutions. Those resolutions cannot be interpreted to mean that the Arab people should accept Israeli military occupation.

10. My delegation has had occasion to state in the past, and would like to repeat once again, that a situation in which the Security Council has to go from one cease-fire to another without withdrawal of foreign forces has serious consequences which cannot be ignored. As long as Israel refuses to withdraw from Arab territories occupied as a result of the hostilities of June 1967, there will be little worth-while prospect for peace in the area. Serious tensions will continue to prevail and the Arabs under foreign occupation will continue to reject that occupation. It would be erroneous to believe that peace in West Asia could be brought about under the pressure of such continued military occupation. It is therefore imperative that Israel should agree to implement fully the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

11. It is equally important that the parties should co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, in his task of bringing about the implementation of that resolution. During the Council's discussion culminating in the adoption of the resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March, my delegation expressed serious anxiety over the effects of armed clashes on the success of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative. We note from the Secretary-General's report of 29 March 1968 [S/8309/Add.2] that Ambassador Jarring is directing his efforts towards obtaining an agreed statement of the position concerning the implementation of the resolution. We should like to hope that the Government of Israel will co-operate with the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative in fully implementing the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. In this connexion, my delegation notes with appreciation the strenuous efforts of King Hussein of Jordan to prevent a deterioration of the situation, and his positive attitude towards the Jarring mission. We should also like to pay a tribute to the King for his leadership of his people under the extremely difficult and trying circumstances in which his country is placed.

12. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Syria and invite him to take a place at the Council table.

13. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Five days after the adoption, on 24 March, of a unanimous resolution by the Security Council, resolution 248 (1968), condemning Israel for its large-scale, carefully planned military action against Jordan

in violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions, and warning 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", the Ambassador of Jordan, on 29 March, called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider a new, premeditated attack by Israel against Jordan.

14. The depravity of that new aggression must be emphasized. Nine Jordanian frontier villages, inhabited by civilians, and the Karameh refugee camp were subjected to intensive shelling by the Israeli air force and artillery, indiscriminately killing civilians. The target was the east Goar canal area, which is the site of agricultural developments, and the express purpose was to deprive the Arab population of its sources of livelihood. This attack was directed from the occupied territory of Jordan. The cynical justification given by the Israeli representative was, among other things, to protect Israeli children. These unprovoked attacks against civilians, the wanton killing of civilians and the destruction of Arab villages have become a Zionist daily exercise in sadism and genocide surpassing Nazi atrocities. They constitute war crimes.

15. The Security Council and world public opinion should not be astonished at these new acts of Zionist Israeli viciousness. In fact, one day after the unanimous condemnation of Israel by the Security Council, Mr. Eshkol, Zionist leaders and the Zionist press made no secret of their defiance and utter disregard of the Security Council resolution; and showing an arrogance of which they alone are capable, declared their determination to perpetuate their annihilation of the Arabs and make the new occupied Arab territories—as they made Palestine before—*Goyim rein*, to use their own terminology, that is to say, clear of the Arabs.

16. Thus the Security Council has before it one new complaint—a complaint of Israel's continuous war of aggression on Jordan and the Arab States which, occurring as it did, can only mean that the Security Council has failed to stop continued Israeli defiance. The repetition of these Israeli acts is an ominous sign to all concerned about world peace.

17. I am duty bound to warn the Security Council and the United Nations of the forthcoming renewal of large-scale military operations by Israel against the Arab States. The continuous attacks on Jordan under the pretext of stopping infiltration, and the large concentration of Israeli troops on Syrian borders and in Sinai, are but proof of Israel's aggressive designs and military planning. The appeals for peace by the Israeli representative monotonously chanted and repeated in the Council cannot and should not deceive anyone. They only confirm what I have just stated, because they fall within the pattern of the Israeli Zionist empire-building—a pattern which constitutes the history of Israel in the last twenty years.

18. Members of the Council will undoubtedly recall the most recent proof: the sneaky and treacherous Israeli attack of 5 June. It took place while the Security Council was in session trying to find a solution to the Middle East crisis. On 23 May 1967 Mr. Levi Eshkol, in an address to

the Knesset was quoted as having told the Arab countries that Israel had no aggressive designs. He said: "We do not demand anything except to live in tranquillity in our present territory."

19. On 5 June 1967 the then Israeli Permanent Representative to the United Nations read to the Security Council the following statement of the Israeli Defence Minister: "We have no aim of conquest. Our sole objectives are to put an end to the Arab attempt to conquer our land and to suppress the blockade . . .". [1347th meeting, para. 33.]

20. That was the prelude to the conquest. Thus, heavy attacks on the Arab States have always been preceded by pious calls for peace. Israel has thus two declared policies: one is to the world proclaiming peace; the other is an active policy voiced at home. It is a combination of expansion, a crippling of the Arab's economic take-off and development, a resort to arms to settle disputes and a continuous defiance of the United Nations. We are today faced with the same grave and threatening situation. There is all the more reason to make the Council fully aware of its world responsibility.

21. Another ominous sign of Israel's vicious designs and well-known pattern, used as a pretext for every treacherous attack on the Arabs, which they have engaged in actively since 1947, is to describe the Arab people of Palestine—the still legitimate owners of the land of Palestine—and the Arabs under the yoke of Israeli occupation as terrorists and saboteurs.

22. My delegation has consistently maintained and continues to maintain that these terms are incongruous. In fact, on 25 July 1966 I stated in the Security Council:

"Our policy is clear: unëquivocal attachment to justice, in any cause, and in particular in the legitimate cause of our Arab brothers of Palestine who feel, according to the words of the High Commissioner . . . in his report of 1965, that: ' . . . a nation has been obliterated and a population arbitrarily deprived of its birthright.'"
[1288th meeting, para. 98.]

23. Again, at a meeting of the Security Council held on 14 October 1966 my delegation stated:

" . . . whenever we are discussing the problems of Israel and the neighbouring Arab States, one thing is lost sight of . . . and that is that besides, beyond . . . and above either the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Lebanese or the Jordanians"—or any other group—"there is an Arab people of Palestine. The whole wretched story that we hear time and again . . . is due to the fact that these Arabs of Palestine have been forgotten. . . . There is an Arab people of Palestine, and these Arabs of Palestine are not different from any other people in their determination, will, attachment and loyalty to their homeland." [1307th meeting, para. 68.]

24. To stress this irreducible fact, I wish to quote the following very wise words used by the representative of Algeria in his brilliant statement during the meeting of the Security Council on Saturday, 30 March:

"The eruption of the Palestinian resistance movement onto the international scene, a movement which some thought had been wiped out forever, is certainly a cause of concern to those who have adopted a policy of ravaging and despoiling; but it would be illusory to think that the rebirth of the Palestinian people can be delayed any longer, and neither collective repressions, so-called preventive actions, nor so-called graduated reprisal measures, will stop the fighting which has been brought about by the occupation itself." [1409th meeting, para. 104.]

25. The Israeli representative in the Security Council has continuously scorned our upholding of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine. I wish to remind him here that the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at a Conference held in Cairo in 1964 resolved to:

"(1) endorse the full restoration of all the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to their homeland, and their inalienable right to self-determination;

"(2) declare their full support to the Arab people of Palestine in their struggle for liberation from colonialism and racism."¹

26. Terrorism was introduced into the Arab lands primarily by the Jewish Zionist underground in Palestine. On 22 March [1404th meeting], I made an enumeration of the various underground organizations—the Haganah, the Palmach, Irgun Zvai Leumi, the Lehi—and I need not go into the details again. But hearing is one thing and seeing is another.

27. The leaders of these organizations have written extensively of their exploits. The book, *Memoirs of an Assassin*,² by Avner Gruszow is one of them. You will see that they have called themselves gangsters and killers. We need not go into any part of this book, but need only look at what is quoted from it on its cover to introduce the book:

"I raised my sub-machine gun and stuck the barrel out of the car window. Conquest was right in front of us. The major turned his head—his face slackened, then hardened again. I pulled the trigger. Three bullets hit him in the stomach. He pitched heavily forward on to his face. The milk bottles he was carrying flew from his hands and burst on the pavement, his blood mingling with the milk . . ."

Later speaking about the assassination of another Major:

"The villa was guarded by two Arab police. Instead of quietly overpowering them, Ouzy shot them thirteen times in the stomach with his Mauser. The four dynamites ran toward the villa. Under the blast of 100 kilometres of explosives the villa disintegrated. Later that evening, washed and wearing a white shirt, I went to the cinema."

28. The leaders of the same underground organizations and their rank and file later became the leaders and army of

¹ See A/5763.

² New York, T. Yoseloff, 1959.

Israel. We know what underground movements the former Israeli representatives to the United Nations belonged to; we should greatly appreciate it—because we are perplexed—if Mr. Tekoah would identify himself to us.

29. Whereas these gangs used to boast of their exploits, of murder, looting and destruction, now these exploits have been incorporated into the history of the State; they have been pre-empted and transformed into activities of the Israeli army, and the Israeli Government acknowledges them as legitimate manifestations of its career.

30. A great rabbi justified the criminal acts of the terrorists in these terms:

“To those who believe that we ought to excommunicate the so-called terrorists in Eretz Israel”—Israel did not exist then—“I am forced to declare that . . . Irgunists and the others are really martyring themselves for the Jews and for Eretz Israel.”

31. Israel, from its inception, has been on a colonial basis but it has surpassed the established methods of colonialism in ruthlessness and barbarism against the indigenous people. While classical colonialism uses the means of suppressing the indigenous people so as to tighten its grip over their land, resources and destiny, Israel sought to dispose of the autochthonous people altogether by murder and displacement. It transformed a people living peacefully and rightfully on its land into refugees living on international charity.

32. But from a basis of colonialism Israel evolved into a spearhead of imperialism. That it is based on expansion is evidenced by the size of the Arab territory it has invaded and still occupies. That aggression is its instrument is evidenced by the series of attacks which it launched against the Arab States and concerning which its criminal record in the United Nations speaks for itself. That it is racist is evidenced by its cult of hatred against the Arabs, against their past, their present and their future and against any sign of their renaissance and economic development.

33. In all of this, it differs from the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia only in the intensity of its ruthlessness, and imperialist ambitions and the perfection of the Nazi methods of genocide and *blitzkrieg*. Like every colonial criminal, conscious of its guilt, the slightest resistance to its aims of expansion constitutes for it a nightmare which arouses its fear of accountability for what it did to 2 million Arabs, what it is now doing to further millions of its victims and what it intends to do. If there is any doubt about it, the new *Führer* dispels it. In his most recent statement he openly admitted that “the attacks on Jordan are part of a campaign that will continue until Israel came to a decision with the Arabs.” Thus Israel is openly declaring its intentions to continue its terror until it comes to a decision about the fate it wants for the Arabs.

34. The Zionist spokesman in the Council forgets all of this and comes here to ascribe to my country, in his own words “stagnation and international claustrophobia” [1409th meeting, para. 64]. No words better illustrate the position of his leaders, whose own sense of humanity is so

completely stagnant that they think only in terms of further murders and further aggressions. Condemned by the Security Council and by world opinion for their acts, they are the ones who are developing stagnation and claustrophobia. Is it not their Prime Minister who is now advocating the use of “different methods”, as, in his words, Israel “has to consider world opinion and her powerful friends”? But world opinion has already taken its stand against colonialism and is increasingly aware of the calamities engendered by the new forms of colonialism; the most ruthless and the most unscrupulous, the colonialism of settlement to the detriment of the rightful peoples.

35. The Israeli representative in a further intervention thought it appropriate to refer to the consideration by the Security Council in 1966 of the Israeli allegations of infiltrations from Syria. What he forgot to mention was that the appropriate United Nations machinery to deal with such allegations has been obstructed by his authorities.

36. The Secretary-General made this fact abundantly clear in paragraph 3 of his report of 1 November 1966 [S/7572]. This obstruction was not limited to 1966, but, as the Secretary-General pointed out, dated from 1951.

37. Indeed, what the Israeli representative also omitted is that the Secretary-General, dealing with the core of the problem in his report of 2 November 1966, did not leave any doubt as to where the roots of the trouble lay. He said:

“On the western bank, Arab villages have been demolished, their inhabitants evacuated. The inhabitants of the villages of Baqqara and Ghanname returned following Security Council resolution 93 (1951) of 18 May 1951. They were later, on 30 October 1956, forced to cross into Syria where they are still living. Their lands on the western bank of the river, and Khoury Farm in the same area, are cultivated by Israel nationals.” [S/7573, para. 16.]

38. Those are the words of the Secretary-General. Can anyone in all conscience come to the Security Council to say that these people, deprived by force of their homes, are infiltrators? Infiltrators in their own villages and farms?

39. Israel is continuing its policy of armed aggression against the Arab States and the resolutions of the Security Council have not halted this aggression. The threat to take effective measures, as provided by the Charter, did not deter Israel from repeating acts of the same nature, always in wider dimensions. As a matter of fact the threat by the Council to take effective measures does not date only from 24 March of this year. Security Council resolution 111 (1956) of 19 January 1956, condemning Israel for its attack in the Lake Tiberias area of Syria, called on Israel to comply with its obligations, in default of which the Council, according to paragraph 5 of that resolution, “will have to consider what further measures under the Charter are required to maintain or restore the peace”.

40. Thus, any mere threat to take action against the aggressor has for long now proved ineffective, and the time is for action, not for threatening to take it. Nor is the stationing of observers the issue. The issue is that the rule

of force, conquest, occupation, annexation, destruction and murder have long been banned from international law, and the Council will fail in its responsibility if it does not halt the aggressor and uphold the right of the victim to its integrity and independence. The Arab people have the honourable duty to defend this right and to deny the aggressor the fruit of its aggression.

41. The right of the Palestinian people to resist liquidation of their personality and rights and the right of every Arab under Israeli occupation to resist annexation and occupation is a natural right whose sanctity and integrity are recognized by the United Nations Charter and scores of resolutions on colonialism. The exercise of this right is an act of honour, not an act of sabotage and terrorism. Representatives who freely use such descriptions had better look into their own history of liberation and adopt one, not a double, moral standard, because morality is indivisible.

42. Indeed, the problems of our area are not the problems of resistance; they are the problems of usurpation and genocide, invasion and occupation. Only when justice is restored can peace prevail.

43. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Iraq, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table. I call on the representative of Iraq.

44. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): I have asked to be allowed to participate in this debate of the Council in view of the references made yesterday by the representative of Israel to my country and the role played by the Iraqi contingents stationed in Jordan in defending that country against Israeli aggression.

45. Let me say at once that we are proud to help the freedom fighters in their struggle against oppression and the alien occupation of their country. We do so, not only because as Arabs we have a national duty to help our people in their hour of need, but also because as loyal Members of this Organization we have the obligation to render all possible assistance to peoples fighting for their freedom. Over and above this, as human beings we cannot stand idle while such unspeakable crimes are daily committed against defenceless people who for fifty years have been the victims of a savage and ruthless campaign to obliterate their national identity and drive them out of their ancestral homeland. It is an insult to the intelligence of the members of this Council and an offence against every decent impulse for the representative of Israel to call these fighters for freedom cowardly creatures. It is the actions of the Zionist guerrillas that can best be described thus. Do we forget that on 9 April 1948 250 Arabs, among them many women and children, were slaughtered in cold blood and dumped in a well in the village of Deir Yassin, outside the city of Jerusalem? Do we forget that in October 1956, on the day when Israel launched its attack on Egypt, scores of innocent Arab civilians were mowed down by a machine-gun at Kafr Qasim? Do we forget the numerous instances of premeditated and callous disregard of human life?

46. However, the debates in the Council during the past two weeks have not been in vain. They have clearly and

conclusively demonstrated that individual acts by the people of Palestine against the occupation forces in that country cannot be equated with the well-prepared military actions ordered and controlled by the Israel Government. It is these acts of military reprisal, for which the Government of Israel is solely and exclusively responsible, that can be considered violations of the cease-fire.

47. Secondly—and this is no less important—it has been shown beyond any doubt that Israel does not accept and has not the slightest intention of carrying out the resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The attempt by the representative of Israel to reduce that resolution to a mere invitation to direct negotiations is contrary to the letter and spirit of that resolution. The members of the Council cannot possibly forget that during the lengthy discussions which preceded the adoption of that resolution many proposals, explicit or implicit, for direct negotiations were put forward but were rejected, and it was on the basis of that rejection that the resolution was drafted in the way in which it was drafted. Therefore the Council can ill afford to indulge any further in self-deception; it must now face the realities of the situation.

48. There is one central issue before the Council: will Israel be allowed to solidify its occupation and thereby be enabled to realize its avowed aim of annexing the occupied Arab territories?

49. That is the fundamental problem which has faced the United Nations since June and still faces it today. Shifting emphasis from this basic challenge to secondary or peripheral issues can only consolidate and prolong Israel's occupation of Arab land. This can hardly be the intention of the United Nations since there has been, and I trust there still is, virtual unanimity among the members of this Organization regarding the principle that territorial conquest by military force is inadmissible under the Charter, and consequently that it is necessary for the Israeli troops to withdraw completely from the occupied territories. Such withdrawal has assumed an even more urgent and necessary character at present in view of the murderous attacks launched by Israel against Jordan and the intensification of its repressive acts against the inhabitants of Palestine. Failure to take action can only be interpreted by Israel as an endorsement of its defiant and aggressive policies. Silence in the past has greatly contributed to Israel's intransigence.

50. Besides flatly rejecting the resolution of 22 November, Israel has done the following since the war in June 1967. It has completely disregarded two General Assembly resolutions on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)]. It has refused to implement the Security Council resolution on the refugees [237 (1967)], twice reaffirmed by the General Assembly [resolutions 2252 (ES-V) and 2341 (XXII)]. It has refused to apply the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949³ to the inhabitants of the occupied territories in Palestine. It has not responded to the Secretary-General's request to send observers to Gaza to look into atrocities and acts of oppression perpetrated against the people of that area. It has unilaterally denounced the Armistice

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), Nos. 970-973.

Agreements. It has tried by every conceivable strategem to pave the way for the annexation of the west bank of the Jordan through such methods as changing the designation of the area from "enemy territory" to merely "occupied territory", and even such methods as changing the names, and, we are informed, only recently introducing a five-year agricultural plan for the occupied area—I repeat, a five-year agricultural plan.

51. We read in the press that when the Director of the Ministry of Agriculture of Israel was asked whether such a five-year plan had political implications, he said, "Well, we do not interfere in politics; this is not our business".

52. Let me continue listing the acts perpetrated by Israel since June. It has wantonly and unilaterally prevented the opening of the Suez Canal. It has continued its expulsion of Arab people from the occupied territories. It has continued its murderous attacks on Jordan, the last of which, on 21 March, provoked a strong condemnation by this Council as a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions. New Jewish settlements have been established in the occupied areas. Large Arab lands and properties have been expropriated. Finally, only a few days ago, on 29 March, Israel launched another massive attack against Jordan, now under discussion in this Council. These acts clearly follow a very well established pattern of Israel policies, that was exactly its policy before the war.

53. Let me mention a few of the actions of Israel before the war, of which the actions after the war can only be considered as a logical continuation: the extension of the boundaries beyond those of the 1947 Partition resolution of the General Assembly [181 (II)]; the conquest of Elath after the cease-fire and the truce in 1949; the murder of Count Folke Bernadotte; the encroachment on the demilitarized zones established under the Armistice Agreements; the refusal to repatriate the refugees or to give them the right of choice, in spite of nineteen resolutions to that effect adopted by the General Assembly by overwhelming majorities; the seizure and division of the Jordan waters; the confiscation of Arab properties in Israel; the treatment of Arab inhabitants as third-class citizens; the savage border raids; the massacres; the expulsion and maltreatment of United Nations personnel; and, of course, the boycotting of the Mixed Armistice Commissions.

54. The representative of Israel never tires of repeating, every time he appears before this Council, the story about the so-called embattled and beleaguered Israel. However, the true nature of the conflict between Israel and the Arabs bears no resemblance to the picture which Zionist propaganda has presented to the world, a picture of the Arabs with their vast homelands and rich resources, maliciously and wantonly begrudging a long-persecuted people their little corner of earth which some of their ancestors had once occupied thousands of years ago. But what are the facts?

55. The conflict arose because the Zionists planned to establish a State in a country which for centuries had been overwhelmingly Arab in population, language and culture. This was not a clash of nationalism, nor was it the usual antagonism between settler communities and indigenous

populations. The new society which Zionism wanted to establish in Palestine was to be completely and exclusively Jewish. Such an aim was bound to be opposed by the Arabs of Palestine for reasons that must be clear to all members of the Council.

56. The Arabs of Palestine could not be expected to co-operate in their own destruction. The story of the implementation of the Zionist programme is well known, and it is this gradual and piecemeal implementation, frequently by force, that is at the heart of the problem and is the basic cause of the conflict.

57. In our discussions we should constantly keep in mind this overriding fact. We are dealing with the fate of a whole people in its attempt to survive as a distinct and homogeneous national community. All the problems besetting our area were created as a result of the onslaught of Zionism against the people of Palestine. Nothing will be settled and nothing will endure until and unless the consequences and implications of that aggression are recognized and fearlessly dealt with.

58. The one solid and unalterable fact that has dominated and will continue to dominate our discussions is the refusal of the people of Palestine to disappear as a distinct national Arab entity and their determination to stay alive whatever the cost. For years the people of Palestine have been cajoled, intimidated, and subjected to all kinds of pressures and temptations to give up their claim to their homeland, but they have resisted. And who can blame them?

59. The relations of Israel with the Arabs of Palestine and the Arab States have followed an unchangeable pattern: Israel made agreement with the Arabs which could not be violated later. I give two examples, namely, the Armistice Agreements of 1949 and the Lausanne Protocol⁴ of that same year. No undertaking was given which could not be repudiated later; no promise was given which was not broken later. The only choice offered to the people of Palestine was submission, either peacefully or by force. But the people of Palestine will never submit, no matter what force is used against them and no matter what possibilities and capacities the State of Israel can marshal against the people of Palestine.

60. The creation of Israel, far from being part of the world-wide movement of national liberation which began after the Second World War and is still continuing in our day, was in fact a complete reversal of that trend, an anomaly, in fact a classic example of a racist settler régime imposed upon an Afro-Asian land. All this has been happening at a time when the rest of the world has become aware of the horrors of similar régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia. The people of Palestine have been the victims of a colonial invasion unparalleled in its viciousness and ferocity. Like other colonial peoples who were also victims of alien rule, they aspire to regain their rights and to recover their lost freedom and usurped homeland. Is this unreasonable? Are they not entitled to the understanding, sympathy and support of other peoples of the world,

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. II, document A/927, annexes A and B.*

especially those who only recently emerged from colonial rule, or those whose territories have also been occupied by a ruthless enemy?

61. Can we forget, dare we forget, that the record of Zionism in the Arab world is one of continuous advance, gradual but relentless, and pursued with unparalleled fanaticism and ruthlessness?

62. In view of this record of uninterrupted expansion and violence, are we not entitled to ask whether it is the security of Israel that is really in danger—this Israel which fifty years ago did not exist, when the Jewish population in Palestine numbered barely 50,000, whereas it is now over 2 million? Do we forget that only fifty years ago, there were two or three small settlements and yet today we have before us a State which imposes its rule and oppression over more than one and a half million Arabs and has a military capacity to endanger and threaten the security of each and every Arab State?

63. Let us look at the record of the last fifty years; on the one side, a record of continuous attack and advance and growing power, and on the other side, a record of defence and retreat and diminishing strength.

64. But if the present generation of Arabs has been found wanting and has not been able to overcome the challenge hurled against our people by the Zionist invaders who came fifty years ago, there should be no doubt of the ability of the Arab people, or the vast untapped resources of resilience and power in the Arab nation, sufficient to overcome its present agony and to prevail over those who came to conquer and plunder and subjugate.

65. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Mr. President, I should like first of all to convey through you to your predecessor, Ambassador Diop of Senegal, my delegation's appreciation and gratitude for the admirable manner in which he conducted our deliberations during the busy month of March.

66. I should also like to take this opportunity, my first intervention in the present debate, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for the month of April. I wish to assure you of my delegation's full and faithful co-operation in the important task that we have to undertake together under your able and experienced leadership.

67. The Security Council is meeting for the second time in less than a week to consider yet another violation of its cease-fire decisions. It is a matter of great concern to us, as I am sure it must be to all members of the Council, that so soon after we unanimously adopted resolution 248 (1968) we should be faced once again with the eruption of conflict and violence in the area of the Jordan river, resulting in further loss of life and in the aggravation of an already dangerous and explosive situation.

68. Indeed, I should be failing in my duty and wanting in candour if I were not today to express the growing anxiety of my Government over the increasing deterioration of the situation, which seems to be heading towards an ever-

growing confrontation and conflict unless, by some determined and concerted effort, the Council can arrest these dangerous developments before it is too late.

69. The large-scale military operations and other violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire that have been taking place of late in the Jordan-Israeli sector have in many respects further increased the tension in the area and, if we are to judge by official pronouncements on both sides, it seems that there is nothing which can warrant immediate hope for a decrease in the present tension.

70. My Government is particularly concerned that, if the present pattern of violations of the cease-fire and of other conflicts is allowed to continue, the delicate task of the Secretary-General's Special Representative may well be jeopardized, if not altogether rendered impossible, and with it the only hope which has sustained United Nations efforts to bring peace to the region will have disappeared.

71. This, then, is the paramount consideration and the frightening prospect that we have to bear in mind as we examine the particular problem of cease-fire violations that is now before us, for it is obvious that the cease-fire is a first, albeit precarious and modest, step towards that peace which we wish to establish in the Middle East; and if that first step is continuously undermined, then it is going to be that much more difficult to make a forward move towards the other steps that will lead to the final goal of establishing a just and lasting peace in that troubled region.

72. It is our considered view that there can be little hope of making progress in the greater and more important task of peace-making if the initial cease-fire arrangements are undermined by repeated conflict and violation. This apprehension on our part is fully confirmed by the Secretary-General's report of 29 March 1968, in which he tells us that the efforts of his Special Representative have not resulted in an agreement, and goes on to say: "Moreover, they have been interrupted by recent events" [S/8309/Add.2, para. 4].

73. That being the reality of the situation, it becomes the urgent duty of the Council to ensure that its cease-fire decisions are fully complied with so that a climate can be created in the area which can be conducive to the ultimate and urgent goal—that of establishing peace based on resolution 242 (1967) unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967.

74. In the face of the new military action and of the violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire, it seems to my delegation that the immediate task of the Council must be to reaffirm resolution 248 (1968), which censured military acts of reprisal and all other violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire, and also to warn in the strongest possible terms against a repetition of such acts.

75. The Council must declare, once and for all, that such actions cannot be tolerated and that their repetition will necessitate the taking of further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter.

76. It is moreover obvious that if the Council is to fulfil an effective function in this respect, it should be in a position

to receive verified information from impartial observers of the United Nations on all violations of the cease-fire. The report of the Secretary-General of 30 March 1968 [S/7930/Add.66] speaks for itself with regard to the need for such action. It would not be fair, in the view of my delegation, for the Council to request the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review and to report to the Security Council as appropriate, without giving him the means by which he can obtain verified information from objective sources.

77. Moreover, as the Secretary-General himself has so poignantly reminded us in his report:

“... 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.” [S/7930/Add.66, para. 2.]

78. Furthermore, the Secretary-General goes on to give concrete and meaningful evidence in justification of his request for the stationing of observers when he states to us:

“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.” [Ibid.]

79. In view of the Secretary-General's request, which my delegation finds justified, we would consider it useful and timely for the Council to envisage appropriate and acceptable arrangements for the stationing of observers in the Israel-Jordan cease-fire sector so that the Council may have the advantage of first-hand testimony, as well as the benefit of verified information on all incidents that may take place in that sector.

80. Let me hasten to add, in view of some of the reservations made during this debate, that my Government envisages the cease-fire arrangements—and, for that matter, the special mission of Mr. Jarring—as being only of temporary duration, without any permanent character, and certainly with no purpose other than that of contributing to the final goal of peace and of peaceful settlement. United Nations arrangements are made with the mutual consent of all concerned, and without prejudice to the rights and positions of any party in any given situation. The duty of the United Nations representatives in such situations is to work themselves out of a given responsible job. The sooner the task is accomplished, the sooner must such arrangements come to an end. And no one will be happier to see that happen in the Middle East than the delegation over which I have the honour to preside.

81. In conclusion, I should like to emphasize once again the need for concerted Council effort in giving full backing to the special mission of the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative in the area. Resolution 242 (1967)

of 22 November 1967, which we adopted unanimously, represents a delicate balance of principles, obligations and requirements. If that delicate balance is to be maintained and the difficult task of peace-making is to be successful, we have to give to the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative our sincere and dedicated support. We have to reiterate our mutual confidence in the decision we have taken together. We have to urge and encourage the parties to use the good offices that have been established for the purpose of building a just and lasting peace through the full and faithful application of the principles set out in resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. It is only in this way that we can hope to avert the dangers of future conflict in that area, and it is only in this way that we can ensure a just settlement and lasting peace in that vital and historic region.

82. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, as you take over the Presidency of the Security Council, I should like to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on the high honour and great responsibility entrusted you, and to assure you that, as always, we are ready to co-operate fully, sincerely and loyally, to help you to fulfil the difficult and delicate task of conducting our debates.

83. At the same time, my delegation wishes to pay a sincere and well-earned tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Ousmane Socé Diop of Senegal, whose outstanding services to the Council during March were marked by his characteristic ability, enlightenment and tact. He is on the point of leaving us, and although we know that Senegal has need of his services, we shall miss him in the Security Council.

84. For the second time within a very short period we are confronted with serious violations of the cease-fire in the Middle East as ordered by the Security Council. Once again, they have occurred in the Israel-Jordan sector. The considerable loss of life and the heavy damage and destruction caused in the past have been followed by further loss of life, more damage and more destruction, and as though such incidents were not serious enough in themselves, a new element now has to be considered, namely, the flagrant violation of the provisions of resolution 248 (1968), adopted unanimously by the Council a mere five days before the date of the new incidents.

85. The authority of the Security Council requires that its decisions should be implemented, and by this I mean not only resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968, but also the earlier resolutions in which the Council gave and renewed the order for a cease-fire, in particular resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. In the present circumstances the establishment of a just and stable peace in the Middle East requires the implementation of each and every one of the provisions of that resolution, and in view of the fundamental importance of its objectives it must be borne in mind at all times. Resolution 242 (1967) also gave the Secretary-General a most important task: it requested him to appoint “a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in

accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution”.

86. With regard to the violations of the cease-fire in the Israel-Jordan sector, the Council has heard the accounts of the representatives of the States involved and has had before it the supplemental reports furnished by the Secretary-General concerning those violations. In my statement at the 1403rd meeting on 21 March I quoted part of the Secretary-General's report [S/7930/Add.64], which I considered very important. It has now been supplemented by the report contained in document S/7930/Add.66 referred to several times by my colleagues in the Council. I refer in particular to the observations in paragraph 2 of that document, and I cannot resist the temptation to quote the Secretary-General's evaluation of the role that the United Nations might play in that area:

“... largely because of the presence of United Nations observers, the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions are better served and maintained in the Suez Canal and Israel-Syrian sectors than in the Israel-Jordan sector”.

87. In my statement of 21 March already mentioned, I said that my delegation was not prepared to condone or justify the acts of violence committed in that sector; that the Council should first of all condemn them and then take swift and effective action to prevent their recurrence; that violations of the cease-fire had jeopardized and were continuing to jeopardize the success of Mr. Jarring's mission; and that the Council should have independent sources of information to enable it to establish clear responsibility for each and every violation of the cease-fire. I thought then, as I do now, that to assist Mr. Jarring in his mission and to provide him with some semblance of a suitable atmosphere in which to work, it was and is essential for the cease-fire to be respected, on the understanding that the situation it created was only temporary pending the full implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

88. The United Nations presence in that area, I would now add, would have two equally important advantages: firstly, it would enable the Security Council to obtain impartial reports in the event of any new violations, which we hope will not occur, and secondly, it would have a preventive value in discouraging the recurrence of incidents such as those which have occasioned our present discussion.

89. I repeat that the resultant situation would be provisional; it could not be otherwise. My country has strong feelings on this matter. The situation in the region is the result of armed conflict. Together with other Latin American delegations my delegation made its views abundantly clear during the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly by reiterating, in the draft resolution we co-sponsored,⁵ our conviction that a stable international order could not be based on the threat or use of force, and that no recognition should be given to the occupation or acquisition of territory through such means.

90. To conclude this statement, my delegation would once again urge scrupulous respect for the cease-fire and the

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.*

implementation of the provisions of resolution 428 (1968), and call upon the parties to accept resolution 242 (1967) unconditionally, thus facilitating the task of the Secretary-General and Mr. Jarring. Our greatest hope lies in the acceptance of that resolution and in co-operation with Mr. Jarring's peace mission.

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic and I invite him to take a place at the Council table. I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic.

92. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): It is our earnest hope that our frequent appearances before the Council to complain of the systematic Israeli aggression will contribute to emphasizing the gravity of the questions brought to the attention of the Council and to sharpening the sense of urgency with which those questions have to be dealt with by the Council. They constitute a clear indication of the increasing tension in the area and of the seriousness of the situation, both of which call for an immediate reaction from the Council to restore peace in the Middle East. Let us also hope that the flow of distortions and falsehoods emanating from the representative of the Israeli authorities will not succeed in distracting the members of the Council from assuming their clearly defined duties and responsibilities as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations.

93. This latest aggression by heavy bombardment and the incursion into Jordanian territory by the Israeli Air Force is an integral part of a determined policy of intimidation of the Arabs by the Israeli authorities. It is by now no secret that the Israeli authorities, hiding behind an alleged right of self-defence and using the pretext that they are defending themselves against so-called terrorist activities, are merely trying to justify—in vain—their persistent policy of expansion at the expense of the Arab States and the Arab people. I say that this policy is no longer a secret for it is at present openly advocated by the various echelons of the Israeli Government.

94. Yesterday, the members of the Council heard the Israeli representative speak about his country's absolute right to act in self-defence. His arguments were embodied in an ultimatum devoid of respect for this august body. The Tel Aviv premise is that Israel is free to attack other countries, expel millions of the legitimate inhabitants, occupy land by force, defy numerous United Nations resolutions, and yet when the suppressed populace spontaneously reacts against the sufferings Israel has inflicted and continues to inflict upon them, their resistance should be called terrorism. Should Israel be glorified when its armed forces quell the legitimate aspirations of the Palestine Arabs with Hitlerite brutality? Should Israel be regarded as justified and exempted from the rule of law when its armed forces attack another State Member of the United Nations?

95. The contingency of an aggressor claiming to have acted in self-defence after perpetrating his crimes was not overlooked by the men of vision and foresight who drafted the Charter. They deliberately chose a strict criterion to foil the attempt of the would-be aggressors to evoke Article 51.

96. The fact that the only armed attacks which did occur were undertaken by Israel clearly identifies the culprit. Besides, by what right is Israel occupying Arab territories? Who gave Israel the right to speak about the wishes and aspirations of the Arab population which is being cruelly suppressed by brutal force, and how can Israel have been allowed to defy the United Nations Charter for twenty years with complete impunity?

97. No amount of distorted interpretation by the Tel Aviv representative can change the true facts of the situation or alter the provisions of the Charter.

98. Last week the Security Council adopted a resolution [248 (1948)] in which the Council censured in unambiguous terms the military acts of aggression committed by Israel. Yet the ink on the resolution had barely dried when Israel once again, in flagrant defiance of the unanimous decision adopted by the Council, disregarded the basic and fundamental principles of the Charter and the various resolutions adopted by this international Organization. Israel is, in fact, gloating in its defiance of the United Nations; Israel these days seems to be wallowing in a fit of arrogance reflected clearly in the words addressed by its representative to this Council. He has told the Council defiantly that Israel, notwithstanding the outcome of the Council's decisions, will continue to pursue the policies it deems fit.

99. I have had the opportunity in this Council to underline the danger of allowing Israel to persevere in this policy of aggression and defiance. I need not remind the Council that though the Israeli armed attack against Jordan on 21 March did not accomplish its objectives due to the valiant resistance of the Jordanian forces and people, Israel's policies of intimidation have not abated. But let me assure the Council and its members that the Arabs have not been intimidated in the past and they shall not be intimidated in the future.

100. Direct and indirect attempts have been made around this table to vilify the noble endeavours of the national liberation movement in the Arab-occupied territories. It is a source of pride for me to extol the heroic acts of the Arab resistance in those territories. Their resistance to occupation and their refusal to accept foreign domination as epitomized by the oppressive presence of Israeli armed forces in their homeland, are extreme acts of bravery and a sacred and honourable duty. No one can detract from the valour of freedom fighters, especially those who, against the heaviest of odds, are still resolved to regain their freedom and liberty.

101. The plight of people under foreign occupation has been discussed at length in the United Nations. In resolution 2160 (XXI) entitled "Strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, and of the right of peoples to self-determination", the Assembly recognized that peoples subjected to colonial oppression are entitled to seek and receive all support in their struggle which is in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

102. All States Members of the United Nations are, by virtue of this resolution, requested to give assistance and aid

to peoples under the yoke of colonialism. The obligation stands whether the colonial Power is the Ian Smith régime, the South African régime, or the Zionist authorities in the Middle East. They all have in common the abhorrent policy of discrimination, oppression and military occupation.

103. I should like to dwell briefly on a quotation from the statement of the representative of the United States [1409th meeting] who has wisely told the Council that "violence breeds violence". I doubt that anyone can disagree with him, yet I am convinced also that no one will disagree with me when I state that if violence breeds violence, then occupation automatically breeds resistance. If Israel, against the will of the civilian population in the occupied territories, is determined to impose its presence, it should expect that the people of the area will react to the unwanted presence of a foreign oppressor. Let it be crystal-clear to everyone that the will of the Arab people shall not be daunted and that they shall continue to resist, for no one can tolerate foreign domination, and Israel should expect that it will have to pay the price of its procrastination.

104. The crux of the matter is that Israel, in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and in defiance of the collective will of the international community is still occupying territories acquired by it as a result of a treacherous and sneaky attack against the Arab States. The precarious situation existing in the Middle East is the direct outcome of the attempts by Israel to perpetuate its occupation indefinitely. We believe that since the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution on 22 November reaffirming the necessity of the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict, it should resolutely stand behind its decision. The Security Council should make it clear to the Israeli authorities that it expects them to withdraw forthwith from all occupied territories and should indicate unequivocally that their reluctance to abide by the principles of the Charter, and their defiance of the United Nations resolutions and their refusal to withdraw their troops from the occupied territories constitute a threat to peace and security in the area, and hence a threat to international peace and security. The longer Israel refuses to abide by the rule of law, the more strongly will the people in the occupied territories resist the unlawful presence of Israeli forces. It is a resistance not only against the acts of violence perpetrated by the Israeli authorities against the civilian population, but also and mainly against the presence of those authorities, which in itself constitutes an act of violence.

105. I repeat that the continued presence of Israeli armed forces in Arab territories is at the root of all the tension and the dangerous situation in the Middle East. Nothing short of the withdrawal of these troops will effectively contribute to the efforts of the United Nations towards establishing peace in the area.

106. My delegation is of the firm belief that the time has come for the Council to face its responsibilities courageously under the Charter. The Council should view with the gravest concern the deteriorating situation in the Middle East resulting from the refusal of Israel to comply with its resolutions. The Council should not hesitate to resort to the

provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure Israel's respect for the obligations contained in the Charter and its compliance with the various resolutions adopted by the Council.

107. In my statement before the Council on 21 March, we requested the Council to apply the enforcement measures of Chapter VII of the Charter in order to deter Israel from further acts of violence. The Council then did not deem it fit to do so, with the consequence that it is now meeting again to deal with a similar act of violence committed by Israel. Today we are again requesting the Council to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter. The failure of the Council to heed this request can only have an encouraging effect on the aggressive policy of the Israeli authorities. Let wisdom and effectiveness and not political expediency prevail. Should it be the former, then we could all look to the future with more hope; should it be the latter, the future would be fraught with danger.

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

109. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I regret that I must bring to the Council's attention the following additional acts of aggression committed against my country since our last meeting.

110. Tonight at 2120 hours local time, mortar fire was opened from Jordanian territory across the Jordan river on the area of Kibbutz Tirat-Tzvi in the Beit She'an Valley.

111. An hour later Kibbutz Maoz Chaim was shelled from the same direction. At approximately the same time the water installations of Kibbutz Neve Eitan, another village in the Beit She'an Valley, was blown up by explosives. A search of the area where the explosion occurred resulted in the discovery of two mines and the tracks of a band of saboteurs who had crossed the Jordan river.

112. I listened carefully to the words of advice—not unusual—expressing the position of the Government of India. I should like to refer to an interesting statement made by the representative of India in the Security Council on 4 September 1965. He said:

“India is a peace-loving country. We have neither the inclination nor is it in our interest to be deviated from the path of peace and economic progress to that of a military conflict. Pakistan has, however, by sending armed infiltrators in large numbers across the cease-fire line brought about a situation in which we have no choice but to defend ourselves and take such preventive action as may be deemed essential. In taking such preventive action we have, in certain sectors, had to cross the cease-fire line for the purpose of effectively preventing further infiltrations. This is a matter of great importance to us.” [*1237th meeting, para. 203.*]

113. Why, may I ask, should India presume that principles applicable to its policies and actions are not valid when it is Israel that is involved? May I draw his attention to a comment published recently following the adoption of the 24 March Security Council resolution 248 (1968) to which

he referred. In an editorial article signed by Ambassador André François Poncet and contained in the Parisian daily *Le Figaro* on 27 March, we read:

“As one reads the texts in which the Security Council unanimously expresses its disapproval, in an indirect and oblique manner, of the actions of the Palestinian commandos, while at the same time directly and severely condemning Israel as guilty of retaliation, one begins to wonder whether common sense has been done away with and the world been turned upside down. We have become so accustomed over the centuries to thinking that the Jews have no rights other than that of allowing themselves to be massacred without resistance that when they stand up and fight we are scandalized. Fortunately, public opinion is less naïve than it is thought to be; it is not on the side of the Security Council.”⁶

114. On the statements made here by the representatives of Egypt and Iraq, I need not add anything to what I submitted yesterday to the Security Council. Egypt and Iraq are still at war with Israel. Egypt and Iraq refuse to make peace with Israel. Egypt and Iraq promise before the Security Council to continue to wage warfare against Israel by terror, murder and sabotage, despite their obligations under the Charter, despite Security Council decisions. We are not discussing here alleged opposition of the population in areas under Israel control. This is a figment of the imagination of Arab Governments. But here we are discussing organized incursions from the outside in violation of Security Council resolutions and in violation of Charter provisions.

115. At yesterday's meeting I described to the Council how the Governments of the United Arab Republic and Iraq are actively organizing, training and supplying the terrorist organizations; how they train saboteurs at army camps and how they have assigned officers and men, indeed entire battalions of their regular armies, to terrorist operations. The record is clear and incontrovertible. In a speech on 13 March 1968, President Nasser announced: “We will not rely on a political solution.” On 30 March President Nasser promised to continue to support the terrorist organizations. Ten days earlier on 20 March, Radio Cairo proclaimed:

“The real Palestine problem is Israel's existence. What matters is the liquidation of Israel's existence and there is no difference between territories captured recently and those occupied in the past.”

That is Egypt's true image, best illustrated perhaps by the following.

116. Several times East European countries, now allies of Egypt, have demanded the extradition of a number of particularly wanted nazi war criminals. Egypt has flatly refused every request. The Soviet Union has requested Friedrich Warzok's extradition no less than three times, without success. Czechoslovakia, another Arab ally, wants Dr. Erich Weinmann badly. Poland would like to try Karl Wesermann, alias Adolf Moeller. Poland heads the list of

⁶ Quoted in French by the speaker.

those nations which would like a crack at Egypt's nazi elite: Dr. Rudolf Mildner, formerly of Katowice, heads an impressive list which includes Wilhelm Boeckler, Bernhard Bender and Gustav Wagner. Thus, twenty-two years after the end of the Second World War, Hitler's nazis have in fact become Nasser's nazis.

117. As for the words of the Iraqi representative, he, in fact, fully confirmed to us Iraq's direct participation in the warfare by stealth and terror carried out by the Arab States against Israel. He complained that the Council, and indeed the world, did not accept the theory that the marauders trained in Egyptian, Syrian and Iraqi army camps and sent across the cease-fire line in the darkness of night to murder, in a cowardly and indiscriminate manner men, women and children were to be considered heroes and freedom fighters. But this has been the United Nations jurisprudence throughout the years. War by terror has never been acquiesced in and never will be—at least, not by my country. This is a jurisprudence which the representative of Iraq cannot change, whatever his wishes.

118. As for his wish to call despicable murderers "freedom fighters," let me refer him to a statement made by the representative of India on 17 September 1965, as follows:

"Then something more. The *Morning News* of Karachi of 19 August quoted a statement by the Central Home and Kashmir Affairs Minister, Chaudhuri Ali Akbar, under the headline 'Kashmiris Free to Cross Line. Pakistan Will Help Freedom Fighters'. To call these people 'freedom fighters' causes me to say: What sins are committed in thy name, Freedom!" [1239th meeting, para. 43.]

119. I notice the interest of the Iraqi representative in human rights. Apparently this is a totally one-sided and prejudiced interest. The world knows by now of the tragic situation in which the Jews of Iraq find themselves. The Iraqi newspaper *El Thaura El Arabiye* stated on 12 November 1967: "The first thing that we must do to purge our ranks is to establish that the Jews living within Iraq shall be second-class citizens".

120. The Iraqi representative found it appropriate to complain also about development plans and projects in certain areas under Israeli control. In a report which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 25 March we read:

"Israel's Agriculture Ministry says it is preparing a five-year plan to modernize and develop farming on the west bank of the Jordan river. The Ministry's Director-General said Israeli experts would train 38,000 Arab farmers in modern techniques and help them switch from traditional summer produce to year-round agriculture with more economic cash crops."

121. That is the kind of project that arouses the ire of the Iraqi representative, and that is not at all surprising. He is not interested in understanding between Jews and Arabs. He and his Government are opposed to peaceful co-operation between the Israeli and Arab peoples. As far back as 29 October 1966 the Iraqi Minister for Foreign Affairs

declared: "The Palestine problem will be settled on the soil of Palestine and not in the United Nations." The name of the Foreign Minister of Iraq at the time was Adnan Pachachi.

122. The protracted, tragic war in the Middle East has brought bloodshed to all its peoples. There is pain and sorrow on both sides. But there is something particularly sinister and malignant in the Arab Governments' attitude and actions. There is an element of bestiality which seems to come to the fore again and again. In this morning's *New York Times* we read that, when the coffins of three Israeli soldiers killed in the recent fighting were returned by the Jordanian authorities at the Allenby Bridge and were opened, two of the coffins were found to contain nothing but sand.

123. If there is a State in the Middle East whose actions symbolize above those of all others a perverse inhumanity and a brutal criminality, it is Syria.

124. In 1948, when the Syrian Army in defiance of the United Nations launched a war of aggression against the nascent State of Israel, the invading forces were not satisfied with conquest. The Israeli villages which were then captured were razed to the ground in an orgy of fire and destruction. When the Syrian Army withdrew in 1949, it was a wasteland of death and desolation that it left behind.

125. Since then Syria has written into the annals of our region a grim page of sadism and cruelty. For years and years Israeli farmers and fishermen kidnapped by Syrian raiders from inside Israeli territory lingered on in the prisons of Damascus and Palmyra, subjected to the most brutal and inhuman physical and mental torture. I shall spare the Council a description of what man is still capable of doing to man in our age. For years and years, while these unfortunate captives served as slaves and guinea-pigs for the perversities of the high and mighty in the Syrian Government, the Damascus authorities denied even that they were being held in Syria. No appeals or interventions from the United Nations, the International Red Cross, the Vatican, or third Governments helped. In reaction there was nothing but denials from the Syrian Government and from the Syrian Chief of Staff. When, after efforts of more than twelve years, the Government of Syria finally admitted to holding those persons and agreed to return them in an exchange of prisoners, those who came back to Israel alive were wrecks of human beings, shadows of men, all of whom had to be confined in mental hospitals.

126. This is not over. Today the Jewish communities of Syria, in Damascus and other towns, communities much older than the Arab conquest in the seventh century, live in dismal oppression and suffering, deprived of food and freedom of movement, many of them in prison and concentration camps.

127. It was perhaps to be expected that Syria should come before the Security Council to plead the cause of the loathsome methods of warfare by stealth. After all, Syria is in a way the spiritual father of these methods. Members of the Security Council will recall the complaints brought by Israel and the debates held in the Council on Syria's role in

resorting to warfare by terror as far back as 1965 and 1966. As a matter of fact, El-Fatah was first organized in Syria as an arm of the Syrian Army's *Deuxième Bureau*. The speech made today by the Syrian representative we heard already in October 1966. We know what has happened since then.

128. No words can whitewash evil deeds or consecrate a crime. The world still hears Radio Damascus calling day and night on the eve of the June hostilities: "Kill, kill, kill, butcher, butcher the Jews." The people of Israel still have before their eyes the Syrian Army posters showing how to murder Jews, how to suffocate them, how to drown them in the sea. Nor can we forget Syria's rejection of United Nations peace efforts, its refusal to receive the Secretary-General's personal representative, Mr. Jarring.

129. As recently as 3 March 1968 the Foreign Minister of Syria, Mr. Makhus, declared: "Terror will continue." On 18 March 1968 he said: "The only way is force and armed struggle."

130. Additional evidence that has reached us since my previous statement confirms beyond doubt that officers and men from the regular units of the Syrian Army have been transferred in the past few days to Jordan to strengthen and expand the terrorist incursions. That step was taken with full co-ordination between the Syrian and Jordanian Armies.

131. Thus Syria, the symbol of warmongering, crime and inhumanity in the Middle East, appears before the Security Council, its hands soaked in blood, not to speak of peace, not to mend its deeds and change its ways, but to proclaim to the world that it will persist in its attitude.

132. Shakespeare wrote: "O shame, where is thy blush?" There is no escaping reality. The Arab States have not changed their attitude towards Israel. It remains the same, still founded on the premise of war, still based on the Khartoum decision:⁷ no peace, no negotiations, no recognition. Only when they do change their position and when they agree to peace, to negotiations and to recognition of Israel will the Middle East conflict find a solution and light and hope and happiness come to all the nations of the area.

133. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The representative of Syria has asked to be allowed to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Security Council table. I call on the representative of Syria.

134. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Not long ago, in fact about two weeks ago, I attended a seminar at an American university. A professor who was participating in the seminar told me about something that had actually happened to him. Someone was circulating a petition asking the professors to protest against the use by the American army in Viet-Nam of napalm bombs, fragmentary bombs and phosphorus bombs. The professor who told me the story replied to him: "If you can include in this petition the same kind of attack by the Israeli army and authorities for having used napalm, phosphorus and fragmentary bombs on the Arabs, then I will sign the petition." Of course, the professor who

was presenting the petition refused to do that. I shall not mention either the name of the university or the name of the professor who told me the story, because the Zionists can retaliate not only in Arab lands but also outside.

135. In the wretched history of Palestine of which the representative of the United Kingdom is aware, letters with explosives used to be received in Great Britain. That led to many tragedies, even outside Palestine.

136. There is another interesting story, quite revealing, in fact, as revealing as the first. The man who was carrying the petition replied to the first professor: "If you were a Zionist and a Jew, you would understand".

137. In the same city I learned that the children who play in the streets—American children; I need not mention their faith—have a game. They say: "Let us play Arabs and people". Perhaps not all people will understand what this means—but the people have the right to kill the Arabs. That is the amount of hatred that is inculcated in the minds and souls of the children of a particular people.

138. I have maintained, and still maintain, that we are dealing not with a usual mentality, not with a normal people, but certainly with an abnormal people. In fact, they are a brand of terrorists, and I repeat that again. In doing so, I can cite no less an authority than the Under-Secretary who is now sitting in this Council, Dr. Ralph Bunche, the Acting Mediator after the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte and his aides. In his report to the Security Council of 27 September 1948, he used these words:

"These assassinations constitute a critical challenge from an unbridled band of Jewish terrorists to the very effort of the United Nations. . . . In a broader sense, they gave evidence not only of contempt for the actions of the Security Council, but also of a cynical disregard for the United Nations as a whole." [*S/1018, para. 15.*]

I apologize to the distinguished Under-Secretary and I hope that he will not be subjected to any reprisal by the Zionists.

139. The Nuremberg trials have defined war crimes and crimes against humanity. They are as follows:

(a) Any acts of aggression; (b) acts committed to destroy a national, ethnical, racial or religious group; (c) inhuman acts against any civilian population, such as murder, extermination, deportation or persecution on political, racial, religious or cultural grounds; (d) plunder or looting of public or private property and wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages.⁸

140. Have the Israelis committed such crimes? I referred the members of the Council, the last time I spoke, to three books written by leaders of the Zionist underground. Menachem Begin has a whole chapter in his book, *The Revolt Story of the Irgun*,⁹ entitled: "We fight, therefore we are. A new race is born to the world, the fighting Jew: from now on we will attack, we will not only be on the defensive."

⁸ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 82 (1951), No. 251, p. 288.

⁹ New York, Schuman, 1951.

⁷ Arab Summit Conference held at Khartoum from 29 August to 1 September 1967.

141. There is the book which I quoted before: *Memoirs of an Assassin*. Here is an author who calls himself an assassin. I showed the Council that book. Here it is. I wish that the very learned Israeli representative would take the time to read just the first chapter of this book entitled "Philosophy of Hate". He would read how they have been taught from childhood to hate the Arabs and to displace them and expel them outside of the Holy Land, outside of the country which they occupied for thousands of years. I was not wrong. Chapter I of the book is "The professor of hatred". I refer him to *The Haganah*¹⁰ by Munya M. Mardor, who now occupies a very high position in the Israeli Government. Describing the illegal operations of the Haganah at that time, he commented as follows: "We were conspirators outside the law, and yet obeying what to us was a higher law." I underlined those words and I checked on each one of them. I was so impressed by them that I kept them in my mind: conspirators outside the law and yet obeying what to them was a higher law.

142. What was this higher law? To kill the Arabs, to expel the Arabs. Did they do so?

143. Mr. Pachachi mentioned Deir Jasin, but there were many other dastardly massacres after Deir Jasin, as well as before. Surely Lord Caradon knows about the King David Hotel massacre of 22 July 1946 in which 110 persons were killed in an infamous attack. There was the massacre of Naseruddine on 14 April 1948; the massacre of Carmel, 20 April 1948; the massacre of Al-Qabu, May 1948; the massacre of Beit Daras, 3 May 1948; the massacre of Beit Khoury, 5 May 1948; the massacre of Az Zaytoun, 6 May 1948; the massacre of Wadi Araba, 13 May 1950; the massacre of Sharaft, 7 February 1951; the massacre of Falamh, 2 April 1951; the massacre of Qibya, 14 October 1953, condemned by the Security Council; the massacre of Nahhalin, 28 March 1954; the massacre of Gaza, 28 February 1955; the massacre of Khan Yunis, 31 May 1955; the massacre of Khan Yunis, 31 August 1955; the massacre of Tiberia, 11 December 1955; the massacre of As Sabha, 2 November 1955; the massacre of Gaza, 5 April 1956; the massacre of Rafa, 16 August 1956. I could go on enumerating and enumerating. But let the representative of Israel tell us what Israel did with the humanitarian resolution [237 (1967)] which specifically called on Israel, after its sneak *blitzkrieg* attack of 5 June 1967, to preserve the lives of the civilians, to allow them to return to their homes, and to observe the laws of civilized humanity.

144. The representative of Israel said that in the attitude or statements which he heard today there was an element of bestiality on the part of the Arab States. This Zionist jargon is the privilege of the representative of Israel. We have a saying in Arabic to the effect that every vase spills out the water that is contained in it. That is certainly a reflection of what he has done

145. He spoke about Syria, but three of the Security Council's condemnations of Israel's wanton and dastardly attacks against our territories—the condemnations in 1951, 1956 and 1962—were because of Israeli attacks against Syrian territories.

146. He spoke about Syrians kidnapping Israelis from Israeli territory. Certainly he has hallucinations. Such hallucinations, as manifested by delirium, were indeed expressed in his statement before this Council yesterday when he began to compare himself and his authorities to Napoleon. I simply laughed.

147. As to the facts about the demilitarized zones, I did not say anything which was not contained in two documents submitted by the Secretary-General, S/7572 of 1 November 1966 and S/7573 of 2 November 1966. I would submit that members of the Council should peruse those two reports in order to see the Israeli logic which, to put it briefly, preaches law and practises lawlessness.

148. The representative of Israel spoke about the Jewish community in Syria. I challenge him to prove one thing that he said. I visited my own home town of Damascus, where I have friends in the Jewish community. I visited them and they visited me. Everything he said was a lie that could only come from someone like him.

149. He spoke about the five-year plan for the development of the Arab lands in occupied Arab territories. Surely he is not trying to convince us that Israel waged a war against three Arab States and occupied areas three times the area of Israel in order to develop Arab agriculture and to put into effect some development plans. We have heard these stories for a long time. I wonder how a self-respecting person can permit himself to say such things.

150. He spoke about our refusal of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. We did refuse it. But everything that Israel has done since the adoption of that resolution proves every word of what we said then.

151. In the joint statement issued by President Johnson and Mr. Eshkol, the word "spirit" was mentioned.

152. The other day, after the representative of Jordan had answered him, Mr. Tekoah spoke about the goals, and I believe that the representative of Jordan told him that the goals were in the Charter but that this is a resolution with specific provisions. Israel has recently said that it constitutes a general framework.

153. Therefore, it is much wiser to call things by their right name rather than to deceive people as they have been deceiving them. Let him tell us what they did with the two resolutions on Jerusalem, with the humanitarian resolutions and with all the resolutions concerning Arab rights that were adopted by the United Nations.

154. Certainly, the learned speaker for the Zionist authorities does not lack quotations, and he quoted Shakespeare. I would not name the State that is mentioned in Shakespeare, but there is a line in Shakespeare which says "There is something rotten"—and I would add "in the State of Israel".

155. In conclusion, I should like to quote from Voltaire, who said: "*Mentez, Mentez; il en restera toujours quelque chose.*"

¹⁰ New York, New American Library, 1964.

156. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The representative of Iraq has asked to be allowed to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Security Council table. I call on the representative of Iraq.

157. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): My friend and colleague, the Ambassador of Syria, has made it unnecessary for me to make a lengthy reply to the rather hysterical outburst and lurid details we have heard from the representative of Israel. But I thought I could not miss this opportunity to congratulate the representative of Israel on his very frank and open admission about the five-year plan which is to be launched in the occupied areas of the west bank of the Jordan in order to integrate the agriculture of that area with that of Israel.

158. Are we to understand that all the resolutions of this Council, especially that of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)], calling, among other things, for Israel's withdrawal from the areas occupied in the recent conflict, are to be put in deep freeze for the next five years while Israel completes the integration of the occupied areas into its economy?

159. I do not think there could be better proof of our contention that Israel has rejected that resolution and does not have the slightest intention of implementing it. Surely, if it had the slightest intention of implementing that resolution, it would not have gone to all the effort and expense of launching this five year plan in the occupied areas of the west bank of Jordan. So there you have the answer from the representative of Israel himself. There is no longer any need for proof, for official reports from United Nations representatives or from our Secretary-General. The fact is there, and it is very clear and obvious.

160. Now, is the Security Council going to take the statement of the representative of Israel seriously, or is it going to dismiss it as the fulminations of hysteria? I think the Security Council can ill afford not to take that statement seriously and believe that it is the firm intention of the Government of Israel not to implement that resolution, not to withdraw voluntarily from the occupied areas—now, in five years, or ever—until and unless it is forced to withdraw by the struggle of the people of Palestine, supported by the Arab nations.

161. I think this imposes a duty on the Council. The Council cannot possibly ignore that important revelation, that important statement we have heard from the representative of Israel. I think it should take the necessary measures and should reach the only logical conclusion that can be drawn from that statement: that Israel does not intend to, and will not, withdraw from those lands, irrespective of any decision which may be taken by the Security Council or any other organ of the United Nations. It is up to the Security Council to take the enforcement measures that are available to it under the Charter of the United Nations. The time is now, and the representative of Israel has provided us with the justification, with the reason, indeed with the necessity for adopting such measures at present.

162. The representative of Israel spoke about the Jews in Iraq. Let me ask him one question: can he give me any

instances of special curfews that have been imposed on the Jews in Iraq; of any Jewish dwellings which have been dynamited and destroyed by the authorities; of any indiscriminate killing, of wholesale arrests and intimidation? This has been the lot of the Arabs in the occupied areas. He cannot give me one single instance in which the Jews of Iraq have been subjected to the kind of repressive treatment that the Arabs of Palestine have been, are now, and, I am unhappy to say, are likely to continue to be subjected to under Israeli occupation.

163. The representative of Israel spoke about our refusal to see the Jews and Arabs live in peace and harmony. But they have lived in peace and harmony for centuries all over the Arab world. It is only with the advent of Zionism and with the imposition of the Zionist programme by force on the people of Palestine that that peace and traditional harmony has been destroyed.

164. The people of Palestine, as I said earlier this afternoon, have been offered no alternative but to resist or to submit completely to the designs of the Zionist movement to take over their country and usurp their homeland. They decided to resist; they had every right to resist; and we shall continue to help them resist the occupation of their land and the spoliation of their country by the Zionist invaders.

165. Finally, the representative of Israel quoted a statement which I had made a year and a half ago regarding the solution of the Palestine problem on Palestine soil, rather than at the United Nations. I do not deny that I made that statement, and I made it in view of the record of twenty years of continuous Israeli aggression, advance and expansion at the expense of the Arabs, and the failure of this world Organization to take the necessary action to prevent that advance. All my fears and suspicions were fully borne out a few months after I made that statement, when in June 1967 Israel launched its treacherous attack against Arab countries and ended by occupying vast Arab territories which today it refuses to relinquish under any circumstances.

166. In spite of all that, we have put our trust in the Security Council, and that is why we come before the Security Council asking it to take the necessary measures for the restitution of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine and to put an end to the aggression of the Israeli invaders. After what we have heard this afternoon about the complete refusal of the Israeli Government to accept or to implement the resolution of 22 November 1967, and after its most recent actions to make the implementation of that resolution impossible, without there having been any use of force or any coercive measures taken by the Council, I think the time has come, as I said, for the Security Council to take action and to remove the doubts that have beset our minds for the nearly twenty years of inaction and of coddling the aggressor.

167. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call on the representative of India in exercise of his right of reply.

168. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): I apologize for taking the floor again today, but the representative of Israel

has left me no choice. This is not the first time that a representative of Israel has tried to inject the India-Pakistan question into the discussion of the West Asia situation. On 13 November 1967 the Foreign Minister of Israel also tried to draw inspiration from statements made by Indian eaders. On that occasion I had the following to say:

“The representative of Israel has also referred to the position of my Government on India-Pakistan relations. I must state in all frankness that the two situations are completely different and have no bearing whatsoever on the question under discussion. The Foreign Minister of Israel, while comparing his Government’s stand with that of the Government of India, ignored—and I am sure he will be the first to appreciate this—the differing origins of the unfortunate situations as well as the divergent histories of relationships among States in different regions of the world. If, however, the Foreign Minister of Israel insists upon drawing parallels, he should remember the eminent practice of this Council, which, in 1965, insisted upon coupling the demand for a cease-fire with a call for withdrawal to positions previously held. Thereafter, it was possible for India and Pakistan, which had never interrupted their formal diplomatic relations, to negotiate at Tashkent with the help of the Soviet Union.” [1375th meeting, para. 136.]

169. May I today again remind the representative of Israel that, in regard to the India-Pakistan question he should leave well enough alone. However, if he insists on drawing inspiration from us, he should go all the way and persuade his Government to withdraw from territories occupied in June 1967; he should persuade his Government not to expand the area of occupation over Arab peoples and Arab territories.

170. We shall be glad if, like India and Pakistan, Israel is ready to declare its willingness to withdraw from occupied territories.

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

172. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to refer briefly to two points made by the representative of Iraq.

173. He spoke about the situation of Jews in his country. Last summer the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel sent a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in which he said, *inter alia*:

“The Iraqi authorities, particularly the Secret Police, threaten the Jews with murder and expropriation of property. Dozens of Jews were arrested in Baghdad and released only after paying a high ransom for their lives. The authorities cut telephone lines leading to Jewish homes. A Jewish girl was arrested, put into a criminals’ prison and repeatedly raped. She was later removed in a state of shock. The Jews of Iraq are under constant fear for their lives.”

My Foreign Minister pointed out the danger of expropriation of Jewish property in Iraq. Since then, on 4 March the Iraqi Government published a law confiscating all Jewish property in the country.

174. The representative of Iraq entertained us with an exercise in the construction of castles in the air. The only trouble with castles in the air is that they topple at the first puff of air. I referred the representative of Iraq to a report in the *Christian Science Monitor*. I shall read it again, adding this time the last paragraph:

“Israel’s Agriculture Ministry says it is preparing a five-year plan to modernize and develop farming on the west bank of the Jordan River. The Ministry’s Director-General said Israeli experts would train 38,000 Arab farmers in modern techniques and help them switch from traditional summer produce to year-round agriculture with more economic cash crops. Officials emphasized that the plan did not indicate any Israeli intention of annexing the region.”

175. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The representative of Iraq has asked to exercise his right of reply and I now invite him to the Council table.

176. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): I wish categorically to deny the allegations made by the representative of Israel and contained in a letter of the Foreign Minister of Israel regarding the treatment of Iraqi Jews. But the representative of Israel did not answer my question. Does he know of any instances in which Jewish properties and houses have been dynamited in Iraq? Does he know of any instances in which hundreds of Jews have been put in jail without reason? Can he give me any instances of the indiscriminate kind of slaughter and murder to which the Arabs of Palestine have been subjected in recent months? Of course he cannot give me such instances. Instead, he has made allegations which are completely unfounded and which have not been, and in fact cannot be, substantiated, because they are not true.

177. Before I end my statement, I should like to refer to one point which the representative of Israel made in his first statement, regarding the right of freedom fighters to resist the forces of occupation and oppression in their own country. He said that United Nations jurisprudence was against giving the right of resistance to such freedom fighters. That is not true. In recent years especially, numerous resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly expressing the support of the international community for the activities and the struggle of the freedom fighters in many colonial territories; and if there is any United Nations jurisprudence on the subject, it is that the United Nations has, in an unequivocal manner, put itself and its prestige behind the struggle of such peoples against colonial exploitation and domination—and the occupation by Israeli forces of Arab lands is a form, in fact the worst form of colonial domination and exploitation that exists in the world today.

178. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The list of speakers for today’s meeting of the Security Council has now been exhausted.

179. As a result of informal consultations, the members of the Council have agreed that the next meeting of the Council on the item now under consideration should be convened following consultation among Council members,

but not later than 4 April at 3 p.m. Since there are no objections to this, it is so decided.

180. Before closing this meeting of the Council, I should like to express my gratitude to those representatives who have offered their good wishes to my predecessor, the distinguished representative of Senegal. Some of them have requested that their good wishes be conveyed to Mr. Diop. I

would therefore ask the distinguished representative of Senegal, who has been present at our meeting, to convey to Mr. Diop all the good wishes that have been made with regard to him. For my own part, I should like to thank all those representatives who have offered me their good wishes and assured me of their co-operation.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организация Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Получите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или напишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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