

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

UN LIBRARY

OCT 27 1976

1440th MEETING: 16 AUGUST 1968

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1440/Rev.1)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616);	
(b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617);	
(c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721);	
(d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 16 August 1968, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. João Augusto DE ARAUJO CASTRO.
(Brazil).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1440/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616);
 - (b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617);
 - (c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721);
 - (d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616);
- (b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617);
- (c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721);
- (d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724).

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT: As the result of consultations, a draft resolution has emerged which, it is my understanding, reflects the views of the members of the Security Council on the course to be adopted by the Security Council on the item under consideration. I shall request the Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General kindly to read out the text which is before us.

3. Mr. VELLODI (Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): I shall read the text of the draft resolution:

"The Security Council,

"Having heard the statements of the representatives of Jordan and Israel,

"Having noted the contents of the letters of the representatives of Jordan and Israel in documents S/8616, S/8617, S/8721, and S/8724,

"Recalling its previous resolution 248 (1968) condemning the military action launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and deploring all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire,

"Considering that all violations of the cease-fire should be prevented,

"Observing that both massive air attacks by Israel on Jordanian territory were of a large scale and carefully planned nature in violation of resolution 248 (1968),

"Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation resulting therefrom,

"1. Reaffirms its resolution 248 (1968) which inter alia declares that grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts;

"2. Deplores the loss of life and heavy damage to property;

"3. *Considers* that premeditated and repeated military attacks endanger the maintenance of the peace;

"4. *Condemns* the further military attacks launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and resolution 248 (1968) and warns that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would duly take account of the failure to comply with the present resolution."

4. The PRESIDENT: I have on my list several speakers who have signified their intention to address the Council after the vote is taken, but it is my understanding, after informal consultations, that the members of the Security Council are prepared to vote. Therefore, if there is no objection, I shall put the draft resolution which has just been read out by the Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General to the vote of the Security Council.

5. Since I hear no objection, we shall now proceed to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: 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, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.¹

6. The PRESIDENT: With the consent of the Council, the President takes note of the widespread support that has been expressed for the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, in the mission entrusted to him, and requests the Secretary-General to convey to him this expression of support.

7. I now call on the representative of the United States of America.

8. Mr. BALL (United States of America): Mr. President, on one subject I am certain that I can, without presumption or immodesty, speak for my colleagues on the Council even though I have not consulted them, and that is in expressing to you, Mr. President our profound admiration for the skill, sensitivity and patience which you have shown in presiding over the evolution of a draft resolution in which we can now all join. This is an example of parliamentary statesmanship of the highest order for which we are all grateful to you, Sir.

9. For long periods, going back more than a quarter-century, the Middle East has lived in an environment of tension, of conflict, of terror. No nation, no people that has been an actor in this drama has been without guilt. The tragedy of terror and the reprisals which it has induced, and induces, is not only that it levies its principal toll on innocent victims who are in no way responsible for the situation against which the violence is aimed; it is that this pattern of conduct is a deception, a tragic illusion. Neither side benefits from terror or violence of any kind; all suffer.

10. The Council meets here today as it has so often, to consider complaints against further incidents of violence. Outrages have been committed against the Israeli population by terrorists operating from Jordan. These acts, in our view, are clear violations of the cease-fire which the Jordanian Government is pledged to uphold, and while I can appreciate the difficulties of restraining terrorist elements in the unnatural circumstances and in the miasma of fierce emotion that prevails in the area, it is the responsibility of every Government to do all that it can to maintain the cease-fire. That, however, is by no means the whole story, for in the long and lamentable annals of human violence terror has inevitably given rise to retaliation and repression, all too often to excessive acts, in which innocent people are killed or maimed or injured, through no fault of theirs other than that they live in an area where the shell drops or the bombs fall.

11. The main thrust of this resolution is directed at such excessive acts of retaliation undertaken in disregard of the emphatic admonitory language of resolution 248 (1968) which this Council adopted on 24 March 1968. My Government strongly deplores the air attacks launched by the Government of Israel against Jordanian territory as I have stated before. Not only does the Council make this explicitly clear in its present resolution, but it also considers that acts of violence and specifically such repeated air attacks endanger the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. This is of course an expression of concern couched in the language of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter.

12. It is the fervent hope of my Government that the resolution we have just adopted will be taken to heart by the Governments concerned, that the Jordanian Government will increase its efforts to control terrorist elements operating from its territory and that the Government of Israel will launch no more excessive and repressive military attacks such as the brutal air operations against Irbid and Salt. Incidents of that kind have a cumulative and insidious effect. They heighten the climate of terror and violence which is the enemy of understanding. They exacerbate the hatred that feeds upon itself and constantly threatens a chain reaction of killing that could again inflame the whole Middle East. They frustrate the most earnest efforts to restore peace to this area which has been in turbulence for so many years. As Ambassador Makonnen so ably said yesterday, these past few days have tragically deflected the attention of all parties from the central and critical matters on which they should be concentrated. How unfortunate it is that this Council has had to devote its proceedings to acts on each side that have marred the climate in which peace can be pursued. For in addressing ourselves to these acts let us not deceive ourselves. We are dealing only with the symptoms, not the causes. History tells us sadly that so long as the conditions of peace are not agreed and accepted, violence and counter-violence will continue to threaten no matter how strongly the rest of humankind may wish an end of it. Thus the time is long past when we should ask ourselves: why has it been so difficult to achieve peace in the Middle East? It is not shameful that we should be meeting here more than a year after the June war and nearly eight months after we had unanimously adopted the resolution of 22 November 1967? This Council did its

¹ See resolution 256 (1968).

work well at that time. In resolution 242 (1967) it laid down the principles on which a just and lasting peace could be established, a peace that would permit every State in the area to live in safety behind secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. It called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories, a just solution to the refugee problem, guarantees of freedom of navigation through international waterways and guarantees for the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area.

13. That resolution was carefully drafted and unanimously adopted, and my Government has given and will continue to give it every support, as I know every single member of this Council that honestly desires peace in the area will do also. But the fact remains that it is only a statement of principles; it is not self-executing. It can be given effect only through agreement of the parties and pursuant to that resolution. Ambassador Jarring continues to promote such agreement.

14. What more do we need than the resolution of 22 November? Certainly through that resolution the Council created a framework within which men of goodwill should be able to reach a settlement. Yet the lack of progress which Ambassador Jarring has so far been able to make in spite of his wise, skilful and untiring efforts brings into question the very existence of such goodwill. For in spite of all that he has done, progress continues to be impeded by procedural rigidities, a refusal on both sides to face the hard realities to break free from the doctrinal strait jackets with which each party has voluntarily hobbled itself.

15. Humanity demands more than this. It demands that all parties to a dispute that keep a major area of the world in agony and turmoil should act responsibly to resolve it. Indeed, the Charter obligates the parties to seek a pacific settlement. I therefore underline the statement that you, Mr. President, made reporting the widespread support of the Council for Ambassador Jarring's efforts, for a just and lasting peace is long overdue in the Middle East—tragically overdue. Such a peace is imperative, such a peace is possible, provided and only provided that the parties show humane restraint so as to create a new environment of understanding and by less doctrinaire positions demonstrate a will to build that sound and lasting peace for which the whole world is crying.

✓ 16. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to thank all my colleagues who have so kindly and generously paid tribute to my humble self for the uneventful presidency I assumed during the past month. Although I have not been consulted by my distinguished colleague Ambassador Ball, I wish to associate myself fully with the well-deserved words and tribute he has addressed to you for the way you have conducted these long, painstaking and delicate negotiations.

17. In explaining its vote, my delegation would like to draw the conclusions from the discussions which have taken place in the past few days, in order to reach the best possible agreement and enable the Security Council to play its rightful role.

18. As on many occasions, my delegation feels obliged to repeat the comments it has made regarding the methods used in this Council in the fulfilment of so complex a task. It seems impossible to us that the Council should fail to realize sooner or later the situation, fraught with future dangers, which our Organization is creating for itself when the Council no longer attempts to fulfil all its obligations as it should.

19. Indeed, it is to be feared that, insofar as the Council continues to offset the grievances addressed to it by alleged counter-grievances, we may finally lose a clear view of that which has always been the strength and greatness of our Organization, and of this Council, namely, the hope we are supposed to offer the weak and oppressed.

20. By this observation my delegation does not wish to give the impression that it is unaware of the motivations determining the attitude of those who seem to have an interest in creating this confusion; for although it is Israel and the Palestinian people's just struggle for liberation which are involved today, the same situation applied to Rhodesia and South West Africa yesterday, as it may tomorrow to Zambia or any other African country beset by all kinds of problems and which will have no other recourse but to engage in a dreadful and desperate struggle.

21. In this connexion it is fitting to recall the memorable words spoken a few days ago by our distinguished colleague from Senegal, Ambassador Boye:

“Members of the Council should realize that Salazar in Portugal, Ian Smith in Rhodesia and Vorster in South Africa are listening to us to see how we react to the interpretation Israel seems to be giving to the concept of legitimate self-defence” [1436th meeting, para. 131].

22. If, today as in the past, our Organization has not been in a position to respond in the only way appropriate to Israel's repeated aggressions against the Palestinian people, it is undoubtedly because there are forces whose interests are directly threatened by the struggle undertaken by the national liberation movements, whether in the Middle East, South-East Asia, Africa, or even in Latin America.

23. The Algerian delegation is as convinced as any of the need to arrive at compromises in the settlement of international disputes, since compromise is the very essence of co-operation and constitutes a step forward on the path to mutual understanding and necessary agreement. But here it is no longer a matter of compromise; it is a matter of outright surrender of principles. Unfortunately, we have become accustomed to a permanent state of bargaining which only too often flouts all principles, and particularly those laid down in the Charter of our Organization which was certainly not intended at the time of its writing to become a mere list of pious wishes. The authors of the Charter certainly did not imagine a day would come when the situation would be such that any threat to peace in the world, bringing in its wake the destruction and suffering we all know, would be primarily the subject of refined legalistic quibbling unrelated to immediate circumstances, which we all witnessed at the time when we learned of the latest, and not the last, of Israel's aggressions.

24. It is even denied that peace is really threatened on the grounds that peace cannot be threatened where it does not exist. Such talk is certainly not the language of the Charter. Whatever language we use, no one here in the Council can deny that a situation of serious conflicts is being perpetuated in the Middle East. To deny the existence of these conflicts in order to avoid sincere and natural implementation of the appropriate provisions of the Charter constitutes a violation of the Charter and a major step backwards in relation to the spirit reigning in the international community at the time it was conceived.

25. No, peace does not reign in the Middle East, nor will it be able to reign there so long as the conditions required for the establishment of a just and lasting peace are not fulfilled—conditions involving the observance and effective implementation of all the Charter's provisions and of all the principles which the international community took such pains, if not to implement at least to lay down as universal moral terms of reference—and I would cite one of the most important, namely the right of peoples to decide their own fate.

26. The theory has been advanced in this hall according to which the so-called defensive measures taken by Israel should be justified by alleged attacks made from Jordanian territory. The resolution we have just adopted deals with this statement as it deserves. The same resolution clearly establishes that premediated and repeated military attacks constitute a danger to peace, and that any further military attack by Israel would be committed in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of resolution 248 (1968).

27. Moreover, the same resolution clearly warns Israel that if such attacks should be repeated the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts.

28. At the risk of once more offending the modesty of my colleague, Mr. Boye, I should like to say that the resolution adopted has fortunately followed the advice he himself gave when he said that we must strongly protest against this method and say "no" to Israel.

29. There is no doubt that the repeated attacks made by Israel against Jordan, the systematic action of despoiling the Palestinians which continues unimpeded constitute obvious threats to peace. Must we really become resigned to admitting that at Israel's next aggression—which, as we all know, will not be delayed for long—we shall again have to call a series of meetings in order to produce once more a watered-down, hesitant and ineffective resolution which will be nothing but a reproduction of previous resolutions?

30. We are now at the crossroads: for, either the Security Council will openly admit its inability to solve these international problems, as was the case, recently, concerning the question of South West Africa, or else it will owe it to its own position to react effectively, in which case it will surely have at last to contemplate the implementation of the measures required by the situation and which are explicitly laid down in the Charter.

31. Mr. MELLBIN (Denmark): May I first also pay homage to the extraordinary skill, patience and, indeed, statesmanship demonstrated by you, Mr. President, during the week-long negotiations which have preceded today's meeting. If I should emphasize your patience it is not because it overshadows your other outstanding faculties but because that was perhaps the one that I taxed the most.

32. Turning to the item on our agenda, I wish to recall that in my statement in the meeting of the Council on 7 August [1436th meeting] I outlined the main considerations which would guide my delegation in the deliberations on the questions now on our agenda. In our meeting today I shall therefore only explain the vote cast by my delegation in favour of the resolution just adopted by the Council. I wish, however, briefly to recall that in our meeting on 7 August I stated that all violations of the cease-fire in the Middle East must be deplored and that it should be brought home to the parties in no uncertain terms that the Security Council expects that from now on they will adhere scrupulously to the cease-fire. I also stated that all concerned must support the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

33. The resolution just adopted by the Council does to a certain degree take into account our fundamental viewpoints. The resolution is very explicit in its assessment of the military actions by Israel and leaves no doubt that those actions must not be repeated. It is equally clear from the resolution that all violations of the cease-fire should be prevented, but the resolution does not contain a reference to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and to the very important mission entrusted to him. That, we believe, is an imperfection.

34. However, I wish to express the great satisfaction of my delegation with the statement made by you, Mr. President, in which you took note of the widespread support that has been expressed for the efforts of the Special Representative in the mission entrusted to him—a statement which the Secretary-General, I understand, will convey to Mr. Jarring, for whose efforts I would like to take this opportunity to express the highest admiration of my delegation and, indeed, of my Government. To our mind, these expressions of support to the Special Representative bear out that the parties must extend their full and unconditional cooperation to Ambassador Jarring.

35. It was only in this context that my delegation could support the resolution. It does not meet with all our wishes but we know and we acknowledge that it is the price that other delegations as well have had to pay in order that we might obtain a compromise which would enjoy the support of all members of the Council. Under the circumstances which I have described, we for our part did not consider that the price was too high because, in speaking with one voice in this important matter, the Council has put its full authority behind the resolution. We can only express the hope that this resolution and the constructive interventions made in the course of our debate will help break up the vicious circle of violence so that an atmosphere may prevail conducive to real progress for the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted

settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in the Security Council's resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

✓ 36. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, the representative of the United States, Ambassador George Ball, certainly spoke for all of us when he paid tribute to your high statesmanship in uniting the Security Council behind the resolution that has just been adopted. If I may say a word more, your determination to break the deadlock which more than once overtook our consultations was a great inspiration to us and impelled us not to abandon our quest for a unanimous resolution. We express our gratitude to you, Sir.

37. As the Council is aware, the draft resolution just adopted has been the result of arduous debates and exhaustive consultations in which all viewpoints were fully set forth. It is therefore a compromise text and, like all such texts, is not entirely satisfactory to all delegations.

38. For our part, we expected a resolution which would be the logical sequel to resolution 248 (1968). In that resolution, the Council clearly pledged itself to consider further and more effective steps, as envisaged in the Charter, to ensure against repetition of premediated and massive military attacks, such as those which were launched on Irbid and Salt in Jordan on 5 June and 4 August. These attacks were characterized by even greater ruthlessness than in the past, and therefore we felt the Council would fall short of its duty if it did not proceed to take such effective steps.

39. It is clear from our debate that the massive air attacks by Israel on Jordanian towns and population centres have been unanimously condemned. The difficulty in the drafting of the resolution did not arise out of any doubts about Israel's responsibility. It arose because of long-standing differences in regard to the exercise by the Council of the powers conferred on it by the Charter. My delegation is one of those which firmly believe that the disuse by the Security Council of its legitimate powers even when the occasion demands their exercise can only result in the atrophy of its strength and the decline of its authority. There have been distressing reports that one of the parties here consistently holds the Council and its deliberations up to ridicule. This is the result of our hesitancy to invoke the Council's powers.

40. Nevertheless, we voted for the resolution—even though we considered it inadequate to the needs of the situation—because it condemns Israel's military attacks on Jordan. The resolution also warns Israel against a repetition of those attacks. Furthermore, the Security Council considers that their repetition constitutes a danger to the maintenance of peace. The Council's responsibilities in the face of a danger to peace are spelt out in the Charter and I have no reason to recite them on this occasion.

41. At the 1435th meeting of the Council on 6 August 1968, I pointed out that to "equate the small, sporadic and spontaneous acts of resistance of the people of the territories occupied by Israel" with the massive and brutal military attacks by "the armed forces of Israel is to ignore a

startling disparity of magnitude and quality" [1435th meeting, para. 73].

42. It is a matter of some satisfaction to my delegation that in this respect the resolution which we have adopted had as its core and essence the condemnation of, and warning to, Israel. It is my delegation's hope that this is the last occasion when the Council will remain content with a resolution of this kind in the face of an act of aggression which is an unmistakable threat to peace.

43. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, I would wish to associate the delegation of Canada with the well-merited tributes to the very high qualities of statesmanship—particularly those of patience and understanding—with which you conducted our affairs, both in the Council and in the consultations which have resulted in the resolution to which we are addressing ourselves today.

44. The Security Council has once again considered and pronounced itself on a further outbreak of violence in the Middle East. The complaints of the parties concerned have been heard in detail, and the Council has now unanimously approved a resolution reaffirming its previous resolution 248 (1968) in its entirety, and condemning the air attacks by Israel on Jordanian territory.

45. Particular note, as far as our delegation is concerned, has been taken by the Council of the fact that "grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated". In supporting the present resolution, the Canadian delegation recognizes that acts of retaliation of the kind we have been considering in the area of Irbid and Salt, however explained, contribute seriously to the deterioration of the situation and should be condemned. At the same time, it should be apparent that the gravity of the situation in the Middle East results from breaches of the cease-fire on both sides. We believe that acts of violence feed on one another, and that all violations of cease-fire must be avoided. We believe that the Council, considering its responsibility in establishing the cease-fire in the area in the first place, must be firm and precise regarding the need for the prevention of all violations of the cease-fire. The ultimate outcome of this cycle of violence can only be a breakdown in the tenuous peace in the Middle East as a whole.

46. My delegation welcomes the fact that a message is being sent from this Council conveying widespread support for the efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative in his important mission for peace. The full co-operation of all the parties concerned is essential to the success of that mission. Ambassador Jarring cannot dictate a settlement, but he can help the parties to attain one in accordance with the provisions and principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

47. Of course, the main responsibility for the achievement of a settlement must lie, as Article 33 of the Charter indicates, with the parties directly concerned.

48. I believe that it is desirable for the Council to try, as it did successfully though with some difficulty on this occasion, to achieve a consensus on the problems brought before it. Nevertheless, it should not be thought that the

Council's resolutions of this kind represent an answer in the long run. There is no doubt that the Council can at times successfully and properly state positions. It can also set forth guidelines for settlement of a dispute, but the Council cannot impose a settlement. It can only facilitate one.

49. My delegation firmly believes that the role of the Council is to make diplomacy work, to help heal rather than to inflame the critical situation, and such an approach is vitally needed in this troubled area with which we are concerned at this time. But it requires the co-operation of the parties directly involved. It is with these thoughts in mind that the Canadian delegation was able to support the text of the resolution which has been adopted unanimously by the Council.

√ 50. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): Permit me, Sir, to add the sincere tribute of my delegation to you for your patient and skilful efforts.

51. As we conclude our proceedings today with the consensus which has been achieved, I wish on behalf of my Government to make this short statement.

52. Throughout our protracted proceedings all of us, I am sure, have had uppermost in our minds the necessity of avoiding all actions which make a just settlement more difficult. On the contrary, what we all wish to see is immediate advance on the basis of the principles and purposes on which the Security Council voted unanimously last November. The urgency for pressing ahead with that initiative is made all the more compelling by the events which we have been discussing.

53. My delegation whole-heartedly supports the efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative and we wish to associate our selves in the strongest terms with your statement.

√ 54. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I join my congratulations to those already so fittingly addressed to you by my colleagues.

55. In its statement of 6 August [*1435th meeting*], the French delegation had occasion to state its position regarding the grave events which have again occurred in the Middle East, especially the attacks against Irbid and Salt, which were referred to our Council. Those statements clearly explain our attitude concerning the resolution we have just adopted and, even though we feel it represents only a minimum on some points, we may congratulate ourselves on the fact that it was adopted unanimously.

56. At the time of that statement of 6 August, in referring to resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 the French delegation observed, and I quote:

"My Government believes that this text... should form the basis for a settlement in the Middle East and that all the principles embodied in it should be effectively carried out" [*ibid.*, *para. 31*].

57. The provisions envisaged in this resolution include sending a special representative of the Secretary-General to

the Middle East. The French delegation has followed Mr. Jarring's activities with the greatest interest. It congratulates him on the efforts he is making within the terms of reference of resolution 242 (1967) which defines his mission, and it pays tribute to the patience and perseverance he has shown in the performance of his duties. It hopes that his mission will receive the full support of our Council, particularly of its permanent members, thereby helping to make possible the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

√ 58. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to say that you have just demonstrated brilliantly how a highly accomplished diplomat should act in the conduct of negotiations. You have been loyal, frank, patient and sincere, showing all qualities which I take pleasure in emphasizing as I, in turn, pay you the tribute you deserve so well.

59. Following arduous negotiations, the Council has just adopted a draft resolution on the painful problem which has been before us for several days. Senegal, which has taken an active part in the negotiations in order to find an acceptable solution, is gratified by the spirit of co-operation which has inspired all the representatives during all these long days. Open to dialogue as it is, Senegal continues to believe that the efforts made by Mr. Jarring will be crowned by success and will no longer be hampered by reprehensible incidents such as those which have concerned us here.

60. Certainly the resolution which has just been adopted marks the Council's more decided intention not to tolerate this kind of incident any more in the future. The Government of Israel must cease the bombings on Jordanian territory and state unequivocally that massive air attacks such as those of Irbid and Salt, which have just been unanimously condemned, will not be resumed again. Personally, I see the moderation shown by the Arab delegations during the negotiations as a proof of their goodwill in the attempt to reach a just and lasting peace. The other party should therefore make an effort and stop trying to use certain arguments such as that of legitimate defence, which is a dangerous concept in international law and one which I, as an African, could not accept in any case because of my solidarity with my Arab brothers, and also with those African fighters for freedom who are struggling for their human dignity.

61. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The Council has just unanimously adopted the draft resolution which, as you have said, Mr. President, is the result of long, arduous and patient consultations during which the participants have contributed, through mutual concessions, towards arriving at a wording acceptable to all.

62. A resolution of this type, as one of our colleagues has already said, does not, nor can it properly reflect the various criteria of the members, but it does indicate the minimum common denominator. Today's resolution is no exception to this general rule.

63. The criterion upheld by my delegation has been stated repeatedly, and particularly in my statement during our morning meeting of last Friday 9 August [*1437th*

meeting]. If we examine the resolution adopted in the light of that statement, the reasons why it does not exactly nor totally agree with our general position are obvious. However, under the present circumstances we have added our vote so that this resolution could be adopted unanimously.

64. The primary and constant concern of my Government, and my delegation which represents it, is to obtain a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In the present conditions we believe the only real possibilities of doing so are based on the achievement of a total implementation of the provisions and principles contained in resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, a resolution which we should bear in mind at all times. But if this resolution is to become a reality, and if the difficult task entrusted to the talent and devotion of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, is to be successful, the complete co-operation of the parties concerned is an indispensable condition. And, as a prerequisite, it is necessary that all these parties scrupulously observe the cease-fire ordered by this Council in 1967. This mutual respect for and submission to the Council's decisions constitute the minimum favorable climate needed for the Jarring mission eventually to achieve results.

65. My Government and delegation are not prepared, and we have said so many times, to condone any of the violations or breaches of the cease-fire, nor the acts of violence, including the acts of terrorism.

66. The situation resulting from the conditions I have mentioned would be temporary, and only temporary, until all the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) have been implemented and all its objectives achieved. We hope that no new incidents will require our attention in the future. We also hope the time will come when this long and bloody era will end in the Middle East and another of just and lasting peace and prosperity for all the countries of the region will begin.

67. In conclusion, allow me, Mr. President, to join those who have already paid tribute to you for the outstanding tact and remarkable skill with which you have conducted our protracted consultations preceding the unanimous adoption of today's resolution.

68. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council has just unanimously adopted a resolution which decisively condemns Israel's new acts of aggression against Jordan's territory, the barbarous bombing of the towns of Irbid and Salt, carried out in violation of the Security Council decision on a cease-fire in the Middle East and despite the warning previously issued to Israel by the Security Council in its resolution of 24 March of this year [248 (1968)].

69. The resolution now adopted by the Council contains the indispensable minimum of the provisions required of the Security Council in the present situation. In its resolution the Council firmly and specifically condemned Israel for the new military attacks on Jordan. It not only condemned these new military attacks, which is very important, but, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, went further and expressed its conviction

that Israel's premeditated and repeated attacks on Arab countries in themselves constitute a threat to the maintenance of peace. In this connexion the resolution contains a warning that if such acts are repeated by Israel, the Council will duly note that this resolution has not been observed. These are serious conclusions and warnings, in keeping with the real state of affairs. They emphasize the Council's responsible approach to its task, which is to put an end to Israeli aggression against the Arab States and guarantee peace in the Middle East on the basis of a political settlement as provided by the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

70. The Soviet delegation supported this resolution, considering that its adoption by a unanimous vote of the Security Council may definitely be useful in creating some tangible barriers in the path of Israeli aggression. At the same time, the Soviet delegation considers it indispensable to state that the resolution adopted, although it does contain that minimum which offers a possibility of agreement on its wording, nevertheless lacks a number of important provisions which could strengthen it considerably and heighten its significance as a measure for putting an end to and preventing Israel's aggressive actions.

71. During the complex and protracted consultations on the drafting of the resolution in which the members of the Security Council took part, it became perfectly obvious which of them not only continue to sympathize with, but even to protect Israel in the continuation of its aggressive course. We cannot fail to draw attention to this circumstance in the discussion of the many serious new acts of aggression by Israel, inasmuch as such a line with regard to the aggressor cannot fail to encourage, and in fact does encourage him to new acts of aggression. Those who take a sympathetic and protective position regarding the aggressor cannot fail to share his responsibility for the fact that Israel continues its acts of aggression, and that so far no progress has been made in implementation of the resolution of 22 November of last year unanimously adopted by the Security Council. As long as Israel refuses—and, in fact, it continues to refuse—to implement this resolution, there can be no progress in this direction.

72. It goes without saying that not one of the provisions of the resolution adopted by the Council today can be regarded as aimed against the struggle for freedom of the Arab population in the territory occupied by Israel as a result of its aggression. In this struggle the people of the occupied territories are defending their legitimate, inalienable right to freedom, a right acknowledged to all people by the international community and by well and widely known decisions of the United Nations.

73. As to whether a political settlement in the Middle East, based on the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 will in fact be effected and when this will be done, now depends on Israel, since the Arab States have clearly and explicitly declared their readiness to accept and implement all the provisions of this resolution; they have even expressed their readiness to work out a time-table for its enactment. Therefore, the main problem is to put an end to Israel's aggression, its new acts of aggression against the Arab countries and peoples, and eliminate the consequences of this aggression.

74. The situation in the Middle East continues to become increasingly dangerous as a direct result, of Israel's unceasing aggressive actions against Arab States. The present aggravation of the situation in the Middle East is the direct consequence of Israel's aggression against Arab countries in June 1967 and its incessant new acts of aggression against Arab countries.

75. It is quite evident that in its position, which constitutes a challenge to the Security Council—a challenge to the entire United Nations Organization—Israel continues, as in the past, to count on outside support on the part of certain Governments, and first of all, as is perfectly obvious, on support from the United States.

76. This is the crux of the matter. This is the cause of the difficulties in the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967; this is the root of the difficulties hampering the success and mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the Middle East, Ambassador Jarring.

77. Therefore any attempt, from whatever quarter, to mitigate Israel's responsibility and transfer its fault to the other side cannot be regarded otherwise than as lending aid and support to the aggressor. Whoever does so is hindering a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and is therefore assuming a grave responsibility for all the possible consequences: for the aggravation of the situation, and for all those obstacles arising both in the path of implementation of the Security Council resolution, and in that of Ambassador Jarring's successful accomplishment of the mission entrusted to him.

78. If Israel, taking advantage of this, once again attempts to repeat its aggressive acts against Arab States, then the Security Council will obviously be obliged to refer directly, in its decisions, to those who sympathize with Israel and support its aggressive policy.

79. The Soviet Union firmly maintains the need for the most rapid settlement possible of the Middle East problem on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The Soviet Union has done and is doing everything necessary to contribute to the implementation of this important decision of the Security Council. The Soviet Union supports the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the Middle East, Ambassador Jarring, and sincerely desires the success of his mission which is designed to promote the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

80. The PRESIDENT: Speaking as the representative of BRAZIL I wish to state very briefly the reasons which have prompted my delegation to support the resolution which the Security Council has just adopted unanimously. This resolution was the result of long and protracted negotiations and it represents the consensus of the Security Council. While it is perfectly natural that not all of our points of view have been met and not all of our opinions are reflected in the text adopted, none the less it is the earnest conviction of my delegation that we have adopted a safe and wise course and we sincerely hope that the

resolution will prove an effective and positive contribution by the Security Council towards peace in the Middle East.

81. In the view of my delegation, the present resolution deplors all violations whatsoever of the cease-fire while laying stress on the premeditated military attacks recently launched by Israel against Jordan. In dealing with these grave incidents we cannot however lose sight of the measures previously taken by the Security Council towards the establishment of a durable peace in the area. In this connexion my delegation wishes to reiterate its full support of the efforts of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Middle East, to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and acceptable settlement in accordance with the provisions of resolution 242 (1967).

82. The Brazilian delegation wishes to emphasize the point made in its previous statement of 9 August [1437th meeting] before the Security Council and to reiterate its appeal to the major Powers to reflect that they should endeavour to reach understanding on the crucial question of the supply of armaments and instruments of war to the parties involved in the crisis of the Middle East. At this stage we forgo the presentation of any specific suggestions on this matter, which certainly requires further thought, study and examination. But we would be failing in our responsibility as a member of the Security Council if we did not draw the attention of the major Powers and of the members of the Council to the armaments race now prevailing in the area—an armaments race which could lead the countries affected to a new round of fighting and untold sorrow and distress.

83. It is our earnest conviction that efforts should not be spared in this connexion, and we reiterate the appeal we previously made to the major Powers upon whom falls the primary responsibility for the preservation of world peace and security.

84. Speaking now as PRESIDENT of the Security Council, I would ask if any member wishes to address the Council on the resolution which has been adopted.

85. The representative of Iraq has asked for the floor.

86. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): The Security Council has just adopted another resolution condemning Israel's attacks on Jordan and warning that such attacks in the future will lead to more effective measures. It is our hope that this will be the last warning. For two decades now, the Security Council has been warning Israel, but to no avail. This latest action of the Council reinforces the already firmly established jurisprudence and practice of the United Nations that military reprisals are inadmissible under any circumstances and for whatever alleged provocation. This principle has been reaffirmed many times in the last two decades since it was first enunciated in clear and unequivocal terms on 19 August 1948 [resolution 56 (1948)], when the Council decided that "No party is permitted to violate the truce on the ground that it is undertaking reprisals or retaliations against the other party"

87. Moreover, the Council today has refused once again to equate the actions of the so-called infiltrators with those of

Israel's armed forces. This view is held not only by Arab States but also by States which can hardly be accused of being unfriendly to Israel. I recall that in similar circumstances the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, said: "This large-scale military action cannot be justified, explained away or excused by the incidents which preceded it", or, as Ambassador Goldberg of the United States said, again in similar circumstances: "This deliberate governmental decision must be judged as the conscious act of responsible leaders of a Member State, and therefore on an entirely different level from the earlier incidents."

88. The cease-fire resolution was addressed exclusively to Governments. It logically follows that violations of that resolution can be attributed to Governments only for actions undertaken directly by them, under their own authority and control. In view of this, the activities of the Palestinian patriots, which have never been inspired, directed or controlled by any Arab Government, do not and cannot, either in fact or in law, fall under the cease-fire resolution. As far as the Government of Jordan is concerned it has respected and scrupulously observed the cease-fire, while Israel has continuously violated it. In fact, those violations go as far back as June 1967, when large areas on the west bank and in Syria were occupied after the adoption of the cease-fire resolution and its acceptance by Israel and the Arab States directly concerned.

89. These incontrovertible facts, and no fictitious and fabricated stories which the representative of Israel claims to be confidential information can alter them. I must say, however, that the representative of Israel has introduced a novel, if somewhat bizarre, element into our discussions by labelling the usual harangue, to which the Council has listened with infinite patience all these months, as "confidential information".

90. Yesterday the representative of Israel changed his tactics and started dropping names and numbers of alleged regiments. And he referred to the alleged activities of the Iraqi forces stationed in Jordan at the request of the Jordanian Government in order to help that Government to repel Israeli aggression against its territory. The representative of Jordan has already categorically denied those allegations, and I do likewise today. In our view, wild and unsubstantiated stories of this kind are no substitute for facts for the Council's consideration.

91. But let us assume for the sake of argument that the Palestinians are willing to cease their activities, or that the Arab Governments are able—which they are not, I repeat—to put an end to those activities: what is there to warrant or justify such reticence on the part of the Palestinians or the Arab Governments? Has Israel done anything since the war of June 1967 to inspire confidence in its intentions? Has it really left any alternative to the Palestinians but to fight and resist?

92. When you ask everyone to stop all activities that may harm you, are you not expected to do the same? Or is this a one-way operation: Israel is to be free to do whatever it likes inside the occupied territories, while the Palestinians should keep quiet and watch passively?

93. Under the pretext of giving the Jarring mission a chance to succeed, the Arabs are told to bear silently and stoically their misfortunes, while Israel is permitted, with full freedom and impunity, to proceed with its plans for annexation of the occupied territory.

94. Now, what has been Israel's record in the past year? The representative of Israel often speaks of reciprocity; but for him, reciprocity means freedom of action for Israel in the occupied territories and complete immobility for the Arabs of Palestine. Lest we forget, let us refresh our memories by a very brief account of the most glaring examples of Israel's activities in the last fourteen months; and then we can be in a better position to judge how we can have reciprocity in this case.

95. In the Suez Canal area, there has been wilful and deliberate obstruction by Israel of all efforts to open the Canal; there has also been repeated shelling of densely populated areas in the Suez Canal region, with heavy loss of life; in Gaza, continuing and systematic expulsion and maltreatment of the civilian population, including refugees; refusal to accept a special representative of the Secretary-General to go into the occupied territories to see for himself what kind of treatment is being meted out to the civilian population; in the Syrian sector the establishment of *nahal* colonies and further expulsion of the Arab population; in Jerusalem, annexation of the City in clear violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council; expropriation of Arab property; demolition of Arab property, and desecration of Holy Places—all in defiance of the United Nations resolutions.

96. On the west bank, civilians have been prevented from returning to their homes, again in violation of the humanitarian resolutions of this Council and of the General Assembly. There are administrative and economic measures in the west bank area to integrate that area into Israel; on the east bank, continuous shelling and bombing across the Jordan, and, of course, the five instances of armed incursion across the Jordan River and inside Jordanian territory, on 21 March, 8 April, 4 June, 4 August and 6 August.

97. Now, against such a background of continuous and wilful disregard of the resolutions of this Organization and a policy of relentless expansion, can the people of Palestine be blamed for continuing their struggle against Israel?

98. If you want reciprocity, then you must give the people of Palestine all the right in the world to react against this catalogue of continuous violations and maltreatment on the part of Israel. And in this struggle for survival, the people of Palestine are fighting to preserve their identity as a distinct national Arab community. They are determined to stay alive whatever the cost. They will never submit. For it cannot be repeated too often that the people of Palestine have been the victims of a colonial invasion unparalleled in its viciousness and ferocity. Like other colonial peoples who fell under alien rule, they aspire to regain their rights and recover their lost freedom and their usurped homeland.

99. I think I can anticipate what the representative of Israel will be saying in a short while: he will repeat the

malicious and tendentious diatribe about alleged Arab aggression. But the fact is that in the three major armed conflicts which broke out between the Arab States and Israel during the last twenty years it was always Israel which committed aggression and attacked first. Was it not Israel which launched a carefully planned attack against the Arab countries in June 1967, an attack which could not by any standard be considered a spontaneous act of self-defence? And in 1956 was it not Israel, in collusion with two great Powers, which attacked Egypt? In 1948, the Arab armies, the armies of the Arab State, entered Palestine only to save the remnants of the Arab population from complete annihilation and to prevent the entire country from being occupied by the advancing Zionist forces. It is a well-known fact that in 1948 the Zionist forces had occupied large areas which were allotted to the Arab States under the Partition Plan and made hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arab refugees long before a single soldier of the Arab States had entered the country.

100. I also think it is pertinent to say that in all these three conflicts—1948, 1956 and 1967—the fighting took place entirely on Arab soil, never on land controlled by Israel.

101. The representative of Israel made ill-concealed and undisguised threats yesterday regarding the possibility of the outbreak of hostilities in the area. If this should happen in spite of all the resolutions of the Security Council, it should be clear to all members where the responsibility lies, and it is our hope, after all these warnings, that when the Security Council meets again—and it will meet again after another incident or another attack launched by Israel—the warning which it has been issuing for all these twenty years will finally mean something and will finally be translated into effective action, because without that there can be no chance for peace in the region.

102. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

✓ 103. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to express to you, Mr. President, my delegation's tribute and also to all members of the Security Council our appreciation of the patience and devotion as shown in the prolonged discussion of the situation arising from the warfare pursued against Israel from Jordanian territory and Israel's defence measures.

104. A significant result of the debate just concluded on the Israel and Jordanian complaints is undoubtedly the light it has thrown on the present Arab attitude toward Israel. It remains an intransigent, belligerent attitude. It openly supports the continuation of warfare against Israel in violation of the cease-fire. It continues to be based on the Khartoum decisions of no peace, no negotiations, no recognition of Israel, decisions which defy the Charter of the United Nations and the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The Arab States are called upon to reach a just and lasting peace with Israel. They retort—no peace with Israel. They are called upon to arrive at agreement with Israel. The Arab States proclaim—there will be no agreement with Israel. Indeed, the attitude adopted by the Arab States in this debate; the tenor of statements made by their representatives, including the arguments used

by them, those we heard today, are precisely the same as five and ten and fifteen years ago—when their belligerency and hostility reigned supreme as unfortunately they still do at present.

105. To us in Israel this adamantly warlike posture of the Arab Governments is not a matter of Security Council debates only. To us it is expressed in premeditated and repeated attacks from Arab territory, in open preparations for another round against Israel, in unabated incitement to hostility and hatred. To us this is the continuation of the twenty-year war of Arab aggression, pursued now in particular by the method of terror warfare. The Security Council discussion has left no doubt regarding the direct responsibility of Arab Governments for this warfare.

106. The resolution which has just been adopted demonstrates again the inadequacy of the Security Council's handling of this situation. It reminds us of the long-standing disabilities under which the Security Council labours in questions arising from the Israel-Arab conflict. However, these circumstances cannot affect the fundamental precepts of law. These bestow upon Israel the inalienable right to defend itself against the continued warfare waged by the Arab States, a right enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The Government of Israel is responsible for the security of the population in Israel-controlled territory and will discharge this responsibility in accordance with its rights and duties. The people of Israel too, like any other people in the world, has a right to independence, security and peace.

107. I should like to express appreciation to those delegations that have raised their voice against the Arab acts of aggression. It is regrettable that reference to these acts in the resolution is insufficient, thus reflecting once more the Council's inability to deal effectively and equitably with this grave obstacle to peace in the area.

108. Yet, if the Jordanian and other Arab Governments heed the unequivocal injunction in the resolution against violations of the cease-fire, they will take action to terminate all military attacks—whether by regular or irregular forces against Israel—attacks which endanger the maintenance of peace. If they do that, the cease-fire will be effectively maintained.

109. Israel will do its utmost to ensure the maintenance of the cease-fire. It expects the Arab States to do the same. Israel will pursue its efforts to attain a just and lasting peace in the area through negotiations and agreement and will extend its co-operation to Ambassador Jarring's endeavours towards this objective. It hopes that the Arab States will act likewise. Whatever they do, however, it is essential that they bear in mind at all times that reciprocity remains the cornerstone of the relationship between sovereign States and that it is therefore in the interest of all the peoples of the area that the cease-fire be fully respected.

110. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Jordan.

111. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): On 5 August, we brought before the Council a complaint of a very serious nature. A

very grave violation of the cease-fire was committed by Israel, in defiance of your previous resolution 248 (1968) and in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. The Israeli authorities in Tel Aviv, as well as their representative in the Security Council, admitted that they had committed that grave violation, and we therefore asked the Council to reaffirm the stand it took in resolution 248 (1968) and consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter, in accordance with that resolution, to ensure against repetition of such acts. We have asked the Council to condemn Israel and to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter.

112. In an attempt to distort the issue, Mr. Tekoah adduced many irrelevant arguments and a variety of colourful, wild allegations to justify the war crime committed by the Israeli air force—namely, the bombing of the civilian population.

113. We asked the Council to reject the arguments, emphasizing that what was committed was a war crime that had no justification. Jordan reminded the Council that the bombing of civilians was listed in the Nuremberg indictment and considered at the Nuremberg trials as a war crime. We are grateful to members of the Council for not taking Mr. Tekoah's allegations seriously when they considered the draft resolution.

114. The question of observers was raised by a few members during our deliberations. Our answer was that the emphasis should be placed on the withdrawal of foreign Israeli troops occupying our territories—not on any idea which may amount to helping freeze the situation or accommodate the continued Israeli aggression.

115. We would like to repeat that the continued Israeli presence, together with the arbitrary measures now being taken in Jerusalem, Gaza, the Golan Heights, and the occupied Arab territories constitute a grave violation of the cease-fire. This is simply because a cease-fire represents a transitional stage; it is a temporary arrangement. It should also be borne in mind that the Security Council's injunction calling for a cease-fire was issued to the parties with that understanding.

116. My delegation would like to express its satisfaction at the constructive approach adopted by the members of the Council. All members, without exception, in one way or another condemned the Israeli premeditated large-scale military attacks. Let me, with your permission, cite some of these statements.

117. The representative of France stated that his Government was seriously alarmed by the repetition of incidents as serious as those committed despite appeals and decisions of the Security Council. He said that the Council must condemn such action and must, above all, do everything to prevent a recurrence by ensuring an effective application of the Security Council resolution of 22 November.

118. The representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik, said that the Israeli representative had placed before the Council a monstrous theory to the effect that inhabitants of occupied territories have but one right: to bow

down to the will of the occupier. Ambassador Malik asked the question: who is responsible for this theory? Hitler? His henchmen? Has Israel fallen so low as to propound this Hitler-like theory, denying the rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories to be patriots, to fight for their freedom and that of their country? The Soviet Union condemned the Israeli attack in the strongest terms.

119. The representative of Pakistan emphasized that the new Israeli act of aggression is not merely another in a long chain, but graver than the earlier incidents. He said that deploring the latest action, in order to be meaningful, should go beyond a mere expression of sentiments; it has to be formulated in such terms, in a pronouncement of the Council, as to have a deterrent effect on Israel.

120. The representative of Senegal, Ambassador Boye, said that Senegal cannot but formally condemn the raids and military operations, such as those before the Council, which can only jeopardize the efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative. He also reminded the Council that Jordan was not the aggressor and had not unleashed any attack against Israel, and that it was on its territory and its towns and cities, that the bombs fell.

121. The representative of Hungary expressed his delegation's deep concern over these new acts of aggression by the Israeli armed forces against Jordan.

122. The representative of India said that his delegation has had many occasions to state before, and would not hesitate to repeat, that there can be no peace in West Asia without the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied Arab territories. That was one of the fundamental principles embodied in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. He emphasized that the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Jordan have already indicated more than once the willingness of their Governments to implement in full the resolution of 22 November. The Council, he said, must expect Israel to come forward with a similar statement.

123. Our colleague the representative of Ethiopia said that in spite of a unanimous decision taken ten months ago by the Security Council, the situation remains as dangerous as ever, with the prospect of another conflict beginning to loom large in the background. This, he said, is a very serious prospect, to which we should give our full and undivided attention. Otherwise, we run the risk of making the same historical error as we made during the time preceding the conflict of June 1967, the error of leaving things to drift towards tension, confrontation and final conflict.

124. The representative of the United States, Mr. George Ball, made it clear that his Government does not condone the major military attack Israel made upon Jordan. He said that there must be no doubt whatsoever of the United States opposition to this attack and others that have preceded it, and I take it that what he meant by others was Irbid, Karameh, Shunah and similar attacks.

125. The United States representative then referred to the human aspects of the tragedy, asking the question, "How many more incidents must occur, how many lives must be

lost, how many families must look forward to a bleak and tragic future before this hard but simple lesson is learned?" [1434th meeting, para. 194.] How many no one can say today, he said, but in situations as complex as this the best we can do is urge and hope.

126. This afternoon, the representative of the United States referred to outrages that "have been committed against the Israeli population by terrorists operating from Jordan".

127. Mr. President, with your permission we are concluding our debate, but I am not aware of any evidence introduced in this Council implicating Jordan other than the statement of Mr. Tekoah. Mr. Tekoah has been offering wild allegations, wild fabrications. He has been repeating distortions time and again, and apparently believing that sometimes repeating a lie may make it stick. I am surprised to hear the United States, without any evidence against Jordan whatsoever, come and say that terrorists were operating from Jordan. Which part of Jordan? The west bank, the part occupied by Israel? This is resistance from within. The other side? Where is the proof? In the Security Council we go by evidence, and I know of no evidence whatsoever implicating my Government, but if the idea is to have Jordan protect Israeli aggression, this was never the case in any resistance. National resistance is not something new to the Council, nor to any member around this table.

128. The other points. It was mentioned that parties should realize the harsh reality. Yes, Israel should realize the harsh reality and the realities are there for every member to see. Reality number one is that Israel does not want to accept the harsh reality that it cannot ignore the immediate party, the 2.5 million Palestinians. This is the reality, the harsh reality, for Israel, but they cannot simply ignore it.

129. Reality number two: Israel does not want to accept the harsh reality that it is those people within the occupied area and outside it who are struggling for their homeland, their liberty and their freedom. Over those people, Jordan has no control.

130. Reality number three: it is true that Israel cannot accept the harsh reality that national resistance and terrorism are not identical. The United States in particular, which resisted foreign occupation, would be unfair to its history if it called resistance in the cause of independence and freedom terrorism. It would be unjust to George Washington, the great American, who started a revolution, calling for resistance and liberation. It would be unfair to the great values of the United States if we confuse resistance for liberation with terrorism. It would be unfair to the great Constitution of the United States if we start confusing resistance for liberation, for getting rid of the occupier, with terrorism.

131. Israel should realize the harsh reality—this is number four—that this Organization refused to accept military force as a substance for valid armistice agreements.

132. The other harsh reality, which relates to number three, is the fact that the United Nations itself recognized the legitimacy of resistance for freedom.

133. The Security Council, after lengthy debate, consultations and contacts with the capitals, has unanimously adopted a resolution this afternoon. It reaffirmed its resolution 248 (1968), which declared that grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts. The Council considered that the premeditated military attacks by Israel endangered the maintenance of peace. Finally, the Security Council condemned these further attacks by Israel in flagrant violation of the Charter and resolution 248 (1968), and warned Israel in clear terms that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would duly take account of the failure to comply with the resolution. This is taken from Article 40 of the Charter, which appears in Chapter VII.

134. Thus this resolution embodies not only condemnation of the attacks, but a specific paragraph which considers that the Israeli military attacks endanger the maintenance of the peace, and here the term "peace" has only one meaning, that is, international peace embodied in Chapter VII of the Charter.

135. However, my delegation feels that the Council was too patient in giving Israel—after it committed seven acts of aggression and after it was condemned or censured seven times—another warning. We thought the Council owed it to itself to go far beyond the steps already taken. We were hoping that the Council this time would, besides condemning Israel for its arrogant defiance of the Council, without any further delay apply sanctions. We are aware of the fact that the resolution has this time gone much further than any other resolution adopted in the past vis-à-vis Israeli aggression. But certainly it did not go far enough.

136. We expressed the hope that the Council would carry out its responsibilities and face the Israeli aggression with the only remaining effective remedy, namely, sanctions.

137. This is the more so, since these latest Israeli attacks were aimed at civilian centres and peaceful Jordanians in towns and cities. Any leniency on the part of the Council in taking a punitive and effective measure, or any underestimation of the grave and serious situation which would result from large-scale Israeli attacks of this kind, can only encourage Israel and lead to a further deterioration of the situation in the area. It will obstruct the constructive efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring.

138. What is more, it will lead to a loss of faith in the Security Council by peoples and Governments. Peoples will then question the usefulness of resorting to the Council for effective remedy.

✓ 139. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to express the appreciation of my Government and my delegation to you for the patience, wisdom and statesmanship with which you conducted our deliberations. I should like to pay tribute to the representatives of Senegal and Pakistan for their constructive contributions. They were certainly instrumental in bringing about the unanimous result achieved this afternoon. I know that there was a time when the Council

was facing one deadlock after another, but thanks to your wisdom, Mr. President, and to the contributions of the representatives of Senegal and Pakistan, together with the goodwill and genuine desire of all members to co-operate, unanimity was brought about in the Council, although it falls short of our expectation.

140. My delegation would like to express its gratitude to the delegations of France, the Soviet Union, India, Ethiopia and Hungary for their kind support for our just cause, and for their continued efforts to reach a decision.

141. Much has been said during our deliberations about giving Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, full support. Our support for Ambassador Jarring is expressed in deeds and words. We have co-operated with him, and we shall continue to do so. I need not repeat that we accepted, and will continue to accept, the resolution of 22 November. We declare our acceptance to implement the resolution in its entirety.

142. On the other hand, I need not remind the Council that Israel has not yet accepted this resolution in its entirety, and has not declared that it will implement this resolution. Actually, we hear of official Israeli statements rejecting the resolution. We also observe the continuous Israeli attacks on Jordan, in direct violation of the cease-fire resolution.

143. Jordan has been working for peace. It is the Israeli stand that is not helping peace in the land of the Prince of Peace.

✓144. The PRESIDENT: As we have come to the conclusion of our debate, I wish to express my thanks for the kind and generous words addressed to me by several delegations, and I wish to express my deep gratitude to each of the members of the Security Council for all the understanding, goodwill and statesmanship that made this conclusion possible.

The meeting rose at 8.5 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 Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Закажите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите 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.
