

UN 1 3570  
DEC 17 1968



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

# 1435<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 6 AUGUST 1968

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1435) . . . . .	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 THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 6 August 1968, at 10.30 a.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/1435)

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 decision taken yesterday by the Council [1434th meeting] I now propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic and Iraq to take seats at the Council table in order to participate, without vote, in the debate on the item under consideration.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El-Farra (Jordan), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), Mr. A. Hilmy (United Arab Republic) and Mr. A. Pachachi (Iraq) took places at the Security Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, on whom I now call.

3. Mr. HILMY (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to take this opportunity of welcoming you, both in your capacity as Permanent Representative of Brazil and as President of the Security Council for this month.

4. I would also wish to extend my delegation's welcome to Ambassador George Ball, the new Permanent Representative of the United States, whose participation in the discussions will, we are confident, be constructive as well as objective.

5. As for our esteemed friend Mr. Kutakov, the Under-Secretary-General, whom I consider a personal friend and who has been my neighbour for many years in the Special Political Committee, I extend to him my delegation's warmest welcome.

6. We were subjected yesterday once more to one of Mr. Tekoah's harangues, to which by now, we assume, the Council has become immunized. It contained, as usual, more than its fair share of stale arguments, falsifications of fact, distortions of history, not to mention a vague reference to peace on earth—all of this quoted in a tone of arrogance unbecoming to the serenity of this body and incompatible with the decorum conventional to the community of nations. It is not my intention to try the patience of the Council with a detailed refutation of all the false allegations advanced by the Israeli representative; yet I do have the firm intention of setting the record straight as to the parts of his statement where the distortion was too flagrant and the falsifications too glaring.

7. The Israeli representative seems to be very fond of referring, as he inevitably does, to the so-called Arab aggression. Here I hasten to state that if aggression there be, the reference should automatically be to Israel, to Israel's aggression and to Israel's aggressive designs.

8. Was it not aggression when a transplanted population, people who seemingly had immigrated into the land of peace to seek refuge from the Nazi tyranny and the rule of terror, having scarcely set foot in Palestine, resorted themselves to the rule of terror in order to evict the indigenous population and so to replace them?

9. Was it not aggression when, not satisfied with what the international community had, rightly or wrongly, allocated to them, they continued to expand at the expense of the original inhabitants of Palestine?

10. Was it not aggression when they invaded my country and other Arab countries in 1967, occupying vast segments of their territories, areas which amount to three times more than the territory of Israel itself?

11. Is it not aggression when, despite the unanimous endorsement by this very body of the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory through the use of force, Israel, in utter disregard of the principles of the Charter and the collective will of the Security Council and the General Assembly, is still holding the territories it occupied as a result of its military adventure in June 1967?

12. I submit that Mr. Tekoah has no right to speak about aggression, unless he wishes to expand on those aspects of Israeli aggression which I have deliberately refrained from invoking.

13. I am sure the members of the Council have noticed the strong accent the Israeli representative has been putting on the importance of the cease-fire and its respect. I do not need to explain to the Council the nature of a cease-fire as a temporary measure; nor do I have to recall the circumstances under which Security Council resolution 235 (1967) was adopted. Suffice it for me in this connexion to refer to the statement made by the then United States representative that the cease-fire should be considered as a "first step" towards the establishment of peace in the area. I for one would never disagree with his statement but I hasten to add that the second step has been already taken. It has been taken by the Security Council when on 22 November 1967 it adopted its resolution 242 (1967), containing the basic elements of peace in the Middle East. Yet I notice—without surprise, I must add—that never since the adoption of that resolution has there been any echo of it in the various statements made by Mr. Tekoah in the Security Council; nor have we been informed that the Israeli Government has accepted, as have the Arab Governments, its implementation. Should we surmise that Israel had decided to ignore that resolution too as it has ignored so many before and since? I submit once more to the Council that this would be too simple a view to take on a matter of such gravity. This is not just another resolution; it is a resolution dealing with the fundamental principles upon which our Organization is founded. Therefore, the Council cannot afford not to react, and react sharply and vehemently, against an attack on those principles.

14. Israeli leaders have over and over again stated publicly that they would hold on to the conquered territories and that certain of their decisions are irrevocable. I have no difficulty in believing that that is their intention; but the question that arises in my mind is: "Will the Security Council tolerate such a stance?"

15. We have been informed by the Israeli representative that the Israeli authorities will spare no effort to guarantee the rights of Israelis to live in security and are determined to use every means to ensure that objective. But what about

the poor Palestinian people? Are they to forsake their rights so that others can impose theirs? Who is to guarantee their inalienable rights as human beings? The United Nations assumed the task for several years, adopting resolution after resolution to preserve the minimum of those rights. Yet in the final analysis they were the ones who had the rawest deal. They have become homeless and destitute, looking forward to a dark and bleak future. If the Israeli representative has arbitrarily and presumptuously arrogated to himself the right to speak on behalf of Jewish communities living peacefully and decently in other countries, he is in no position to deny us the legitimate right to seek redress for the injustices that have befallen our Palestinian Arab brethren, for it is as a result of the actions of the Israelis that over a million Arab refugees are living in suffering and distress.

16. I felt obliged to make the preceding remarks in order to set the record straight, but I am not going to be distracted—though this might have been the intent of the Israeli representative in introducing peripheral and irrelevant remarks—from dealing with the matter under consideration by the Council.

17. The facts are simple and evident: Israeli armed forces and air forces have penetrated deep into Jordanian territory, to within fifteen miles of Amman. The pretext, as brazenly presented by the Israeli representative, was to carry on a punitive expedition against so-called terrorists bases in the area, resulting in the massacre of a substantial number of civilians, including women and children. The clarity of the facts has made it impossible for the Israeli authorities to deny them; so instead they arrogantly boast about them. Therefore, the problem is not in ascertaining the facts; it resides in agreeing on the definition of certain actions.

18. To undertake a carefully preplanned military attack by one country against another, whether under a cease-fire régime or otherwise, is obviously a case of aggression to which the Security Council under the provisions of the Charter should devote its attention. To disregard and openly violate and defy resolutions adopted by the Security Council in the discharge of its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security undoubtedly constitutes a serious threat to the peace and security which the Security Council is in duty bound to maintain. On the other hand, when the population of an occupied territory rises to resist the continued presence of a procrastinating occupier and oppressor who maintains his occupation and oppression despite calls and exhortations to the contrary by the world community, the people can only be defined as freedom fighters. The label of "terrorists" should be confined and reserved to those who not only refuse to comply with the unanimous decisions adopted by this body but also impose inhuman living conditions upon the people they continue to subdue militarily.

19. The continuous refusal by Israel to indicate its readiness to comply with and implement resolutions of the Security Council, the persistence of Israel in pursuing militaristic policy to achieve its expansionistic designs, the inhuman and racist behaviour of Israel towards the population in the occupied territories, the arrogance with which Israel heeds the considered views of world public opinion,

can be conducive only to the increasing resentment of the people living under its occupation. For they are the ones who feel the brunt and sting of the Israeli presence.

20. Peace appears to be the concern of everyone around this table, for the Security Council adopted a resolution last November [242 (1967)] delineating its elements and its modalities. The resolution mentions the need for a just and lasting peace in the area. We have accepted this resolution because we believe both in peace and in justice. Israel has not, up to the present moment, manifested its acceptance, though it continues to pay lip service to the cause of peace. Are we to assume that what they want is peace without justice and that that is why they are reluctant to declare openly and without reservations their acceptance? Let me assure you that this cannot be because peace without justice is an edifice without foundation; it will soon crumble.

21. The case for constructive reasoning is still within the realm of the possible; but it is not incumbent upon us to practise it. It should in all objectivity apply to those who, to score a point, resort to massive military activities believing that the rule of force is the rule of law. In the light of the record of Israel over the past twenty years—a record of intimidation, aggression and destruction—we wonder if it is proper for an Israeli representative, his country having earned with justice a long list of condemnations from the Security Council for what the Israelis have destroyed, to come and preach to us a constructive approach.

22. It is not the first time that Israel has perpetrated brutal crimes against the Palestinian people, and it is not the first time that an Arab country brings its complaint to the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. However, it should be admitted that the Security Council's inaction did more harm to a rightful cause. The Council's reluctance to face its Charter responsibilities and uphold the lofty principles of the Charter by suppressing the aggressor and restoring peace with justice convinced the aggressor that he could persist in his policy with impunity. The Charter, however, did lay down a whole Chapter, Chapter VII, which was to be implemented whenever overt aggression was committed and the Charter foundations are flagrantly flouted. On 24 March 1968 resolution 248 (1968) was unanimously adopted. In that resolution the members of the Council declared that:

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

Since that time Israel has twice resorted to its policy of retaliation and massive reprisals, and I hardly need to remind the Council of the grave consequences which will result from the Council's continuous inaction. What is needed is not another condemnation by the Security Council. Israel has already a long list of those condemnations which is completely disregarded by its authorities. It is high time to consider adopting “further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts”.

23. Mr. CHAYET (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, yesterday you expressed perfectly the feelings of the members of the Council about our President for the month of July, Mr. Bouattoura, Permanent Representative of Algeria, whom we were very happy to see assume that office. You also accurately interpreted our feelings about Mr. George Ball, the new Permanent Representative of the United States of America who is already so well known in international circles and whom we should like to welcome in our midst, and also about the new Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Kutakov, with whom my delegation has for many years enjoyed warm relations.

24. It would not be fitting for me to add anything to or detract anything from the statement you made yesterday, Mr. President, on behalf of the members of the Council. May I be allowed to tell you how pleased my delegation is to welcome you to the United Nations as Permanent Representative of Brazil and to find that, immediately after your arrival, you are presiding over our work. Though seemingly a newcomer you are in fact already held in great regard in the United Nations both for your competence and for your friendliness and courtesy. You have our full confidence and you may rest assured that we are most anxious to help you in your work.

25. I should of course have preferred to welcome you in happier circumstances than those which have led to the convening of this meeting of the Council. Once again the Middle Eastern region has just been the scene of bloody incidents, and once again the Security Council has been urgently convened as a result of the grave events which have just taken place there.

26. The French Government was deeply concerned and moved when, on 4 August, it learned of the bombing of Salt by the Israeli air forces, a bombing which has inflicted new suffering on the already sorely tried population of the region. We are told by the representative of Jordan that this military operation, admitted by the Israeli Government, resulted, in the space of three hours, in the killing of 34 and the wounding of 82 persons and that it caused considerable material damage. My Government deplores this damage and, above all, the loss of human life. Moreover, it is seriously alarmed by the constant occurrence of serious incidents of this kind despite Security Council appeals and decisions.

27. On 24 March 1968, the Security Council unanimously condemned the military action launched by Israel against Karameh on 21 March in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions; it deplored all violent incidents and declared that such actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire could not be tolerated. Yet, less than five days after the adoption of that resolution, new incidents occurred, causing blood to flow in the region and calling for another meeting of the Council.

28. On 4 June 1968, there was the attack against Irbid and the neighbouring villages, for which the casualty rate was 59 killed and 121 wounded. Two months later to the very day, there has been the bombing of Salt which the Council is now meeting to consider.

29. My delegation, after listening to the statements by both sides on this question, considers that such operations can by no means be justified as legitimate defence when they are in fact reprisals. As the representative of France has already emphasized in this forum, we have never considered the concept of military reprisals acceptable. It is condemned by our Organization and by the Charter.
30. Moreover, if there were still any need for proof, the list of incidents which have occurred in the last few months in that region would in itself prove the futility of such actions. Whatever events provoked them, reprisals inevitably spark off a tragic series of reactions and repression which can only engender hatred and resentment and might lead to the renewal of hostilities.
31. We should decidedly embark on the opposite course, the one that leads to a peaceful solution, the course made possible by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. My Government believes that this text, for which it voted, should form the basis for a settlement in the Middle East and that all the principles embodied in it should be effectively carried out. That is why it closely follows Ambassador Jarring's praiseworthy efforts to fulfil his mission. At a time when the Special Representative is striving to do just this, military operations like the bombing of Salt can only complicate his task and endanger the chances of achieving the just and lasting peace that we all hope for. The Council should therefore condemn such actions. Above all, it should endeavour to prevent their repetition by striving to carry out effectively the resolution of 22 November 1967.
32. Mr. BEAULIEU (Canada) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, for personal reasons I should feel remiss if I were not to welcome you, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, as Permanent Representative of your country and as President of the Security Council for the month of August. My delegation fully shares the confidence expressed by other representatives that under your enlightened leadership and thanks to your long experience in international affairs, the work we do should prove most useful. I can assure you of my delegation's complete co-operation.
33. The new representative of the United States of America, Ambassador George Ball, is so well known that we need hardly dwell upon his qualities. He brings a wealth of experience in international affairs and the problems of government to our Council. We know that this will be most valuable to him and will help him fulfil his onerous task as Permanent Representative of his country to the Security Council.
34. May I also take this opportunity to congratulate my neighbour on my right, Mr. Kutakov, on his recent appointment as Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs. His long participation in the work of our Organization is a guarantee of his competence and we wish him every success in the accomplishment of his task.
35. The Canadian delegation is deeply aware of the human tragedy that is being enacted and has listened very carefully to the statements made in the Security Council by the distinguished representatives of Jordan and Israel. No one can deny the seriousness of their complaints or of the specific incident which is the principal reason for our present meetings.
36. Once again this was a violent incident to be added to the long list of incidents and acts of reprisal that have taken place in that area. My delegation sincerely regrets the military operation undertaken in Jordan on 4 August and all the loss of life which ensued.
37. My delegation calls upon all those concerned to observe the cease-fire scrupulously and not to adopt any position or undertake any action which might render the already tenuous peace which somehow is maintained from day to day in the Middle East even more unstable. Obviously such acts of violence cannot help in any way to create a climate in which the Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, could succeed in the vital task which has been conferred on him. As the Council knows, Ambassador Jarring has recently informed the Secretary-General of his intention to continue his efforts to promote an agreement between the parties concerned. I am sure all representatives share the conviction that, in the present circumstances, the only hope of ultimately finding a peaceful solution lies with Ambassador Jarring and his mission. In the present situation, the Council's decision may have a far-reaching impact on the vital task of the Representative of the Secretary-General.
38. According to my delegation, these are the considerations which should guide members, fully aware as they are of their responsibilities, in their quest for the most appropriate course of action for the Security Council to take when it has concluded its discussions.
39. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to be allowed to speak.
40. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to exercise briefly my right of reply.
41. For twenty years the Middle East has been in the throes of a war of aggression waged by the Arab States against Israel. The aggressive character of this war, launched in defiance of the United Nations, has never been in doubt. In 1948 it was condemned in the Security Council by member States, including the United States, the Soviet Union and others. The war is not over because the Arab States refuse to conclude peace with Israel. The war's aggressive character has not and could not have changed simply by virtue of the lapse of time. For nineteen years the Middle East had only an armistice; for a year it has had a cease-fire. However, whether in the period of the armistice or now at the time of the cease-fire, one salient factor has stood out in all clarity: the Arab States have never abandoned their war. They have never ceased to wage it by all means at their disposal: political and economic warfare, naval blockade, bombardment of border villages, and, above all, terror and sabotage raids.
42. It is odd to find the Arab representatives and their supporters attempting to describe, and even to justify, the armed attacks of Jordanian military positions on Israeli villages, and terror operations conducted against Israel, as resulting from the hostilities of June 1967. Nothing could

be further from the truth. The same methods were used by the Arab States long before 1967. The same arguments to justify them have been voiced by Arab representatives in the Council for years. The allegation that Jordanian artillery shells Israeli villages and that armed raiders from Jordan attack Israel and Israeli citizens solely because they are reacting to the failure of Arab aggression in 1967 is without any foundation whatever. These acts of hostility are as old as the Israel-Arab conflict itself.

43. The *fedayeen* are not a novel idea. El-Fatah is not a new organization. The so-called Arab war of liberation is not a new label for Arab terrorism against women and children. Israel has confronted these attacks in the 1940s, in the 1950s and in the 1960s, despite what the Arab Governments would have us believe. These acts of aggression have been ruled illegal and as requiring immediate termination, again and again. Even as far back as the fragile truce of 1948, the Security Council called for a stop to the type of warfare the Arab States now try to pass off on the world as justified.

44. In resolution 56 (1948) of 19 August 1948, the Security Council decided that:

“(a) Each party is responsible for the actions of both regular and irregular forces operating under its authority or in territory under its control;

“(b) Each party has the obligation to use all means at its disposal to prevent action violating the truce by individuals or groups who are subject to its authority or who are in territory under its control;”.

In later years, Security Council resolutions, reports of the Secretary-General and of his late predecessor, declarations by member States of the Council, condemned these acts and called for their cessation.

45. Terror raids are an old method of Arab warfare against Israel. They are as despicable as they are condemnable, as dangerous now as in the past. They remain an inseparable part of the general Arab war effort against Israel.

46. In war, self-defence is not a matter of phraseology. Those who kill, those who organize killing, those who support and encourage murder and sabotage, know full well that the attacked might hit back, and that when he does he will not ask the killer, how, where and when to do it. It is as simple as that, and no distortion of law, nature or morality can alter this fundamental tenet. Those who support Arab terror operations, not to speak of armed attacks launched by Arab regular army positions, must understand that they lend support to the continuation of Arab war against Israel. This war is an international crime and those guilty of support to it cannot suggest sanctimoniously how to react or how not to react to it.

47. It is not surprising that the United Arab Republic delegation should join the Jordanian representative in the defence of continued war against Israel. Egypt, after all, was the initiator many years ago of the warfare-by-terror method. Today it is well known that Cairo organizes, trains and arms terrorist commandos operating from Jordan. It has transferred officers and men from the Egyptian regular

forces to the saboteur camps in Jordan. Some of the raiders killed and some of those captured wore Egyptian military uniforms and carried papers testifying to their membership in the Egyptian army. *The New York Times*, of 17 June 1968, summed up the situation as follows: “Reports from Arab sources indicate that guerrilla action against Israel is increasing with the blessing of Cairo and Amman”.

48. Of all the Arab States, Egypt is also most responsible for the present situation in the Middle East. The events of last year are still fresh in the minds of all of us. Today again Egypt is in the forefront of Arab belligerency. After a desperate attempt to appear in the eyes of the world as somewhat less intransigent, the mask has fallen from Cairo's face. All reports about readiness for peace have been denied by Egyptian Government spokesmen. All suggestions that Egypt might be ready to move towards agreement with Israel have now been shattered by Cairo, Egypt is again what it was a year ago and more: an uncompromising aggressor thirsting for the renewal of hostilities.

49. Let us hear what President Nasser—not the Egyptian representative in this debate—had to say on 23 July 1968:

“The bases are clear and definite in United Arab Republic policy: no negotiations with Israel, no peace with Israel”—I repeat, no peace with Israel—“no recognition of Israel. No projects exist”, he continued, “for a peaceful solution, and it does not seem to me that there will be any in the future”. I repeat: “No projects exist for a peaceful solution, and it does not seem to me that there will be any in the future”.

“We add”, he said, “peace in this part of the world will not be achieved by the mere elimination of the consequences of the 5 June aggression”.

Those who have been watching Egyptian action and listening to Egyptian pronouncements for the last twenty years know what it means. “The next point”, he said, “concerns Palestinian *fedayeen* activities. We are fully committed to offering every help to the *fedayeen* action”.

50. The speech by President Nasser is an event of great international significance. It provides a brutally clear and conclusive picture of Egyptian policy. It is a policy of total, unreserved and uncompromising opposition to peace. The policy of the United Arab Republic is in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of the basic principles of international law. Nasser rejects the declared will of the international community for the promotion of agreement on the establishment of a just and lasting peace. That statement, as well as other indications that we have received of Egyptian policy, destroys any possible illusion about Egyptian moderation. Nasser's policy is to have a new war in the Middle East for the purpose of bringing about Israel's complete liquidation. He is against peace, against agreement, against negotiation, against the recognition of Israel's sovereignty.

51. Egypt's previous statements about readiness for a peaceful settlement and acceptance of the Security Council's resolution of November for the establishment of peace have now been entirely repudiated. They were intended to mislead world opinion. Nasser no longer attempts even to do that.

52. In the light of the foregoing, it may not be surprising to find the Egyptian representatives speaking out in favour of the pursuance of warfare against Israel. We deny totally their Government's right to question the propriety of Israel's air action against the terrorist bases. A government that used airplanes to bomb and gas innocent civilian villages cannot be entitled to speak out about defensive air actions directed against military objectives.

53. I should like to read here from a report of the International Red Cross of 18 May 1967, only a year ago:

"The undersigned doctors, members of the International Committee of the Red Cross medical mission to the Yemen, arrived at Gahar (North Yemen) in the Wadi Herran, on May 15, 1967, following an appeal for assistance from the inhabitants who claimed to have been under gas attack by airplanes"—Egyptian airplanes—"on the morning of May 10, 1967 . . .

"1. Seventy-five persons died of poison gas shortly after the raid. They showed the following symptoms: shortness of breath, coughing, pink foam at the mouth, general edema, especially in the face . . .

" . . .

"The undersigned doctors draw the following logical conclusions from their findings:

"The cause of death in the case of the corpse examined was pulmonary edema. The over-all consistency of the ICRC medical mission's findings shows that in all probability this pulmonary edema was caused by inhalation of toxic gas."

54. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Algeria has asked for the floor on a point of order.

55. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): My delegation is not in the habit of interrupting the discussions in the Council. But, as Mr. Malik, the representative of the Soviet Union, rightly pointed out yesterday, some persons here would like to establish the practice of introducing irrelevant elements in the debate on every occasion.

56. On this occasion, I am bound to recall the courageous decision taken by Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom, who wisely remarked that the speakers who are invited to make statements before the Security Council should make every effort to confine themselves strictly to the subject under discussion.

57. In order to prevent the Council from reverting to this kind of practice which my delegation would not like to see become a habit in the Council, my delegation, with all due respect, Mr. President, would urge you to request the speakers who ask to be heard in the Council to observe most scrupulously the procedure which is accepted and recognized by one and all.

58. The PRESIDENT: With reference to the point raised by the representative of Algeria, I wish to emphasize that the practice of the Security Council has been sometimes

liberal and sometimes strict in interpretation but I definitely agree with him that some limitations must be placed on the debate so that it will be confined to the terms of the item under consideration. Therefore I appeal to the representative of Israel to confine his remarks to the item under consideration, all the more so since, as I understand it, he asked for the floor in exercise of his right of reply. I am sure the representative of Israel will pay due attention to my appeal. I now request him to resume his intervention.

59. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Allow me to reiterate that Israel as a Member of the United Nations, an Organization based on the equality of all the Member States, will question the title of any State that persecutes Jews or discriminates against them to come before this Council to speak on behalf of human rights. We shall question the right of any State guilty of acts of aggression to come here and express its view, its judgement, on Israel's defence against aggression. We and the world at large will not admit that those who pursue a criminal policy aimed at the destruction of a Member State of the United Nations and the annihilation of its people masquerade here in the garb of defenders of law and justice.

60. The Security Council is confronted by a situation which is clear: Arab war waged against Israel for twenty years, pursued at present by continuous firing across the cease-fire lines from Jordanian military positions, and in particular the repeated and wanton shelling of Israeli villages and by armed terror attacks from Jordan territory, with the connivance, aid and encouragement of the Jordanian Government and its armed forces.

61. There is only one way for the Security Council to act in order to contribute to peace in the area—not by focusing on Israel's defensive counter-action, but by ruling once and for all that Arab warfare must end. Indeed Council action is required, action to put an end to the shelling of Israeli villages by Jordanian military positions and to the terror raids conducted against my country and my people from Jordanian territory.

62. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, allow me, first of all, to welcome you as the representative of Brazil on the Security Council, as well as in your capacity as the Council's President for this month. Your great knowledge and experience of the work of the United Nations and also in foreign affairs is well known to all of us. We welcome your presidency over our deliberations and are confident that all of us will benefit greatly from your sagacity.

63. Secondly, I should like to pay our sincere tribute to Ambassador Bouattoura who guided the Council's activities during the month of July. Though there was no meeting of the Security Council during that month, Ambassador Bouattoura conducted valuable consultations among the Council's members which we all know are no less significant to the conduct of our meetings than presiding over our formal deliberations.

64. Let me also say a word of respectful welcome to the representative of the United States, Ambassador George Ball, a statesman of high stature with whom we look forward to co-operating in the achievement of the Council's aims.

65. I have another pleasant duty to perform and that is to extend our welcome to Under-Secretary-General Kutakov. His work and experience render him eminently suitable for the post to which he has been appointed, and we assure him of our full co-operation.

66. Last March the Council was confronted with a grave situation caused by military action of a large-scale and carefully planned nature taken by the armed forces of Israel on the territory of Jordan. After intense consultations and careful consideration of all aspects of the matter, the Council adopted resolution 248 (1968) which condemned this military action, called upon Israel to desist from acts or activities in contravention of resolution 237 (1967) requiring Israel to ensure the safety and welfare of the inhabitants of the occupied areas and declared that such actions of military reprisal could not be tolerated. The Council also pledged that it would have to consider effective steps envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts.

67. Hardly had a week passed when Israel, in utter disdain of the Council's resolution, launched a heavy and concentrated bombardment of the east bank of the Jordan by land and air. This time, at the 1412th meeting of the Council, the President stated the consensus of the members of the Council that they were deeply concerned at the deteriorating situation in the area and that the Council would keep it under close review.

68. Two months later Israel launched yet another major aggressive action on Irbid in the territory of Jordan. The tragic assassination of Senator Kennedy prevented the Council from considering that matter.

69. Today we are confronted with the fourth large-scale act of aggression by Israel against Jordan in the last four months. The untold sorrow, the grievous loss of life caused by this latest act are too plain to need any description. But this incident is not merely another in a long chain. It is incomparably graver than the earlier incidents. It has caused a tumult in the area which, if not controlled by the Council, will destroy whatever little chances of restoring peace still exist. The question is, what is it that the Council can and should do in the face of this consistent and sanguinary pattern of military actions by Israel which has finally led to the present intolerable situation?

70. Some of my colleagues have preceded me in this discussion. There is one common denominator in their statements. All have deplored this latest action of Israel. This is a natural humane reaction. But if it is to be meaningful, if it is to contribute to a real amelioration of the situation, if it is to revive some prospect of peace in the area, it cannot be allowed to remain a mere expression of sentiment. It has to be formulated in such terms in a pronouncement of the Council as to have a deterrent effect on Israel.

71. There are, however, two trends in the discussion here which, in the sincere opinion of my delegation, impede the Council's objectivity and may render our deliberations totally infructuous. We would respectfully urge that these trends be abandoned.

72. The first is the tendency to be overimpressed with the fact that the Council is faced with charges and counter-charges from the parties and has no independent knowledge of the truth. I would beg to remind my colleagues that confusion is unwarranted in this case. The military action by Israel which has brought us to these meetings is admitted by Israel itself. No better testimony of the attitude behind this action could be available than is presented in the statement of the representative of Israel himself. It is true that Israel offers a long catalogue of the acts in violation of the cease-fire which are alleged to have been committed by Jordan. But the fact that whenever Israel launches an aggressive action it keeps handy a catalogue of such violations is all too familiar not only to the Council but even to the world press. The Council would be showing a singular lack of judgement if it were bemused by such tactics.

73. The second trend is more facile and more destructive of a movement towards peace. It is the tendency to equate the military actions of Israel with all other violations of the cease-fire, and, in so doing, to strike a posture of justice and even-handedness in disregard of the human realities of the area. To equate the small, sporadic and spontaneous acts of resistance of the people of the territories occupied by Israel with the carefully planned and large-scale military actions of the armed forces of Israel is to ignore a startling disparity of magnitude and quality. Moreover, it is to confer a right on the perpetrator of an aggression, the illegal occupier of another's territory, equal to that of the victim of that aggression. In the present case, it amounts in effect to nothing less than condoning the actions of military reprisal by Israel. The right of reprisal is nothing more than a revival of the law of the jungle. It will be a sad day when the Council finds itself accepting this law in camouflage.

74. This is the compelling consideration of justice involved in this case. But it is not a matter of ethics or of the standards of the Charter alone. From even a hard-headed political viewpoint, it is totally unrealistic to think that there is a vicious circle of violence and counter-violence between Jordan and Israel for which both parties are equally responsible. On the one side we have actions of large-scale violence committed by a Government which has a mighty arsenal at its disposal. On the other side we have a defenceless Government which has shouldered the burden of accepting a mass of people brutally evicted from their homes. Is it realistic to expect that Jordan should wage war against its own people, who in desperation are struggling with the pitiful means at their disposal, for nothing more than to regain their homes? Short of waging such war, there is no means for Jordan to prevent the so-called violations of the cease-fire.

75. On 24 March 1968, when we adopted resolution 248 (1968), I stated:

"The Government of Jordan has stated that it is in no position, in spite of its best efforts, to control the activities of resistance movements. We cannot permit an interpretation of operative paragraph 3 that would, in the event of any future incident, enable Israel to claim the freedom to launch any military attacks against Jordan or any of its other neighbours. It is always notoriously easy, as is borne out by the history of two world wars in this

century and by that of colonial wars, to stage incidents and to use them as pretexts for launching wars of aggression. We cannot be a party to binding Jordan to unjust conditions which it is not in a position to fulfil, and, in the event of non-fulfilment, to expose it to the mortal danger of a massive armed attack.

“Pakistan must therefore reject any such interpretation, for it not only would destroy the very foundations of international relations and the United Nations order, but would condemn small and weak States to live in fear and trembling before their stronger neighbours.” [1407th meeting, paras. 62 and 63.]

I have repeated this statement because it closely applies to the present situation.

76. In conclusion, I must say that my delegation has appreciated the many references to the Jarring mission which have been made in this debate. All the representatives except one have expressed anxiety that the latest developments should not adversely affect the progress of Ambassador Jarring's efforts. We note this exception and we believe it is of no small significance. But leaving it aside for the moment, my delegation is convinced that the situation in the Middle East will not ripen towards even a temporary solution unless a measure of balance is introduced into it. Such a balance cannot be introduced unless the derangement caused by Israel repeatedly inflicting death and destruction on the Arabs is effectively checked. It is this thought which, we believe, needs to be uppermost in our minds.

77. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United Arab Republic has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

78. Mr. HILMY (United Arab Republic): It is obvious that the tactics of Mr. Tekoah are to divert us from the issue before us. But since he has given a lot of information about my country which is complete distortion I find myself obliged to invoke my right of reply.

79. The statements of Mr. Tekoah now are like a record that has been played time and again. After listening to the first phrase, one expects what is coming. It is a record that has been repeated so many times that it is worn out now. It is showing some cracks, and those cracks repeat the same phrase many times, even in the same statement. It is fashionable to put the statements of Israeli representatives on records; I have seen some of them displayed for sale on Fifth Avenue; I believe the record costs three dollars.

80. If Mr. Tekoah has another record to give us—saying that he accepts the rights of the Palestinians to live in peace, as he says his own people should have the right to live in peace—then I will buy that record.

81. If he says that Israel will forever be a minority if they decide to stay with us in our part of the world—and even inside their own country they will be a minority, and a minority needs the protection of the majority, and they ask for that protection—then I will buy that record.

82. If he declares here that his Government is willing to accept and implement the resolution of the Security

Council of 22 November 1967, then I will buy that record. Now, he painted a picture to you of us as the aggressors. He mentioned 1948—that we waged war on Israel; so the Arabs are aggressors. But I should like to know one thing: before May 1948, where was Israel? There was no Israel. But when the Irgun Zvei Leumi, the Haganah, the Stern—all those terrorist gangs—murdered the Palestine civilians, the indigenous people, and expelled them, how can he come here and say those people are the aggressors and the Israelis are the victims?

83. He mentioned something about poisonous gas in Yemen, which was totally irrelevant; it is not the issue here. We refuted it earlier, and I am not going to go through it again. But I should like to give him a dose of his own medicine.

84. In 1948, in Gaza, two Israelis were caught with two vials near the main well which supplies Gaza with water. The chief bacteriologist flew there from Cairo and analysed them. Those vials contained a dysentery bacillus and a typhoid fever bacillus, type A and B. Those two Israelis were Yemenite Jews, who looked exactly like their cousins, which is how they were able to reach that well.

85. That is bacteriological warfare. If someone has his house made of glass he should not throw stones at his neighbours. So he thinks that after the expulsion of a few million people—Palestinians—and making them live as refugees on seven cents a day is proper, those people must be stamped as aggressors.

86. In 1956 a contractor who was cleaning the road in Mitla Pass at 5 o'clock one afternoon saw airplanes fly over him; parachutes dropped and about 62 of his poor labourers were annihilated by the Israeli paratroops. They were armed with picks and shovels. At that time we were ready to defend ourselves against another attack by two big Powers. We were turning our back to Israel and we were stabbed in the back. In that we also were aggressors.

87. When in 1956, the Israeli Prime Minister declared the annexation of Sinai and they sang in the Knesset we were also aggressors in this war.

88. Now, coming back to 1967, when my President gave his word of honour to the representatives of two major Powers that he would not attack Israel, that he had given his orders to the armed forces to stand down, and that he was all for a peaceful settlement. He went even further and sent his deputy here to the United States to talk on peaceful terms. What happened then? Mr. Tekoah's predecessor, Ambassador Rafael, came to this very Council and said, “We saw an hour later hundreds of Egyptian airplanes coming to destroy Israel, so we had to go to war to defend ourselves”.

89. That would have been quite a phenomenon because the flying time of a modern jet between Israel and Cairo is about twelve minutes; to the Suez Canal area it is less. Mr. Rafael did not explain that phenomenon—how there was not a single Egyptian airplane destroyed over Israel or even *en route* to Israel. They were all destroyed on the ground. People forgot that statement. He calls us aggressors.

90. Now the representative of Israel talked about the speech of President Nasser. I have here a verbatim record. The President said:

“We have accepted the Security Council resolution. But Israel did not accept it. At present there are no plans for peaceful solution and it seems there will be no such plan in the future. Hence, our position vis-à-vis a political solution of the present crisis in the Middle East is clear. We shall not give up one inch of our occupied territories.”

I do not know why Mr. Tekoah objects to that.

91. I do not wish to go further with this, because I should like to confine the discussion to the issue before us. I reserve the right to deliberate further in exercising my right of reply should that be necessary.

92. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

93. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I shall say only that I would suggest that the Council members study and weigh very

carefully the instructive clarification we have just heard from the representative of the United Arab Republic. He said that he hopes for—I understood him to mean that he aspires to—the time when the people of Israel will be a minority in their country. The situation could not be clearer.

94. I appreciate this clarification on the part of the Egyptian representative who explained to the Security Council again what Egypt's goal is—the denial of sovereignty and freedom to the people of Israel and the land of Israel. That is the situation that confronts us, those the dangers that Israel has to cope with. That is the real problem in the Middle East conflict.

95. The PRESIDENT: I have no more names on my list of speakers. I wish to thank the representatives of the United Arab Republic, France, Canada and Pakistan for their kind and generous words in my regard.

*The meeting rose at 12.20 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. Напишите 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.

---