

UNITED NATIONS



**SECURITY COUNCIL  
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

UN LIBRARY

NOV 27 1972

UN/DA COLLECTION

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1417<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 27 APRIL 1968

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1417) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560) .....	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 SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 27 April 1968, at 3 p.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1417)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council [1416th meeting], I shall invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table and to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the item on the agenda.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Council will continue its consideration of the question on its agenda.

3. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): There is a well-known saying that whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad, and in our opinion it applies quite well to the present euphoria of the leaders in Tel Aviv, who, in their short-sighted Machiavellianism, have been taking the maddest decisions.

4. Every time the Palestine question comes before the Security Council we are faced with a further worsening of

the situation as a result of fresh annexations. There is hardly any need to draw up a list of the political day-dreams of the Israel authorities and the hard-core extremists. We hear, for instance, that at its meeting in Tel Aviv the World Congress of Orthodox Communities decided unanimously to ask the Government to proclaim what they called the cease-fire lines as the permanent frontiers of Israel. The Congress also passed a resolution calling for Israel citizens to be settled in the occupied territories. Then again we hear that the Chief Rabbi, Yizhak Nissim, will leave Israel to tour the United States and Canada for the purpose of urging Americans and Canadians of the Jewish faith to emigrate to Israel. The Chief Rabbi will launch this appeal for immigration—a vital religious need at the present time—in synagogues, theological seminaries and Jewish cultural centres. Another report that we have received is that the Zionist authorities, after long hesitation about establishing Jewish settlements in Hebron because no Jews had lived there for a very long time, have, despite their fears about the reaction in foreign capitals to such an unfortunate step, decided to authorize seventy persons, mostly ecclesiastics, to establish themselves in a hotel in the town.

5. The latest move of this kind is the recent decision to hold a military parade in the Holy City of Jerusalem, in order to intimidate the inhabitants and create a climate of religious tension. No one can foresee the repercussions this will have, since they will go far beyond the political aspect of a problem which is still unsolved.

6. Notwithstanding these moves, which give a clear indication of their immediate and long-term objectives, the Tel Aviv authorities continue to claim with their usual cynicism that they want peace and that the only obstacle to the endeavours to achieve an acceptable settlement lies in the alleged intention of the Arab Governments to destroy Israel.

7. It is not difficult to refute claims of that sort and to demonstrate that the only obstacle to such a settlement lies in the measures taken by the Zionist authorities to challenge the sovereignty of the Arab States. One measure worthy of particular attention is this plan to lure foreign citizens away from their countries on a massive scale. It implies that Israel considers the territories it has wrongfully occupied to be too large for the local population. In that case, should it not be suggested that the only proper immigrants would be the Palestinian citizens unlawfully driven out of their country. But perhaps the Tel Aviv authorities are unaware of their existence and, to use their spokesman's favourite word, should be invited to "recognize" the existence of the Palestinian population without

delay. The fact remains, however, that while it is fond of the word "peace" Israel appears to be totally unaware of the very existence of the word "justice".

8. A little while ago I used the word "day-dream", and it is a fact that Israel's expansionist policy has brought about a situation which seems to have put the clock back by a hundred years to the days of colonial aggrandizement, when a few great Powers settled international disputes through peace treaties, or partition agreements with no regard for the indigenous population, or by conventions containing very rigorous stipulations and based on the doctrine that might is right.

9. Seen against such a background, the methods employed by Israel become clear; they reflect the philosophy of Machiavelli and other thinkers who inspired the imperialistic policies of the nineteenth century, policies which were thought to have been finally discarded after the Second World War.

10. It need hardly be added that the very existence of the United Nations, the principle of self-determination and the rejection of the use of force were intended to create a new world and to banish such anachronistic notions for ever.

11. We are now about to witness a tragi-comic spectacle—the military parade that Israel intends to hold in Jerusalem. It is meant to be provocative and intimidating, and can be expected to have very serious consequences; especially in view of the fact that Zionism bases its territorial ambitions largely on a fanciful interpretation of the Bible and itself adds a religious note to this latest step towards total annexation. Adding a religious dispute to a political and military situation which is already serious enough can hardly fail to make the existing dispute almost insoluble. Perhaps, however, that is Tel Aviv's intention. Perhaps, relying on a dubious long-term military superiority, it plans to use every conceivable method to drive out the local Arab population for ever. If the parade does, in fact, take place, it is bound to introduce an element of sacrilege into the dispute that no political move will ever obliterate. Furthermore, as the Secretary-General himself has just reaffirmed, the parade violates all the resolutions on the subject of Jerusalem adopted by the United Nations since 1948.

12. The long series of violations and the refusal by Israel to implement those resolutions, particularly those of 4 and 14 July 1967 [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], demonstrate once again what Tel Aviv thinks of its international obligations.

13. It may well be that at some future date Israel will really desire peace, but that will not be before it has satisfied its territorial ambitions, or before all the immigrants it can manage to lure into this adventure have been settled in the annexed territories. The only right and legitimate reaction for the people of Palestine is therefore to take up arms in self-defence in order to avoid extermination. If extermination seems too strong a word, anyone interested in the matter should reread the copious literature that the Zionist leaders have been good enough to supply us with during the past decades. They will then

perhaps understand why the people of Palestine have reason to fear the fate that befell the indigenous inhabitants of certain territories we all know of when they were colonized. In the latter case, however, there were mitigating circumstances in so far as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had not yet been adopted, nor had respect for man become a guiding principle in international relations.

14. Accordingly, the Council's first duty is to condemn soundly and put an end to Israel's current retrograde policy. First of all it should prevent the situation from deteriorating as a result of the annexation of Jerusalem, which is certainly in the offing; in particular it should put a stop to deliberate acts of provocation. Following its traditions, the Council ought to ensure that aggressive military parades cannot take place in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

15. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The Security Council has again been convened to deal with the latest Israeli challenge to the authority of our Organization. As the letter addressed by the representative of Jordan to the President of the Security Council properly puts it: "The Israel acts of violation are culminating now in the Israel military parade to be held in Jerusalem on 2 May 1968, and which will start in the occupied City of Jerusalem." [S/8560.]

16. The policy of Israel with regard to Jerusalem has perhaps been the best illustration of what kind of peace and coexistence Israel has been offering to its Arab neighbours. As is well known, the status of Jerusalem was established by the General Armistice Agreement signed by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and Israel on 3 April 1949 at Rhodes. In article IV of that Agreement, we read:

"The basic purpose of the Armistice Demarcation Lines is to delineate the lines beyond which the armed forces of the respective Parties shall not move."<sup>1</sup>

17. It is common knowledge that Israel had started to erode the provisions of the Agreement by gradually shifting its governmental organs to Jerusalem, a policy which large numbers of Governments have refused and continue to refuse to recognize.

18. Everyone well remembers that in June 1967 the armed forces of Israel did move beyond the demarcation lines delineated in an agreement signed by the representatives of Israel. Not only did they move across the demarcation lines, but official representatives of Israel, such as Prime Minister Eshkol and others, openly stated that Israel had decided to annex the Jordanian part of Jerusalem acquired by armed conquest. It is for that reason that the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly deemed it necessary to adopt, by an overwhelming majority, two resolutions on Jerusalem.

19. In the first of these, resolution 2253 (ES-V), the General Assembly considered that the measures taken by

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

Israel to change the status of the City were invalid, and called upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. In view of the continuing Israeli violations of the status of Jerusalem, the special session of the General Assembly was obliged, ten days later, to adopt another resolution [2254 (ES-V)] by an equally heavy majority, which deplored the failure of Israel to implement the earlier resolution and reiterated the call to Israel contained in that earlier resolution to rescind all measures already taken and to desist from any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. Finally, both resolutions requested the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council and the General Assembly on the situation and on the implementation of the resolutions.

20. The Secretary-General in his report of 12 September 1967 stated that:

"In the numerous conversations which the personal representative"—Ambassador Ernesto A. Thalmann—"had with Israel leaders, including the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, it was made clear beyond any doubt that Israel was taking every step to place under its sovereignty those parts of the city which were not controlled by Israel before June 1967." [See S/8146, para. 33.]

Further in that report we read that:

"The Israel authorities stated unequivocally that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable." [Ibid., para. 35.]

21. The process of integration, that is, the annexation of a part of Jordan, has since been continued by the demolition of Arab tenements, by the appropriation of the land of Arab owners, by the forced resettlement of Israeli citizens in the Jordanian part of Jerusalem, and so on. The terrorist actions perpetrated by the invaders have met with the determined resistance of the people of Arab Jerusalem. The declarations and subsequent deportations of leading Arab personalities and the police methods used against demonstrating women, as reported in *The New York Times* of 26 April, all attest to the fact that the sacred right of resistance is actively used by the Arab people of Jerusalem against the invaders of their city.

22. Israel's argument for all this has remained the same: the General Armistice Agreement is null and void as apparently are, according to Israel, all resolutions based on that Agreement. In this connexion it is not out of place to refer briefly to paragraph 3 of article XII of the Agreement, which states that:

"The Parties to this Agreement may, by mutual consent,"—and I underline the words "by mutual consent"—"revise this Agreement or any of its provisions, or may suspend its application, other than articles I and III, at any time."

23. We should be interested if the representative of Israel would inform the Council of the mutual consent of the

parties to the Agreement which resulted in the revision or suspension of the provisions of that Agreement. Israel, however, has never stated that the parties to the Agreement have ever availed themselves of this provision. Consequently, it is not the General Armistice Agreement that is null and void, but the Israeli position that states that the Agreement is dead. So the situation is clear for everyone: Israel feels that international agreements are valid so long as they serve its interests, and become null and void if Israel's presumed interests so require. This is a concept which no Member of this Organization can accept without giving up everything the Organization stands for.

24. The latest of the Israeli violations of the General Armistice Agreement and of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly involves the proposed military parade Israel wishes to hold on 2 May in Jerusalem. Apart from the fact that the General Armistice Agreement limits the presence of defensive forces on each side to two battalions in the city, the proposed parade is an open challenge to the United Nations. As I have earlier recalled, two General Assembly resolutions called upon Israel to desist from any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. The fact that Israel ignores all this and wishes to go ahead with a military parade in the territory of another Member State of the United Nations cannot but evoke the indignation of all Members of our Organization. In this connexion I wish to remind the Council that it has a precedent to follow. In its resolution 162 (1961) it endorsed the decision of the Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission which found on 17 March 1961 that heavy armament, in excess of that allowed in the General Armistice Agreement, on the Israel side of the Demarcation Line in Jerusalem constituted a breach by Israel of the Agreement. It consequently condemned this act of Israel and called upon the Israeli authorities to take the strongest measures to prevent the recurrence of such a breach and to refrain in the future from bringing to Jerusalem any equipment in excess of that allowed under the terms of the General Armistice Agreement.<sup>2</sup>

25. My delegation feels that the Council can certainly do nothing less when such a violation of the terms of the Armistice Agreement is coupled with a clear challenge to the decisions of the various organs of the United Nations. Israel should be made to understand that it cannot place itself above the law of nations, including the Charter of the United Nations. The Secretary-General, in his note of 20 April 1968, supported this view by stating:

"... The Secretary-General wishes to emphasize that the holding of a military parade in this area at the present time will almost surely cause an increase in tension in the Near East and could well have an adverse effect on the efforts now going forward to find a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area." [See S/8561, para. 3.]

26. Despite the outstanding clarity of the facts and their legal background, not only did the Israeli representative repeat today his noisy comments of vilification addressed

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., *Sixteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1961*, document S/4776.

to the Security Council, but, according to some newspaper reports, his Government has rejected in a high-handed manner the communication of the Secretary-General, who only reminded them of their obligations concerning Jerusalem. The Israeli attitude serves as a strong warning to the entire international community that no effort should be spared to curb the aggressor. What more is needed to justify the inalienable right of the Arab population in the Israeli-occupied territories to take up arms of resistance and to fight for their freedom? It was for this reason that the First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, János Kádár, stated on 19 April 1968, speaking before the Congress of the Patriotic People's Front in Budapest:

"The latest Israeli armed attacks on Jordan have proved again that the Government of Israel continues its policy of aggression, ignores the resolution of the Security Council, and adds new crimes to those already committed. In this matter too we are on the side of those who are attacked, on the side of the Arab countries, and we support their cause."

27. In conclusion, I wish to state the following.

28. Firstly, Israel is openly violating the Charter of the United Nations by trying to annex the territory of another Member State of the United Nations, including the City of Jerusalem, and by arrogantly preparing there a provocative military parade.

29. Secondly, by doing so, Israel is acting in violation of the General Armistice Agreement and of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

30. Thirdly, the Security Council cannot tolerate such an attitude and should condemn Israel's policy and demand that Israel accept and implement without delay the stipulations of the Armistice Agreement, the earlier resolutions of the Security Council—particularly resolution 162 (1961)—and General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), and desist from taking any action which might violate them.

31. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): My Government has already clearly stated its position on the Middle East problem generally and the question of Jerusalem in particular. It now wishes most vehemently to deplore Israel's intention to organize a military parade in Jerusalem. My Government believes that the evacuation of the territories occupied by Israel would be a step which might lead to a peaceful settlement of the unhappy problem in the Middle East.

32. Israel is well aware that military parades have always been regarded as acts of sovereignty over a territory on the part of the holders of the parade. For that reason, and more particularly on the account of the provocation that such a parade might cause, my Government strongly disapproves of military parades being held in occupied territories.

33. On behalf of my Government I appeal most urgently to Israel to refrain from any act that might worsen the already very tense situation in the Middle East. By

organizing a military parade east of the Demarcation Line established under the Armistice Agreement and in part of the Old City of Jerusalem, Israel is deliberately violating important provisions of the Agreement.

34. The General Assembly has on an earlier occasion called upon Israel to make no changes in the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, where the three great religious communities have always lived peacefully side by side. We feel that the time has now come for Israel to respect the resolutions of the international community, and also the property rights of the Arab population of the wrongfully occupied territories.

35. My Government proclaims its solidarity with the Arab peoples in general and, on the question now before us, with the Government and people of Jordan in particular.

36. The Security Council should unequivocally forbid Israel to hold the military parade, and my delegation will associate itself with any proposal to that effect, in the hope that the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly will at last be respected by Member States and by Israel in particular.

37. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): In any consideration of the present Middle Eastern situation the matter that must surely be uppermost in our mind is the fate of the delicate mission that we have entrusted to the Secretary-General and, through him, to his Special Representative in the area. That mission is a delicate endeavour which must be sustained and supported by all of us, and nothing must be done that is likely to make that task more difficult or to reduce the chance of its success, for on that mission depends the only opportunity for peace in that area, so long the arena for confrontation and conflict. Moreover, as we have had occasion to say repeatedly in previous debates on this problem, the co-operation of the parties concerned and their utmost restraint is a matter of paramount importance to the success of the United Nations peace effort. The parties need to exercise a measure of self-discipline and restraint, avoiding all actions which are likely to aggravate further an already grave situation.

38. It seems to my delegation that in this particular case of the intended military parade in Jerusalem we have an example of the kind of action that could risk creating a much feared aggravation of the delicate and explosive situation that inevitably exists in any area that, like the Middle East, has gone through the experience of military tension and conflict, with all that this implies in terms of animosity and intense emotion.

39. My delegation tends to agree with the assessment of the Secretary-General contained in his note that

"the holding of a military parade in this area at the present time will almost surely cause an increase in tension in the Near East and could well have an adverse effect on the efforts now going forward to find a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area" [*see S/8561, para. 3*].

40. In view of this assessment of the Secretary-General, to which we attach the greatest significance, and of our own concern to avoid any action which would tend to spoil the chance of peace in the area, we find ourselves duty bound to endorse the wise call for moderation made by the Secretary-General in his note to the Government of Israel of 20 April 1968; likewise, we join the members of the Council in calling on the Government of Israel and in appealing to that Government to abandon its plans for a military parade in the Holy City of Jerusalem on 2 May 1968. The Council should and must make this call in a single and united voice, and in the name of that noble objective of justice and lasting peace which, after all, is the universal interest of one and all.

41. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Ever since the question of Palestine came before the United Nations in its very early days there has been a justified concern about the fate and future of Jerusalem and the protection of its Holy Places. The international community has always had, and rightly so, a special interest in the question of Jerusalem in all its aspects. Accordingly, it is particularly painful that that historic City continues to be a source of grievance, complaint and now potential collision.

42. Canada remains concerned, as it has been since 22 November, that nothing should be done which would upset or make more difficult the efforts of Mr. Jarring "to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement" in accordance with the unanimously adopted resolution of that date [*resolution 242 (1967)*]. My delegation has also stressed, both in private and in public in this Council, the need for the fullest co-operation with Mr. Jarring by all the parties concerned in application of the principles and provisions of resolution 242 (1967). Furthermore, we have made it clear, and I would like to emphasize this again, that a key element in this co-operation is the acceptance of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967 as a whole by all of the parties directly concerned.

43. It is against this background that the Canadian delegation is obliged to emphasize here the position which it took in the General Assembly in July 1967. It is clear that the question of Jerusalem and the Holy Places cannot in practical terms be considered or resolved as an isolated issue. We are, therefore, opposed to any unilateral actions with respect to Jerusalem which would be prejudicial to the legitimate international concern about that city, to the preservation of special spiritual and religious interests there, or the settlement sought by Mr. Jarring. Such actions are neither helpful nor acceptable, and we cannot condone any steps which would either alter the status of the city of Jerusalem or endanger the prospects for a peaceful and agreed settlement.

44. The current discussion in the Council has focused on the forthcoming parade in Jerusalem on 2 May. We have before us a report [*S/8561*] which clearly sets forth the views of the Secretary-General on this matter. In the present circumstances, the parade is inevitably provocative. It is bound to raise tensions in the area. By implication, it seems to prejudice the future of Jerusalem. Canada regrets

the decision by the Israeli Government to mount this parade, and particularly the decision to send it through that part of Jerusalem which was occupied by Israel during the fighting last year.

45. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Even before an emergency meeting of the Security Council was asked for, the French delegation had taken note, with great concern, of the letter of 18 April from the representative of Jordan drawing the Secretary-General's attention to "the grave situation arising from Israel's decision to hold a military parade in Jerusalem on 2 May 1968" [*see S/8549*].

46. We can, of course, understand that the State of Israel, like many other States, should wish to commemorate the anniversary of its independence. But that is not the issue. According to our information and as confirmed by the Israel press report cited by the Jordanian representative in his letter, half of the route of the proposed military parade in Jerusalem passes through the sector occupied by Israel forces after the events of June 1967.

47. There was a previous occasion when a similar display gave rise to serious criticism and had to be dealt with by the Security Council. At that time it was a question of a military parade in the Israel sector of Jerusalem. Even that parade conflicted with the international status of the city as defined by General Assembly resolutions, while the size of the military forces assembled for the parade was an express violation of the ceilings laid down by the Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement. That violation was condemned in a very clear resolution by the Security Council.

48. The parade planned for 2 May is far worse, since its route passes through the part of the city on the Jordanian side of the Armistice Line. Such a decision can hardly have been lightly taken and, like similar acts that have been carried out since the conflict last June, must surely be seen as part of a general policy.

49. At its fifth emergency special session the General Assembly considered the measures taken by Israel on 29 June 1967 to "unify" Jerusalem. In resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July, it expressed its deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of those measures; it considered them to be invalid and called upon Israel to rescind them and to desist from taking any action which would alter the status of the city. In a second resolution [*2254 (ES-V)*], dated 14 July, the Assembly took note with the deepest regret and concern of Israel's non-compliance with resolution 2253 (ES-V). It deplored the failure of Israel to implement the first resolution and repeated its earlier request.

50. France had voted for those resolutions. Consequently, as soon as it learned about the measures in question, the French Government let it be known that it could not accept the Israel Government's decision. Yet, quite apart from not complying with the General Assembly resolutions, the Government of Israel decided in January 1968 to expropriate about 500 hectares of land in the occupied sector to build a residential quarter for Israeli families. That decision aroused strong feelings in Jerusalem, which were

expressed in a number of communications circulated as Council documents. In our view there is no legal basis for such measures and they are likely to have the most serious consequences. They can only stir up ill-will, increase tension and complicate a problem which should be solved by peaceful means.

51. The Israel authorities have repeatedly given assurances that they would take all necessary action to protect the Holy Places and to ensure free access by all to the places of worship of the religions concerned. Without wishing to challenge their good intentions, we feel that the problem is not as simple as that. There are also political and legal aspects. The main point is still the question of sovereignty. The future of Jerusalem cannot be determined unilaterally. Jordan, too, has a direct interest in the matter, as does the international community, since, as the United Nations has repeatedly proclaimed, Jerusalem, being a Holy City for three religions, must no longer be a cause for strife or a bone of contention. In accordance with its universal spiritual significance, it must become a symbol of peace.

52. Mr. MISHRA (India): The Security Council has once again been called to consider the tense situation which has existed in West Asia since June of last year. As members of the Council will recall, it was after long and strenuous efforts that the Council adopted resolution 242 (1967), which laid down the framework for settlement of the whole range of problems in the area. My delegation stated at that time, and would like to reiterate, that it would be unrealistic to expect a stable and lasting peace in the area in the absence of a withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories.

53. It is more than ever necessary that all parties should extend their co-operation to the efforts now being made to find a peaceful settlement of all outstanding problems through the implementation of resolution 242 (1967).

54. I turn now to the subject under immediate discussion. In his letter dated 25 April 1968 [S/8560], the representative of Jordan, in requesting a meeting of the Security Council, has drawn our attention to the proposed military parade by Israel in Jerusalem and to the situation prevailing in that city. In today's debate, many members have drawn attention to the condition of the inhabitants of occupied Jerusalem. My delegation shares their concern.

55. We should also like to emphasize that Israel must desist from any and all measures that tend to aggravate the already serious situation prevailing in the area. In the present case, my delegation cannot but express its anxiety at the proposed military parade in Jerusalem by Israel. Such an act can only exacerbate the existing tensions and further vitiate the atmosphere.

56. We note that the Secretary-General has expressed a similar concern in his note of 26 April 1968 [S/8561]. That note clearly indicates the régimes which the parade would violate. It is therefore incumbent upon the Council to take the immediate, although interim, step of calling upon Israel to desist from holding the parade as contemplated on 2 May 1968.

57. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Over the many years during which the Middle East question has been discussed in the United Nations, Paraguay has always considered that Jerusalem should be under an international régime, in conformity with United Nations decisions for which we voted.

58. To cite a further example, this position was recently confirmed by the inclusion of a special operative paragraph in the draft resolution which my delegation, together with other Latin American delegations, submitted at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup> During that same session, prompted likewise by its concern to preserve the international status of Jerusalem, my delegation supported resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V).

59. In the general context of the Middle East problem, this is my country's attitude towards the specific question of Jerusalem. But the general situation, particularly in the Israel-Jordan sector, is explosive and in the course of a few weeks the Security Council has held a series of meetings to consider it. In these circumstances, which are in themselves extremely serious, the military parade which Israel proposes to hold on 2 May to celebrate the anniversary of its independence can only make the current situation more dangerous.

60. The hopes of the Security Council and of the international community are centred in the Secretary-General's peace mission, which is delicate and difficult enough already, and any aggravation of existing tensions would make it even more difficult. I have already on several occasions referred to this mission in the Security Council and there is no need for me to repeat myself now.

61. For the reasons I have given, and because we have a duty to prevent any aggravation of this dangerous situation, my delegation considers that Israel should refrain from holding the military parade on 2 May, and trusts that that country will heed the appeal we are addressing to it here and now.

62. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Security Council is concerned today with a situation of great urgency. We have before us the note of the Secretary-General [S/8561] to which, I have no doubt, the Council will attach due attention and weight.

63. It was in discharge of his responsibilities that the Secretary-General addressed a note verbale to the Government of Israel on 20 April 1968 regarding the proposed decision of the Israeli authorities to hold a military parade in Jerusalem on 2 May. The route of the parade would cut across the Armistice Demarcation Line and pass through the Old City. It is certain that such a parade would aggravate tensions in the area and provoke added bitterness. Accordingly, the Secretary-General wrote in the note verbale:

"... The Secretary-General wishes to emphasize that the holding of a military parade in this area at the present

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

time will almost surely cause an increase in tension in the Near East and could well have an adverse effect on the efforts now going forward to find a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area". [Ibid., para. 3.]

The Council has surely noted with regret that the Government of Israel has not chosen to favour the Secretary-General with a reply. In these circumstances, my delegation regards it as the duty of the Security Council to reinforce and sustain the Secretary-General's efforts to prevent an aggravation of tensions in the area. There can be no doubt that the intended military parade, if allowed to be held, would cause a serious setback to the process of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation. The Council would therefore be remiss in its duty if it did not call upon Israel in the plainest language to refrain from holding the parade.

64. It is on this basis that I have the honour, on behalf of the delegations of India, Pakistan and Senegal, to introduce, as an interim measure, the following draft resolution [S/8563] which reads:

*"The Security Council,*

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

*"Having considered the Secretary-General's note (S/8561),*

*"Recalling its resolution 162 (1961) of 11 April 1961,*

*"Considering that the holding of a military parade in Jerusalem will aggravate tensions in the area and will have an adverse effect on a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area,*

*"1. Calls upon Israel to refrain from holding the military parade in Jerusalem which is contemplated for 2 May 1968;*

*"2. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution."*

65. The draft resolution which I have just read out is self-explanatory and needs no comment. I commend it to the Council for unanimous adoption.

66. I have only two other observations to make. First, we attach the greatest importance to the integrity of the Security Council, and we believe that this integrity demands a measure of consistency in the Council's pronouncements on international issues. The Council will recall that by its resolution 162 (1961) it forbade a military parade by Israel even though that parade was scheduled to be held on the Israel side of the Armistice Demarcation Line in Jerusalem and even though the situation at that time was far less explosive than it is today. When it adopted that resolution it was the sense of the Council that the crucial question was how the military parade would affect public feelings, the force of the cease-fire or Armistice

Agreements and the attitudes of the parties towards them. This question is even more crucial today.

67. Secondly, references have been made in the statements this morning to the status of the City of Jerusalem. The Pakistan delegation regards that question as one of supreme importance. We therefore reaffirm the validity and force of General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), which were unanimously adopted at the fifth emergency special session and which called upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem.

68. No settlement of the Middle East problem which militates in the slightest degree against those resolutions will be morally defensible or politically viable.

69. As we are concerned today with preventing a specific action contemplated by Israel which would further endanger peace in the area, I shall reserve my observations on the question of Jerusalem for a later occasion. Suffice it to say that I could not agree more with the representative of Israel than when he described Jerusalem as the focus of spiritual elevation. At the same time, we are compelled to ask: is it not a sacrilege to transform this focus of spiritual elevation into an arena for an arrogant display of the panoply of military might? The sacred character of Jerusalem is not something which belongs exclusively to the Jewish people. It is also part of the immortal spiritual heritage of the Christians and Moslems which has existed for thousands of years.

70. We believe that the Security Council will be only showing a decent respect for the opinions and sentiments of the overwhelming part of mankind if it reinforces the efforts of the Secretary-General to prevent the City of Peace from becoming a theatre of belligerence and the spoils of war.

71. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Thank you for waiving consecutive translation. I give the floor to Mr. Liu.

72. Mr. LIU Chich (China): I believe the President is aware that I am speaking as a representative on the Council.

73. The Security Council is called into session on an urgent basis at the instance of Jordan with a specific request, namely, to prevent the Government of Israel from carrying out a military parade which it intends to hold in Jerusalem on 2 May 1968.

74. In normal circumstances it is nothing extraordinary to hold a parade in celebration of a national holiday. The conditions in the Middle East, however, are anything but normal. Moreover, the legal status of the area in which the parade is to take place is directly at issue. A military parade in the city of Jerusalem at the present juncture of affairs cannot fail to arouse the resentment of Jordan. In his letter to the President of the Security Council dated 25 April 1968 [S/8560], and in his statement this morning, the representative of Jordan has made it clear that the

scheduled military parade is being looked upon by Jordan as a wilful display of military might designed to "bring about drastic changes in the national and historical character of the Holy City".

75. It seems to my delegation that in a sensitive area such as the Middle East both Israel and the Arab States are in duty bound not to heighten the tension or increase the dangers of armed conflict. That is particularly true in the Israel-Jordan sector, where artillery duels have become an almost daily routine. There is always the possibility of escalation resulting in a renewal of full-scale hostilities. My delegation, therefore, regards the Secretary-General's communication addressed to the Government of Israel on 20 April [see S/8561] as a timely warning, and we join in the appeal to Israel to refrain from any provocative act such as the scheduled military parade.

76. In resolution 242 (1967) the Security Council has set forth what it considers to be the essential elements in a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East situation. The road to peace is a long and tortuous one. Today, United Nations efforts aimed at bringing about the necessary conditions for peace have been hampered in various ways. It is to be regretted that the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Middle East, Mr. Jarring, has not been as successful in bringing about agreements between the parties as might be expected. My delegation is gratified to note, however, that he is now renewing his contacts with the parties. More than ever before, the parties concerned must exercise restraint and moderation so that the efforts of Mr. Jarring may be pressed forward in a climate conducive to a peaceful and just settlement.

77. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): My delegation can only regret that the Security Council has to meet once again to discuss one of the aspects of the complex of interrelated and inseparable problems of the Middle East. In our opinion, such discussions, however important their subjects to the parties concerned, do not facilitate the establishment of a just and lasting peace in accordance with the unanimously adopted Council resolution 242 (1967).

78. The occasion for this meeting is the Israeli authorities' plan to hold a military parade in Jerusalem on 2 May. This has caused strong resentment in Jordan, especially as the parade is to pass through both the old and the new parts of the city. The representative of Jordan has made that clear to this Council in the statement he made earlier.

79. Irrespective of the various legal points of view, there can hardly be any doubt that the parade as planned is going to increase tension in the area. Therefore my delegation would call upon the Government of Israel to reconsider its position with regard to the proposed military parade, in the light of international reactions to its intentions and in the interest of the endeavours 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 of the resolution to which I have just referred.

80. In a communiqué issued at the conclusion of the Nordic Foreign Ministers' meeting in Oslo yesterday, the

Ministers emphasize that it is important that the parties support the mission of Mr. Jarring so that it may lead to constructive results. By the same token, my delegation would like to emphasize that it is highly important that all parties desist from any steps which might increase tension in the area, because in that mission lies perhaps the only hope for a peaceful solution of the problems afflicting the Middle East.

81. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I should like now to take the floor in my capacity as representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.

82. Only a month ago, the Security Council, in a resolution adopted unanimously on 24 March [resolution 248 (1968)], condemned Israel for its fresh act of aggression against Jordan. Two weeks ago the Council was forced again to turn its attention to a situation which threatened to upset the cease-fire between Jordan and Israel, because Israel had not abided by the provisions of the Council resolution of 24 March and had renewed military provocations against Jordan. At that time the Council expressed deep concern at the deterioration of the situation in that region and acknowledged that the dangerous situation there must be carefully watched. However, that action by the Council has also not had the desired effect on the Israel aggressors.

83. Today, the Council's attention is again drawn to the serious situation in the Middle East, particularly the situation created in Jerusalem as a result of illegal and provocative actions on the part of Israel, which continues flagrantly to violate the General Assembly resolution concerning the status of that city and the decisions of the Security Council relating to a political settlement in the Middle East.

84. In his letter to the Security Council [S/8560], and also in his statement, the representative of Jordan has given detailed and accurate data exposing the criminal and arbitrary conduct of the Israel authorities in Jerusalem.

85. The Security Council is again a witness to aggression by Israel, which, having occupied a considerable part of the territory of the Arab States, is continuing its aggressive acts, is organizing military provocations against its neighbours, is seizing Arab lands, in particular the Arab part of Jerusalem, is evicting the indigenous Arab population from their places of birth, is destroying Arab homes, and is installing its own settlers in the Arab part of Jerusalem.

86. The provocative plan of the Israel Government to hold a military parade on 2 May in the Arab part of Jerusalem is a further confirmation of the expansionist policies of those who rule in Tel Aviv. It is an attempt to support their illegal claims on Arab territories and the Arab part of Jerusalem by a demonstration of military might. This is a new provocation and also a new challenge to the United Nations and the Security Council.

87. It is common knowledge that the States Members of the United Nations, meeting in the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the question of

the Israel aggression in the Middle East, adopted by an overwhelming majority two resolutions, on 4 July and on 14 July 1967 [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], which declared that the measures taken by the Israel authorities to change the status of Jerusalem were invalid. In those resolutions the General Assembly demanded that Israel should rescind all measures already taken and should desist forthwith from taking any action, which would alter the status of Jerusalem.

88. As several representatives have already pointed out today, this is not the first time that the Security Council, also, has had to deal with the question of the illegal acts of Israel in Jerusalem. In the past the Security Council has had occasion to condemn such acts by Israel, and in 1961 [resolution 162 (1961)] the decision was taken to prohibit Israel from holding military parades in Jerusalem in violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan.

89. Israel, however, continues to disregard the resolutions of the General Assembly and the decisions of the Security Council. It continues on the path of aggression in defiance of international law. By all its actions, and in particular by its intention to hold a military parade in Jerusalem, Israel has brazenly demonstrated to the whole world and to the United Nations that there is no thought in Tel Aviv of a withdrawal from the Arab part of Jerusalem.

90. Today the Security Council learned from the note of the Secretary-General [S/8561] that the Government of Israel is evading replying to the *note verbale* in which the Secretary-General expressed concern at the Israel authorities' intention to hold a military parade in the part of Jerusalem which was seized from the Arabs. The Secretary-General's note to the Government of Israel reflects the position of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations, who are concerned that the new anti-Arab provocation being planned in Tel Aviv will bring about a great increase of tension in the Middle East and will hamper the efforts being made to achieve a political settlement in that region.

91. In Israel's actions in regard to Jerusalem we see the general line adopted by an aggressor who refuses to abide by the decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly concerning a political settlement in the Middle East.

92. While the United Arab Republic and Jordan have officially informed the United Nations of their readiness to accept and implement the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] and to co-operate with Mr. Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Middle East, whose mission is to assist in giving effect to that resolution, Israel's policy has been to obstruct a political settlement, to impose its rapacious demands on the Arabs and to dictate its own terms from a position of strength.

93. Israel, to this day, refuses to declare its agreement to accept and implement the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Israel's recalcitrant position with regard to

that resolution today represents the fundamental and principal obstacle in the way of a settlement in the Middle East. The responsibility for the present tense situation in the Middle East and for all the difficulties and hindrances which prevent Mr. Jarring from carrying out his mission rests squarely on the Government of Israel.

94. The discussion of this question in the Security Council must serve as a new and serious warning to those who rule Israel. It is essential that the Council require Tel Aviv to stop its policy of aggression and provocation against the neighbouring Arab States.

95. The question of demanding that Israel unconditionally rescind its plans to hold a military parade in Jerusalem, specifically in the Arab part of that city, is an urgent one, and it requires prompt action from the Security Council. The Soviet Union, for its part, will give its full support to such a decision by the Council. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation will, of course, support the draft resolution [S/8563] which has been proposed by three members of the Security Council, the representatives of India, Pakistan and Senegal. We regard this resolution as a first step. Of course, if Israel fails to comply with the decision of the Council, then the question of taking further measures will arise.

96. The current events in Jerusalem and in other Arab territories occupied by Israel brings to the fore, with new emphasis, the most important and most urgent question, that of the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops from the territories seized by them from the Arab States. This was demanded by the Security Council in its resolution of 22 November 1967. The military provocations of Israel, which is acting in violation of decisions taken by the Security Council and the General Assembly, the events in Jerusalem, which indicate that the aggressor intends to remain on land which is not his and to expropriate Arab territories which have never belonged, nor ever will belong to Israel—these are all further alarm signals, evidence of the extremely grave situation deliberately created by Israel in the Middle East. They constitute yet another confirmation of the incontrovertible fact that, so long as Israel's troops remain on the Arab territories which they have seized, there cannot and will not be peace and tranquillity in that region.

97. The Government of Israel must strictly comply with the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and above all with the demand contained therein concerning the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from all occupied Arab territories. The Government of Israel must realize that the challenge offered by its policy of aggression and military provocation to the peace-loving peoples and the cause of international peace and security, a challenge which undermines the prospects for a political settlement in the Middle East, will not remain unpunished. As long as the Israel leaders, relying on the support of the imperialist Powers, hold to their course of annexing foreign territories, it is the duty of the United Nations, of the Security Council, and of all peace-loving States interested in the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East to give their support to the victims of aggression, and thus fulfil their commitments under the Charter of the United Nations.

98. The Soviet Union, for its part, declares with all firmness that, together with other peace-loving States, it will seek to halt the Israel aggression, to eliminate all consequences thereof, to secure the return to their rightful owners of the territories seized from the Arab States and to achieve the indispensable political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967.

99. This is the position of the Soviet Union and it will not change. Israel and its protectors should not cherish any illusions that the aggressor will successfully carry out its expansionist plans in the Middle East.

100. Speaking again as PRESIDENT, I give the floor to the representative of Jordan, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

101. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): There is a saying: keep repeating a lie and eventually it will stick. I regret to say that this has been the attitude of Mr. Tekoah of Israel in the Security Council. Following his practice, well known by now, he chose to inject irrelevant material into our discussion in order to confuse the issue. This intended to divert the attention of the Council from the real and only question before it.

102. What is before the Council is the situation in Jerusalem and the recent developments and violations by the Israeli authorities. What is also before the Council is the matter of the parade, a matter of very urgent nature. It is the act of provocation contemplated by the Israeli authorities, in utter defiance of the Armistice Agreements and of the 1961 resolution [162 (1961)], which now requires an immediate interim measure to stop this provocation before the situation deteriorates further. I shall have time to answer, all the Israeli fabrications after an urgent interim measure has been taken by the Council to remedy the urgent situation.

103. I am sure that the Council will not indulge in the consideration of illegal issues which are intended for one single purpose, namely, to confuse the issue and to involve the Council in all kinds of questions. I am sure that Mr. Tekoah will not be given this accommodation.

104. Mr. Tekoah referred to the Armistice Agreement as a ghost. No one shares his view; neither the document presented to us by the Secretary-General this morning [S/8561]—for which we are grateful to him—nor the introduction to the Secretary-General's report submitted to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly supports it. The Secretary-General, quite rightly, said:

“... there has been no indication either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council that the validity and applicability of the Armistice Agreements have been changed as a result of the recent hostilities or of the war of 1956; each agreement, in fact, contains a provision that it will remain in force ‘until a peaceful settlement between the parties is achieved’. Nor has the Security Council or the General Assembly taken any steps to change the pertinent resolutions of either organ relating

to the Armistice Agreements or to the earlier cease-fire demands. The Agreements provide that by mutual consent the signatories can revise or suspend them. There is no provision in them for unilateral termination of their application. This has been the United Nations position all along and will continue to be the position until a competent organ decides otherwise.”<sup>4</sup>

105. What is more, Israel contradicts Israel in this case. Foreign Minister Eban contradicts Ambassador Tekoah. Here is what Mr. Eban said before the Special Political Committee:

“Israel regards the Armistice Agreements as permanent”—as permanent, not provisional—“The fact that certain mutual claims remain unsettled would in no way affect the existence of the Agreements or presage a breakdown of the armistice system itself.”<sup>5</sup>

That was said by Mr. Tekoah's Foreign Minister.

106. Mr. Tekoah said that everything was fine in Jerusalem and that only fifty women demonstrated the day before yesterday. This is not only belied by press reports; apparently here again Israel contradicts Israel, and the representative who spoke this morning contradicts his Foreign Minister. Here is what his Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban, said about imposing a rule from outside: “No one has ever succeeded in imposing a particular régime from outside by peaceful means on a population which did not wish to accept it.”

107. That is the statement of the Foreign Minister of Mr. Tekoah. This is a vicious circle. Is it because of a lack of knowledge on the part of Mr. Tekoah? Is it inconsistency in the policy of the Government of Israel? No, it is nothing of this. This is a well-planned policy based on distortion, misrepresentation and deceit. It is aimed at using up time and exploiting the situation in order that they may achieve their purposes.

108. Mr. Eban, the Foreign Minister of Mr. Tekoah, said that all statements and all declarations, even the British Mandate for Palestine and the Balfour Declaration, are not binding on Israel. Here is a quotation from Mr. Eban: “Everything depended on whether all this could be replaced by a geographical reality more substantial than this.”

109. All these are means. Your resolutions, the Balfour Declaration, the partition resolution, the Protocol of Lausanne, the Armistice Agreement, the cease-fire resolution—every single one is not binding. They represent for the Israelis only an opportunity to be used as a vehicle to carry them to their goal of expansion, expulsion, oppression and persecution.

110. On the question of the parade, the very same policy has been adopted. Mr. Ysrael Galili, a Cabinet Minister, when the Americans, the British, the French and other big

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 43.

<sup>5</sup> This statement was made at the 79th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee whose official record was published in summary form.

Powers refused to attend a parade last year, became upset, and he had this to say: "The day would come"—this was last May on the same question—"when all the world's statesmen would realize that Jerusalem was the capital of Israel by virtue of the political fact we shall create."

111. Again, it is political fact and geographical reality that is referred to, not United Nations resolutions, not instruments and not declarations.

112. Mr. Tekoah said that we violate the cease-fire resolution. This also is not true. The record of the United Nations is very clear. The condemnation the other day of Israel by the Security Council is still fresh in the memories of the members who adopted the resolution [248 (1968)]. The attack on Karamah is well known. Only today, the Security Council received a report in which the Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull, said: "El Kantara Control Centre reported that at 0817 hours GMT Observation Post Yellow observed a breach of cease-fire by Israel with rifles, heavy machine-guns and mortars" [S/7930/Add.67].

113. This happened this morning, and it was this very morning that Mr. Tekoah, while Israeli guns were displaying an intoxication of power, came and told us that Jordan is violating the Armistice Agreement.

114. Another misrepresentation was made about land ownership. In order to expose much of the Israeli distortions about this and other aspects of the question of Jerusalem, the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, who was expelled by the Israelis, will be coming to this Council, we hope within a very short time, to present to this honourable body first-hand information. He has much to say. He, too, was arbitrarily expelled by the Israelis.

115. Mr. Tekoah said that the two resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], adopted in July by the General Assembly referred to the legislation. They did not call for stagnation, he said. The resolutions are clear and speak for themselves. They certainly did not call for annexation or for continued occupation. They deplored the Israeli violation, and fourteen out of fifteen members of the Council voted for the resolutions, and I leave it to them to see how much credibility should be given to all the statements of Mr. Tekoah.

116. A naked act of annexation through military occupation cannot be called "unity". When the forces of nazism occupied Czechoslovakia and Poland, Hitler announced, "Now our unity has been accomplished". This is what the Council is now hearing from Mr. Tekoah.

117. Moreover, Mr. Tekoah spoke about the desecration of Christian churches which, according to him, has now been terminated after the unity of Jerusalem. I have presented to the Council document S/8552, and much of the material in it is taken from Christian sources. Mr. Tekoah tried this morning to say that these churches were destroyed by us, and not by the Israelis. I wonder whether he would say that what was written on a shrine pictured in this document in Hebrew and in English was written by us. It states, "Night club, are you lonesome

tonight?" This is on a Christian shrine; it was not written by us, it was written in Hebrew in the area occupied by Israel.

118. I can give further information about the behaviour and the practices of the Arabs vis-à-vis the Holy Shrines. In a letter written to *The Times* of London published on 13 June, Canon Every, Canon of St. George's Cathedral in Jerusalem, stated:

"... the Christian Shrines have been protected by the Islamic sovereign of Jerusalem and the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem have had their traditional rights, including self-government in matters of personal status and in the administration of charitable and religious foundations.

"In the past, when the Christian Churches were often antagonistic to one another, the Islamic custody of the city prevented any one of them from monopolizing the shrines. Forms of Christianity which were proscribed as heretical in Christian countries were free to live their own life in the Islamic world. In recent years the courage, wisdom and courtesy of the successive Governors of Jerusalem, under King Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and father and grandfather have contributed in no small measure to the great improvement which has come about in the mutual relations of the Christian Churches in the City. This is symbolized by the restoration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre".

119. I will not mention what happened to the Crown of the Virgin Mary immediately after the Israeli occupation. I leave it to the Mayor of Jerusalem, who is coming with more information.

120. Canon Every continued:

"The custodian is not the sovereign, much as he is revered. It is the sacred law which gives protection, in certain definite ways, to other monotheistic faiths in any Islamic state. This has been and may continue to be of real value."

121. The last paragraph is of special significance since Mr. Tekoah claimed more than once the absence of legislation to protect the Holy Places. It is the sacred laws developed under Islamic guardianship that preserve the Holy Places; it is not a matter of legislation, certainly not legislation by the Israeli Knesset, the legislature of the aggressor.

122. Mr. Tekoah said that Jordan opposes not the parade but the paraders. We oppose the parade and the paraders, and all invaders. We do not stand alone on this question; we have ninety-nine Members of the General Assembly who voted for the July resolution. Those Members voted against the systematic and well-planned Israeli acts of annexation in Jerusalem. We are here not only to stop the Israeli plans for changing the status of Jerusalem, but also to reaffirm the United Nations resolutions and implement them. This we hope the Council will do when we come to the second phase of our deliberations.

123. Mr. Tekoah kept repeating his invitation to me to visit my own country. But I do not need to go into the occupied area of my homeland to get information. Those expelled Arabs who come to our east bank of the Jordan report to us how they were expelled, banished, mistreated, tortured. I do not need to go there.

124. The most monstrous of the fabrications of Mr. Tekoah was the allegation that the Arab Governments, and Jordan in particular, have refused to safeguard free access to the Holy Places. This is not true. The records of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine show that in response to an appeal by the Commission the Arab Governments, at that time of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria, pledged themselves to the following declaration on 15 November 1949. The preamble to the declaration states:

"The undersigned representatives of Egypt, the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Lebanon and Syria to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, duly authorized by their respective Governments, hereby make the following declaration on behalf of their Governments.

". . .

"[These Governments] solemnly undertake by the provisions of the present declaration to guarantee the protection of, and free access to, the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites of Palestine, situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem or pending that settlement, in the territory at present occupied by them under armistice agreements."<sup>6</sup>

Article 4, the operative article, states:

"The Governments of Egypt, the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Lebanon and Syria undertake to guarantee freedom of access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem, or, pending that settlement, in the territory at present occupied by them under armistice agreements; and, pursuant of this undertaking, will guarantee rights of entry and of transit to ministers of religion, pilgrims and visitors, without distinction as to nationality or faith, subject only to consideration of national security, all the above in conformity with the *status quo* prior to 14 May 1948."<sup>7</sup>

This was signed by the four Arab Governments.

125. What was the response of Israel to a similar appeal made by the very same United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine to obtain the very same declaration? Here is the record, which I quote verbatim: Israel was

<sup>6</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex*, vol. I, document A/1113, sect. C.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

"... of the opinion, however, that it would in the circumstances be in the interests of a constructive and final settlement if the matter of formulation were dealt with after more far-reaching consideration of these problems by the General Assembly".<sup>8</sup> Israel in effect rejected the appeal and made no declaration and signed none

126. I hope I have made these matters clear. I am very unwilling to keep coming back here to answer distortions and fabrications, but I am compelled to do so to keep the record straight.

127. I wish to reserve my right to speak on the other irrelevant issues which have no place in our present deliberations at this time. I reserve the right to speak on them at a time of my own choosing, not of Mr. Tekoah's.

128. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I now call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

129. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): We all know what is Jordan's attitude to Israel and to the fundamental question of peace and war in the Middle East. There was really no need for the representative of Jordan to reiterate it. That attitude was most recently expressed by King Hussein himself, who endorsed, on 6 April 1968, the continuation of warfare against Israel by terror, and emphasized that "its efficiency will develop if it is integrated within a general policy and if its efforts are co-ordinated with the Arab States involved, and especially Jordan".

130. It took the Jordanian representative six weeks to fabricate the letter [S/8552] which he submitted on 19 April 1968 in reply to a letter I submitted on 6 March [S/8439], which he referred to a while ago. He attached to that letter an Arab publication issued in Beirut which included a number of photographs. Some of those photographs have nothing to do with the churches on Mount Zion. This applies equally to the photograph depicting a doorway with the inscription "night club". I have already said earlier this morning that the churches in question were destroyed by Jordanian fire when Jordanian aggression in 1948 and in 1967 turned Mount Zion into a battlefield—the compound of the church in question remaining for nineteen years a no-man's land because of this Jordanian aggression.

131. The Jordanian representative has again set himself up as judge and spokesman of the Secretary-General, his emissaries and the Christian communities in Jerusalem. May I suggest again that we allow each to speak for himself. This is what the representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Thalmann, had to say about the situation in Jerusalem in his report:

"Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, meeting on 7 June with the spiritual leaders of all communities, declared:

'Since our forces have been in control in the entire city and surroundings, quiet has been restored. You may rest assured that no harm of any kind will be

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, sect. B, para. 4.

allowed to befall the religious Holy Places. I have asked the Minister of Religious Affairs to contact the religious leaders in the Old City in order to ensure orderly contact between them and our forces, and enable them to pursue their religious activities unhindered." [See S/8146, para. 138, dated 12 September 1967.]

132. On 27 June the Knesset adopted a special law for the protection of the Holy Places, and I continue to read from the report by Mr. Thalmann:

"These statements and statutory measures were very favourably received. Various religious representatives in fact told the Personal Representative"—of the Secretary-General—"spontaneously that so far the Israel authorities had conformed to the principles which had been laid down and that there was therefore no ground for complaints. They hoped that whatever difficulties still existed or were feared—mostly of a practical and physical nature—would be resolved in a spirit of co-operation.

"Although the attitude of representatives of other Christian denominations was rather one of 'wait and see', they also described the present situation as satisfactory." [Ibid., paras. 141 and 142.]

133. At the beginning of July, the following letter addressed by His Beatitude Theophilos, Patriarch of the Church of Ethiopia, to the Israeli Ambassador in Addis Ababa, was received in Jerusalem:

"The Patriarchate of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church would like to express its appreciation to the Israeli Government for the proper care with which it handled the sanctuaries in the Holy Land in general and the Ethiopian convent in particular. We also extend our thanks to the Israeli authorities for having granted unhindered and free movement to our clergy in Jerusalem during the war and after. We hope that such good care of the Holy Places will continue to enable our people in Jerusalem to perform their religious duties without any difficulty. Please convey this message to your Government."

134. On 14 July a group of Dutch Catholic and Protestant theologians issued the following statement in Amsterdam:

"Catholic and Protestant theologians connected with Het Leerhuis (the Inter-confessional Centre of Bible Studies) feel themselves called to issue the following statement on Jerusalem, which they hope may offer for Jewish and Islamic theologians an acceptable point of departure for common thinking on the future of Jerusalem.

"The Jewish people, the Promised Land and the City of Jerusalem are, through Bible and history, linked with one another in a unique way. To separate by thought or deed the Jewish people from that land or from Jerusalem is tantamount to challenging Jewish identity.

"The autonomous existence of the Jewish people in its own country, with Jerusalem as its capital, is felt by the

overwhelming majority of the Jewish people throughout the world as a vital condition for its existence. Recognition of the international character of the Holy Places cannot imply any denial of the above mentioned biblical and historical links binding the Jewish people with undivided Jerusalem. Neither can such recognition imply distrust with regard to the Jewish people, as if it could not be trusted to have sufficient understanding and respect for the links connecting Christians and Moslems with Jerusalem."

135. On 6 October, the *Catholic Herald* of London published a letter from *Les Filles de la Charité de l'Hospice Saint Vincent de Paul* of Jerusalem in which a campaign of lies against the Israelis since their victory in the six-day war is deplored—and I quote from that letter:

"We do not know the source from which those who are hawking such rumours are drawing their inspiration, but they fill us with profound grief. There is no question for us of 'taking sides'. Our service is at the disposal of all who stand in need of it. This is confirmed by the fact that of the 400 inmates of this *Hospice* approximately 360 are Arabs of all ages, from babes in arms to the senile.

"Some are in good health, others suffering from every conceivable kind of ailment. This, of course, in no way means that we deny a brotherly hand to the Jewish population. Within the charity of Christ we love both Jew and Arab. But we owe it to truth to put on record that our work here has been made especially happy and its path smoothed by the goodwill of the Israeli authorities—in peace and in war alike—smoothed, that is, not only for ourselves but (more important) for the Arabs in our care.

"...

"The Jews, like the Christian and Moslem communities, number among themselves a spiritual élite whose moral quality none can mistake and which we, at least, cannot but admire.

"Like us, too, they also have their black sheep. But all in all, after an experience extending now over a number of years, we have found amongst them much to appreciate and indeed to applaud. The recent war, moreover, has revealed them to us—both the soldiers and civilians—as deserving of our deepest admiration.

"War is war, and the Jews prosecuted theirs with the sole object of preserving their existence, while saving every single human life that they possibly could."

136. A fortnight ago, on 12 April, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Benedictos, made the following declaration:

"It is true, and we would like to stress it again, that the Holy Places in general, monasteries and churches were given full respect and protection by the Israelis before the war, during the war and afterwards, and we hope that in the future they will be respected as well and the *status quo* which exists will be safeguarded."

137. Finally, the representative of Jordan, both in his letter to which he referred and in his statement, has shown particular solicitude for the Armenian community. He will understand if I suggest that we rely not on him but on the leaders of the Armenian community in Jerusalem to tell us how they fare in united Jerusalem.

138. On 8 April, the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem wrote as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to Your<sup>1</sup> Excellency's kind visit of today to our Patriarchate and to thank you sincerely for the genuine interest shown by the Israeli authorities to the Holy Places.

"In this connexion I also present my deep thanks to Your Excellency for your willingness to render us every help in order to restore our Monastery of the Holy Saviour and cemetery, situated on the front line for twenty years.

"I am confident that the Israeli authorities have always been animated by a spirit of justice and equity and that the great consideration and respect they have shown for the Holy Places will continue with the same spirit and feeling."

139. The representative of Jordan referred to the problem of discrimination against Christian communities under Jordanian occupation. May I be allowed to say only this: On the eve of the six-day war the slogan in Jordan was: "After Saturday Sunday comes. On Saturday we murder the Jews; the next day the Christians." That was plainly understood to mean what it said. However relieved the Christian communities may have felt at the liberation of Jerusalem by the Israel defence forces, weeks passed before the story about this slogan was repeated, and then only reluctantly by laymen and clergy to Christian visitors from overseas. Discrimination against Christian communities actually found its way into Jordanian legislation. The Parliament of Jordan enacted a law in 1958 prescribing that all members of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre should become Jordan nationals. Since its foundation in the fifth century, the members of the Brotherhood have always been Greek; and, if applied, the law would have deprived the bishops and the Patriarch of the Orthodox faith of their Greek citizenship.

140. Another ordinance, concerning the use of immovable property by moral bodies, was adopted in 1965; it curtailed the development of Christian institutions in Jerusalem by an embargo on their acquisition of further land or property within the bounds of the municipality and its surroundings, whether by purchase, testament, gift or otherwise. The sponsors of that ordinance were apparently Moslems opposed to the building of a church in the neighbourhood of Al-Aqsa Mosque. Yet in recent years, wherever possible the Jordanian Government has built mosques cheek-by-jowl with churches, or, wherever that was not possible, sequestered a room in the premises of a church for Moslem worship and installed a loudspeaker in it.

141. In October of 1964, the Jordanian Government decreed a stoppage of the work of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

That work had been officially permitted by an order of 21 February 1960. The Jehovah's Witnesses were accused of maintaining contacts with Jews, and were consequently persecuted.

142. In October 1966, the Jordanian Government took other steps, discriminating against Christian ecclesiastical institutions and clergy: for instance the exemption from customs duty, including that on food-stuffs, formerly granted to churches was withdrawn. Education in Christian schools and institutions was narrowly supervised by the Jordanian authorities, who required that the curricula be sanctioned by them. Christian schools were bidden to close on Fridays. Christian civil servants and army officers suffered, in comparison with their Moslem<sup>1</sup> colleagues, in advancement and often were pensioned off before the age-limit in order to make way for the promotion of Moslems. Christian prisoners of war taken by Israel during the six-day war were beaten up by their Moslem superiors and comrades, who charged them with disloyalty as citizens and soldiers.

143. If there can be any value to the Security Council's debates and resolutions, it is to the extent that they remain based strictly on fact and law. It is quite clear that the course of history does witness from time to time modifications in international relations. Surely, however, such modifications, especially as they occur between Governments rather than between peoples, cannot affect historic fact, the tenets of law, and political analysis.

144. At a meeting of the Security Council on 10 April 1961, the following observations were made on a Jordanian complaint concerning a military parade in Jerusalem:

"The representative of Jordan has requested the Council to consider—and I quote from his letter—a 'violation of the Armistice Agreement and acts of military provocation which threaten international peace and security'. He obviously does not imagine that the ceremony planned by Israel for 20 April might be a direct threat to his country . . .

" . . . it is quite evident that the ceremony of 20 April, as it is planned, cannot in any way harbour a threat of attack or represent any blameworthy intention.

" . . . we have no reason to doubt the intentions of Israel's authorities or the purely ceremonial character"—purely ceremonial character—"of the anniversary celebrations which are held each year . . ." [*See 948th meeting, paras. 7, 8 and 14.*]

That statement was made by the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador Bérard, in 1961.

145. There is really no need for me to comment more fully on the statement made by the representative of Algeria. I will allow his own President to do that for me. On 15 September last year, President Boumédiène stated: "The liquidation of Israel is the only solution. Algeria will never accept a solution that guarantees Israel's existence."

And then, on 25 October, he was quoted as having said: "Nasser's main error was his acceptance of the cease-fire agreement. We reject the cease fire."

146. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria stated on 21 July 1967: "Algeria has never put any hope in the Security Council or in the General Assembly of the United Nations." Now, Article 23 of the United Nations Charter reads as follows:

"... The General Assembly shall elect ten other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance, to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security . . ."

I wonder what world opinion should be expected to think of our deliberations here, with Algeria on the Security Council.

147. Mr. President, I regret to say that the essence of the statement we have just heard from the Soviet representative is a vicious negation of Israel's rights. It reminded me of a conversation I once had with Mr. Khrushchev, the former Prime Minister of the USSR. I asked him whether he had ever pondered how his anti-Jewish, anti-Israeli attitude would appear in Jewish history. In reply he questioned me on how large a population Israel had. When he heard my reply he said, "We are 220 million strong. What interest can I have in 2.5 million Israelis?" Verily, the country represented by Ambassador Malik is one of the largest in the world in territory and population. It is one of the two nuclear super-Powers. Indeed, it can even speak of peace in the First Committee and arm Arab forces of war and aggression free of charge and come to this Council to threaten small countries like my own. However a considerable number of Members of the United Nations are of Israel's size. These nations too have a right to exist a right to defend themselves, a right to peace with their neighbours, a right to hold independence day parades.

148. With regard to Israel's presence and actions in eastern Jerusalem, what exactly would the Soviet Government have Israel do? We know of the methods applied in Europe in the wake of hostilities: dismantling of plants, emptying of warehouses and mass arrests. We are not prepared to follow those methods. We are not prepared to apply the example of our big brothers of Europe. We would rather build houses, pave roads and hold show parades.

149. We are not entirely surprised of course that the Soviet Union vilifies Israel for this attitude. After all, in the Soviet Union we Jews are branded for whatever we do; we are all at once nationalists and cosmopolitans. We are dangerous liberals and religious reactionaries. One would have expected, however, the representative of those who allow their press to speak of men, women and children murdered by the Hitlerites in gas chambers as nazi collaborators to remain silent in their sacrilege and disgrace.

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

151. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): The reference we have just heard to the Moslems and Christians in my country will not be dignified by an answer. Our record is clear.

152. Mr. Tekoah tried the other day to create a kind of separation between the people on the west bank and the people on the east bank. He kept shouting, championing the rights of the people on the west bank, saying that they had been deprived of everything and were now getting everything from Israel. It did not work.

153. This morning he tried to bring in every single irrelevant issue—but not the relevant one, the parade. He spoke of everything that had happened since 1947. He did not speak about the real issue. Again I refuse to indulge in charges and counter-charges with him, knowing what his desire is. It did not work this afternoon and he is trying another—excuse the expression—cheap way of conveying distorted, unfounded and false utterances.

154. I do not have to defend my country against my people. They are all people of Jordan. Discrimination is not in our tradition, not in our heritage, not part of our values. Right here in the United Nations at least four out of twelve or thirteen Ambassadors are Christians. We do not think in terms of Christian or Moslem. That is the mentality of Mr. Tekoah, which breeds discrimination. We do not think of those things, they do not come to our mind. The three representatives of Palestine here in the United Nations are Christians. There is Mr. Izzat Tannous who is Christian; Mr. Issa Nakhlah is Christian; the Assistant to the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Mr. El-Ghori, is a Christian.

155. Our record is clean and clear and we are proud of it. But, as I said, I will not dignify that kind of false misrepresentation with an answer.

156. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the methods of Europe. I wish that he had learned his lesson. Mr. Toynbee said in volume 8 of his book<sup>9</sup> that the tragedy of the whole thing is that the Israelis did not benefit from their tragic experience. They are practising on us what they should have been the last people on earth to practise. Mr. Tekoah tells us that they know the methods of Europe. Yes, they know them. But, regrettably and unfortunately, they did not learn their lesson. I say this with sadness. Why does he attack every single member around this table? He is attacking every Gentile. Why? There must be something wrong. The whole world cannot be wrong and Israel right. There must be something wrong in them, in their mentality, in their thinking and in their aggressiveness. This is a divide-and-rule theory. It did not work the other day when he spoke about the people of the west bank. He is now attempting to make it work on the east bank, but he is speaking about the wrong people. Our people have the same values, Arabism, whether they are Christians or Moslems.

157. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): The representative of Israel has argued that there is a contradiction between, on the one hand, the position of my

<sup>9</sup> Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, London, Oxford University Press, 1954.

delegation and myself and, on the other, the statement I made on behalf of my Government to the Security Council on 10 April 1961.

158. It is always easy to misrepresent statements by quoting them out of context. I do not propose to repeat my statement of 10 April in full; it is readily available and my colleagues can read it at their leisure. There was no question of our approving on that occasion of the military parade organized by Israel in Jerusalem. On the contrary, we considered it most unfortunate and much to be deplored. It was merely in a spirit of conciliation that we did our best to placate whatever ill-feeling such an action might provoke on the Arab side.

159. It is in the same spirit that we today deeply deplore the Israel Government's decision to hold another military parade, which on this occasion is to leave the Israel sector and pass through the Old City of Jerusalem. We believe that such an action can only cause feelings to run higher and it is in the same spirit of conciliation that we have now appealed to the Israel Government to cancel the parade.

160. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Speaking as representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and replying briefly to the statement of the representative of Israel, in which he made some cheap comments on the position and the policies of the Soviet Union, I shall restrict myself to mentioning that the Soviet Union has recognized and continues to recognize the sovereign rights of all States and peoples, whether large or small; but we have never recognized and do not now recognize either aggression or military provocations directed against other States.

161. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): My delegation has no intention of drawing out the Council's discussions on the urgent matter that is before us this morning. On the other hand, my delegation obviously cannot let the remarks of the spokesman for the *de facto* authorities in Tel Aviv pass without expressing, if not its surprise, at least its reaction.

162. The best way for members of the Council and Members of the United Nations to understand the Algerian position is not from press reports taken out of context, but by reference to official statements. It is not for my delegation to evaluate Algeria's contribution to international peace and security. A vast majority demonstrated its support for Algeria and its policy by electing it to the Security Council.

163. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): There are no further speakers listed. The debate on this question is now concluded. The Security Council has before it a draft resolution [S/8563] submitted by the representatives of India, Pakistan and Senegal. Copies have been distributed to all delegations. The text of the draft resolution has been read out by the representative of Pakistan. If there are no other proposals, the Council will proceed to consider and then vote on the draft resolution.

164. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): The draft resolution before us, as all speakers today have indicated,

deals with a highly important subject: the status of Jerusalem. My delegation believes that a brief recess for consultations would be highly useful, indeed necessary, to establish whether it may be possible to arrive at a common Council position on this matter. Accordingly I propose that this meeting be suspended for approximately thirty minutes for such consultations.

165. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I am not sure, Mr. President, whether I fully grasped what you just said about the closure of the debate. As the Algerian delegation understands it, the item on the Council's agenda is "The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560)". The representative of Jordan raised two matters in that letter: the first is the military parade and the second, which is mentioned quite explicitly in the last paragraph of the letter, is the situation in Jerusalem. As I see it, we have finished the examination of the first matter and it will of course be for the Council to decide if and when to continue that discussion, as well as when to deal with the second point raised by the representative of Jordan, namely, the situation in Jerusalem and effective measures for remedying it.

166. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I shall explain. I said that the list of speakers was exhausted and that therefore the discussion at today's meeting was concluded. I then suggested that we proceed to take up the draft resolution and vote on it.

167. The representative of the United States has proposed a brief suspension of the meeting for half an hour. If there is no objection from the other members of the Council, the meeting will be suspended for thirty minutes, after which the Council will continue its consideration of the item on its agenda.

168. As there are no objections, the meeting will be suspended for thirty minutes.

*The meeting was suspended at 6.10 p.m. and resumed at 7.30 p.m.*

169. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Following consultations, certain changes have been made in the draft resolution [S/8563]. Will the Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General kindly read out the full text of the draft resolution with the changes that have been made as a result of the consultations?

170. Mr. VELLODI (Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): The text as changed now reads as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

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

*"Having considered the Secretary-General's note (S/8561), particularly his note to the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations,*

"Considering that the holding of a military parade in Jerusalem will aggravate tensions in the area and will have an adverse effect on a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area,

"1. *Calls upon* Israel to refrain from holding the military parade in Jerusalem which is contemplated for 2 May 1968;

"2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution."

171. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The text of the draft resolution as read out by the Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General will now be put to the vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*<sup>10</sup>

172. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak. I now call on the representative of Israel.

173. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The Security Council has adopted a resolution advising Israel not to hold a military parade in Jerusalem. This resolution cannot be accepted by my delegation because it concerns a question which, under the cease-fire, falls within the purview of Israel's internal jurisdiction. Moreover, there is danger that the resolution might prejudice the efforts now being pursued in the area toward a peaceful and accepted settlement.

174. I regret very much indeed but I cannot conceal the fact that it is with some bewilderment that I have listened to today's deliberations and read the resolution now adopted. In an adjacent hall the United Nations is considering the grave problems of world peace and the non-proliferation of atomic weapons. The Security Council, entrusted under the Charter with the responsibility for international peace and security, is discussing a forty-five minute parade. The Middle East is still convulsed in a twenty-year war of Arab aggression. We are examining here the title deeds to parcels of land on which ruined synagogues would be restored.

175. Israelis are being attacked and suffer casualties on the border while the Council is deliberating how Israel should celebrate its national day. I have listened with attention to the advice given to my Government on what parts and what streets of the areas under Israeli control the Israeli army should hold its independence day march. The advice the Middle East is in need of is of a different nature, the counsel hoped for on a different problem.

176. For twenty years Israel has been receiving advice of a rather particular character. When Egyptian guns in the Gaza Strip pointed at the very heart of Israel used to attack Israeli territory and Israeli citizens we were advised to stay away from the demarcation line. When Syrian army

positions bombarded the fields of Israeli villages near the border we heard the counsel not to cultivate the fields. When mines began to explode on Israeli roads, killing and maiming Israeli civilians, when commando raids against Israeli villages multiplied, we were told that the footprints of the attackers did not always show clearly on the ground as leading to the border. It is not this kind of advice that the Middle East is looking for. It is not this kind of counsel that is required in order to strengthen the prospects of peace in the area. The counsel the Middle East requires, the advice the world hopes to hear from the Security Council, is how to terminate the twenty-year Arab war of aggression, how to put an end to the active belligerency that the Arab States persist in waging against Israel contrary to the United Nations Charter, in violation of their international obligations. Until such advice is given clearly, unequivocally and effectively, there can be little hope for progress towards a peaceful settlement. Until the Arab States are persuaded to abandon their aggressive designs in Israel, the peoples of the region will continue, unfortunately, to find themselves in a situation of continuous tension and danger.

177. The celebrations in united Jerusalem will take place. The Jewish people waited for this for 2,000 years. People everywhere will rejoice, together with us, in this great hour of biblical prophetic consummation. Behind the parades in Jerusalem will march twenty centuries of foreign conquest, exile, oppression, discrimination, genocide and then revival and repulsion of aggression. The twentieth anniversary of Israel's rebirth will be celebrated by the Israeli people and by people of goodwill everywhere. Nothing should or can mar it.

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

179. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): At the very outset I should like to pay a tribute to all my colleagues around this table for taking prompt and immediate action with regard to the first part of the complaint of Jordan. I am particularly grateful to the delegations of India, Pakistan and Senegal for their most helpful contribution.

180. Seconds after the unanimous adoption of this resolution by the Council, it heard Mr. Tekoah begin his very first sentence with a misrepresentation of fact. He said that the Council "advised" Israel. The Council did not advise Israel. The Council called upon Israel. His very first sentence was a misrepresentation of fact. His second sentence was an act of arrogance. He said that Israel will not accept what was unanimously decided. The third sentence was an act of defiance, challenging this great body, the body responsible for peace and security.

181. The statement we have just heard calls for action. We know the motives. We know what they are saying and what they are going to do. He said openly to the members of this esteemed body that the parade will be held and that the celebration will take place.

182. I am glad that the Council took action on only the first part of my complaint. The situation in Jerusalem is still under consideration. I take it that, together with that

<sup>10</sup> See resolution 250 (1968).

situation in Jerusalem, the Council will have to consider sanctions and the invoking of Chapter VII of the Charter. This baby of the United Nations, which was created by the United Nations but which accepted only what it wanted from the United Nations and rejected what did not meet its designs, should be made to understand that this is an Organization of law and that arrogance has no place in the Security Council. I hope, Mr. President, that you in your wisdom will convene an urgent meeting to continue consideration of the situation in Jerusalem.

183. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The resolution of the Security Council, which was adopted unanimously, contains a request addressed to the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the resolution. It appears from consultations that all members of the Council agree that the next meeting for consideration of this item should be held at 10.30 a.m. on 1 May.

*The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.*