

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1418th MEETING: 1 MAY 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1418/Rev.1)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	2
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146)	2

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 EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 1 May 1968, at 3 p.m.

President: Lord CARADON

(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

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/1418/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146).

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: First of all, I wish on behalf of all members of the Council to express our gratitude to Ambassador Malik. We thank him for the able and impressive way in which he has conducted our deliberations during April. He has done so with robust vigour and forthright directness, qualities which we expect from his proud native land of the Ukraine. It is a privilege to succeed him, and I am very glad to do so on the first of May, a day of special significance to all socialists, a very good day for one socialist to hand over to another. It will be my humble endeavour to live up to the standards which he has so signally set.

2. It has always been a comfort to me in this Council to be so well supported on the right and on the left. If I want conservative advice, I can turn to the distinguished Soviet Ambassador on my right, knowing there is nothing so soundly conservative as a good Communist. If I want to refer to the highest liberal traditions, I can turn to Ambassador Goldberg on my left. I am particularly glad that in this month I can continue to do so, in spite of the sad news that Ambassador Goldberg will soon be leaving us.

3. Before we become immersed in the business of the day, allow me to say a very respectful word about Ambassador Goldberg's contribution here at the United Nations. He came to us from the calm cool of the Supreme Court. He did not despise the descent into the confused heat of the arena of international controversy. It was a courageous decision. A resignation from the Supreme Court is the

nearest thing they have in this country to the renunciation of a peerage in mine. He came to us with the highest reputation, from the highest judicial position in his country, and here, in the turmoil of our disputes and conflicts, he has added to that enviable reputation.

4. I would not wish to miss this opportunity to say today that those of us who have worked day by day with Mr. Goldberg greatly respect his persistence and his fairness. It would be impudent for me to enlarge on his qualities, his skill as a negotiator, his perseverance as a conciliator, and his wisdom as a Judge. We have been privileged to work with an outstanding American who has brought to our labours and our relations three gifts all too rare in public life: the gift of magnanimity, the gift of devotion to principle, and the gift of generosity and friendship. We mourned his great predecessor, we shall welcome his experienced successor, and we shall sorely miss him. I extend to him my most sincere affection and admiration.

5. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): Mr. President, the more than generous tribute that you have just pronounced means more to me than I can say or adequately respond to. In attempting to respond to it, I believe I must address not one person but three.

6. First, I must address my dear personal friend Lord Caradon, whom I got to know when I came to this Council three years ago and whose wisdom and kindness and optimism have sustained and cheered me during many a difficult time. Let me express my warm thanks to you, Sir, and the hope that my departure from the United Nations will not require me and my wife to depart from the pleasure of your friendship and that of your charming and beautiful wife.

7. Next, I must address the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom. Let me say how much I have learned to admire the outstanding service which I have seen you, Sir, render in this Council, not only to your great country, to which, as the world knows, my country is bound by the strongest ties of common tradition and affection, but also to the Council itself in all its work. I am sure I can speak for every member of the Council when I say that all of us have benefited and learned from your diplomatic skill, your wisdom, your kindly wit—which you have again displayed today—your sense of proportion and, always, your unfailingly generous and patient disposition. You, Mr. President, as the representative of your country, have truly set an example for all of us as a model of what a United Nations diplomat ideally should be.

8. And finally, Mr. President, I must, in response, address a few words to you in your capacity as President of the

Security Council. The fact that you said what you did from that Chair means a great deal to me additionally. Above and beyond the differences between Governments which it is our duty to try to harmonize, I have in three years learned that we have at this Council table a tradition of mutual forbearance and mutual respect, developed over the years in the service of the Charter. There is here, although sometimes the world does not recognize it sufficiently, a sense of common purpose to subdue the conflicts of nations to the Charter's great purposes. I profoundly believe in that tradition and that sense of common purpose and I believe it is one of the great, priceless possessions of the world community in this troubled age; indeed, I believe the common purpose which is developed in this Council is one of our best hopes for the future, for our children and our children's children.

9. I have been privileged to serve in the company of able colleagues here in the Council and at the United Nations, and I shall always regard it as one of the highest privileges of my life. It has been an equally high privilege to serve with our Secretary-General, who sets an example for all of us and for all those who have been recruited in the great tradition of the international civil service to serve the cause of peace.

10. I shall be leaving here at the end of the month, but your remarks, Mr. President, have called forth from me this expression of goodwill to all of my colleagues here. I sincerely wish them Godspeed in the most difficult task in which they are engaged, the task of bringing nearer to fruition the great goals of the Charter.

11. I thank you again most profoundly, Mr. President.

Adoption of the agenda

12. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Algeria on a point of order.

13. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Before I explain the point of order which my delegation wishes to raise, perhaps you will allow the representative of a young socialist revolution to join our President, himself a democrat and socialist, in paying a tribute to the distinguished representative of the socialist October Revolution.

14. My delegation is also happy to greet you, Mr. President, on the occasion of your taking that office. We have no doubt that under your enlightened and good-humoured direction we shall make considerable progress in the many tasks with which the Security Council will have to cope during the month of May.

15. My delegation would like to draw the Council's attention to the fact that the provisional agenda, as it appears in document S/Agenda/1418/Rev.1 dated 30 April 1968, includes the letter dated 25 April 1968 [S/8560] from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council. The last paragraph of that letter calls for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Jerusalem and to take effective measures to remedy that situation.

16. At the last meeting of the Security Council [1417th meeting], following a request for clarification from the Algerian delegation, the President said that at our next meeting—the meeting we are now holding—the Council would take up the entire question of Jerusalem as requested by the Jordanian representative.

17. Referring to resolution 2254 (ES-V), adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session on 14 July 1967, I see that paragraph 3 “requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council and the General Assembly”. That report of the Secretary-General appears in document S/8146 of 12 September 1967. Accordingly, my delegation wonders whether it would not be appropriate for the Council to include in its agenda the Secretary-General's report I have just mentioned, which was submitted in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V).

18. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria first of all for his kindly reference to myself, and I refer to the proposal which he has put before us, which is in regard to the report of the Secretary-General [S/8146] under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem. As the representative of Algeria has made clear, the Secretary-General was requested to report both to the Security Council and to the General Assembly on the situation in Jerusalem, and Mr. Thalmann's report was duly circulated accordingly.

19. I would, therefore, wish to consult the Council on the proposal which the representative of Algeria has put before us; and specifically to inquire whether any objection is raised to adding to our agenda the report to which he referred? If there is no comment from members of the Council, I shall take it that there is no objection to the addition to the agenda which has been proposed.

The agenda, as amended, was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

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

(b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146)

20. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken previously I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion.

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

21. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it. The first speaker is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

22. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): We are gathered here today to consider the situation in Jerusalem and the continued

Israeli violations of United Nations resolutions. My Government has requested me, as a matter of urgency, to inform the Council that it has irrefutable evidence that the Israeli authorities are intent on going ahead with their military display in Jerusalem, in defiance of resolution 250 (1968) adopted by the Council on Saturday, 27 April 1968.

23. This intention has already been made clear to the Council by Mr. Tekoah and by the fact that on Monday last a full-dress rehearsal of the military parade intended for Thursday was held in Jerusalem. The parade went over the nine-kilometre route as all roads into the city were closed. Moreover, Israel openly rejected the Council resolution 250 (1968) unanimously adopted last Saturday which called upon Israel to refrain from holding its military demonstration in Jerusalem. That rejection was confirmed in a letter sent to the Secretary-General by the Foreign Minister of Israel.

24. My Government is still hoping that the Security Council will take adequate steps to remedy the new situation created as a result of the utter contempt shown by the Israeli authorities for the Council's decision. We come to the Council because we have all faith and confidence in the United Nations, and in the Security Council which is primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace and security. We have confidence in our able and dedicated Secretary-General. We therefore appeal to the Council to do everything possible to prevent further deterioration of an already explosive situation. We appeal to the Secretary-General to use his authority to stop the Israeli demonstration of military force in the City of the Prince of Peace. I urge you, Mr. President, on behalf not only of my Government but of my people, to use your authority and put your weight behind another attempt to emphasize to Israel the dangerous consequences of the course it is now following in utter contempt of world public opinion and United Nations authority.

25. Three days have passed since the Council unanimously adopted its resolution calling upon Israel to refrain from holding its military demonstration in Jerusalem. The Israeli rejection of that decision makes it very clear: first, that Israel is deliberately and with premeditation obstructing all peaceful efforts which, according to our Secretary-General, were going forward to find a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area; second, that the Israel authorities are intentionally and with malice aggravating tension and cultivating a situation fraught with danger; third, that the Israeli authorities arrogantly and with contempt defy and undermine the authority of the Security Council; fourth, that the Israeli authorities, which invaded Arab territories and in a sneak attack occupied Arab lands, are now turning to declare war against the Security Council, the Charter of the United Nations, its values, and everything called law and order.

26. Until the creation of Israel in 1948 by the United Nations itself, at the expense of the Arab people of Palestine, it was hardly thought possible that any conduct contemptuous of the Organization, the rule of law and the norms of morality and decency would be allowed to prevail with impunity. Yet all this has been and still is the general pattern characterizing the behaviour of Israel throughout its

twenty years of existence. Israel, which the Zionists have established to tell the Jews of the world that they do not belong to any community or owe allegiance to any country except a Jewish State, has never lived up to the Charter obligations of a Member State. Its responses to the United Nations recommendations and resolutions on Palestine have consistently ranged from utter deceit to outright defiance and contempt, depending each time on the circumstances of the particular situation.

27. *The New York Times* in its editorial yesterday quite rightly said that "Thursday may become a day of sorrow for Israel's friends abroad if the Israelis persist in their plan to parade through East Jerusalem in defiance of the resolution unanimously adopted last weekend by the United Nations Security Council". Yes, Thursday will be a day of sorrow for the friends of Israel. We emphasize the point that those friends share the responsibility for what is happening because to a great extent they helped bring about a situation which is now creating a tragic atmosphere in the City of the Prince of Peace. The City of Jerusalem was always a centre of peace, spiritual values and inspiration for all faiths and all nations. Now it is a base for military demonstrations and provocations. With the rumbling of tanks, roaring of planes and arrogant display of brute force, which is most regrettable, the friends of Israel are expected to take more effective steps to help the Council remedy this most unfortunate situation and help genuinely—and I underline the words "help genuinely"—to bring peace to the land of peace.

28. Surely, we agree with *The New York Times* that unless the contemplated Israeli provocation is stopped, Thursday—tomorrow—will be a day of sorrow for every friend of Israel, because Israel is indeed embarrassing its friends. It is not enough to call the day on which Israel carries out its military demonstration in defiance of Security Council resolution 250 (1968) a day of sorrow: it should be called a day of examination of conscience.

29. Mr. Tekoah went so far as to claim that the Israeli demonstration of military force on 2 May will be shared by men of goodwill everywhere. Undoubtedly the world abounds with men of goodwill who cherish peace and uphold the cause of justice. In this very Chamber the representatives of more than three quarters of the population of the world have opposed the subjugation of the City of Jerusalem. But the Israelis do not mind distorting everything to serve their political ends. To them, whatever is in harmony with their objectives is right and accepted and whatever is in discord with them is wrong and rejected, even if all mankind thinks otherwise.

30. The Arabs have now been the custodians of the Holy Places, including the Jewish Holy Places, for many centuries, and until the Zionists came to spread their false and slanderous allegations there was no cause for complaint.

31. In 1854, when the Crimean War broke out, feuding church groups entrusted the keys to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which is the site of Christ's crucifixion and burial and is holy to all Christendom, to a Moslem Arab family, the Nusseibah family. The Nusseibahs have kept that trust with the continued consent of all churches to the

present day. That is the same Nusseibah family of Jerusalem of which Mr. Tekoah said on 27 April when speaking of the Arab women demonstrating in Jerusalem against the Israeli military demonstration: "Some of them, like Miss Saidi Nusseibah, sent especially for that purpose from the east bank by the Jordanian authorities" [1416th meeting, para. 80]. The keys to the Holy Sepulchre are still entrusted to Moslems, to the Nusseibah family, which comes from Jerusalem and not from the east bank. I have pictures here of the demonstration to which Mr. Tekoah referred, saying that only fifty women had participated, with the leader coming from Amman. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like those pictures to be made available to the members of the Council so that they can see for themselves what the demonstrators went through, the acts of persecution, the part played by Israeli force, in the city of peace. Those pictures also show the signs carried by the ladies of Jerusalem. Members of the Council are entitled to look at those pictures and compare them with the figures given by Mr. Tekoah the other day. I have them available here.¹

32. The King-Crane Commission, sent by President Wilson of the United States to carry out an investigation on the spot of the question of who was the most eligible custodian, stated:

"With the best possible intentions, it may be doubted whether the Jews could possibly seem to either Christians or Moslems proper guardians of the holy places, or custodians of the Holy Land as a whole. The reason is this: the places which are most sacred to Christians—those having to do with Jesus—and which are also sacred to Moslems, are not only not sacred to Jews, but abhorrent to them. It is simply impossible, under those circumstances, for Moslems and Christians to feel satisfied to have these places in Jewish hands, or under the custody of Jews. There are still other places about which Moslems must have the same feeling. In fact, from this point of view, the Moslems, just because the sacred places of all three religions are sacred to them, have made very naturally much more satisfactory custodians of the holy places than the Jews could be."²

In that finding by a responsible American Commission sent by President Wilson of the United States lies the answer to the Israel allegations. Is that finding of the Commission sufficient to put an end to all the Israeli distortions and fabrications?

33. Israeli behaviour and irresponsible practices all along have created this tragic story of Jerusalem today. The Holy City of Jerusalem echoing the tread of the Zionist armed forces: that is the situation the Council tried to prevent by unanimously adopting resolution 250 (1968) on 27 April. And although Mr. Tekoah, as well as his Foreign Minister, has rejected the resolution outright we still entertain the hope that the Israeli authorities will be prevailed upon,

¹ See document S/PV.1418/Add.1.

² See United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The Paris Peace Conference 1919*, vol. XII (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 794.

particularly through the good offices of the Security Council and the Secretary-General, to refrain from holding their military demonstration in Jerusalem. Israel has persisted in its rejection of the resolution and, as on previous occasions, has not responded to the Council's call or heeded its pleas. Instead, tanks and other heavy vehicles have been rumbling through the streets of Jerusalem, since the beginning of this week, in preparation for the big display of Israel's potential for aggression. It is now an accepted fact that the military display will take place in Jerusalem tomorrow, despite the Council's call for its cancellation. Is this to be allowed to pass with impunity, or will the Council face up to its obligations under Chapter VII of the Charter, which was intended specifically to cope with such brazen acts of defiance of the rule of law and the United Nations?

34. The attention not only of Jordan, not only of the Arab States, not only of the Christian and Moslem worlds, not only of the small Powers, but also of peoples all around the world is now focused on you. Whether Security Council resolutions are to be taken seriously or not will depend on your decision.

35. Israel obviously sees no room for United Nations peaceful efforts in the area and its representative in the United Nations has clearly stated that it would not tolerate any interference in Jerusalem, which it already considers as a matter of internal jurisdiction.

36. In July 1967, Israel did not feel that the time had come to declare openly the annexation of Jerusalem and informed the Assembly that the steps that had been taken related to nothing more than the integration necessary to secure administrative measures designed to render to the Arab inhabitants services such as water, electricity, civic co-operation, social welfare and education. On 27 April 1968, some nine months later, Mr. Tekoah unveiled more completely the true intention of his Government and warned the Council not to intervene in Jerusalem as such a measure would be construed as intervention in the internal affairs of Israel. Naturally we did not believe the representative of Israel last July, and we warned the Assembly of this Israeli deceit and policy of gradual expansion. We did that because we are very familiar with Israeli tactics of attaining their objectives in stages.

37. At one time the Zionist leaders declared their intention was, in the words of the Balfour Declaration, limited to a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine, without prejudice to the rights of the lawful inhabitants. Once that step had been taken, the Zionists unfolded yet another page of their sinister programme and a new demand, for a Jewish State, was made. They were content, they said, with partition. When that step was attained they worked for a third stage of their expansion. Thus they encroached on more lands and expelled more people. Today's stage involves Jerusalem, a question which the Security Council is now considering. Through Jerusalem the Israelis aim at strengthening their hold on the whole west bank of Jordan. They have already enlarged the Jerusalem area through legislation to include several Arab villages and areas in order to provide more land for Jewish settlements.

38. The facts of the case are well established, and a conclusion should not be hard to reach. However, we feel there is reluctance on the part of some Powers in attempting to help the Council take adequate measures.

39. We of Jordan are of the opinion, which is shared by many Members of the United Nations, that such reluctance is unwarranted and damaging to the prestige and authority of our Organization. What are the reasons for this reluctance, or, to use a better expression, sheer inaction? It cannot be argued that it was dictated by practical wisdom. It cannot be argued that the reason is concern for the success of the mission of Mr. Jarring, which is being used time and again as a screen to conceal certain aims and intentions. Obviously it is not the Jarring mission, nor is it practical wisdom, which causes the inaction of certain Powers. Plainly and simply, it is political expediency which is followed, unfortunately, without regard to legitimate Arab rights.

40. My country has declared from the outset that it will lend all its support to help in the success of Mr. Jarring's efforts to bring peace and security to the area. Consequently we have refrained and continue to refrain from any action that would jeopardize any peaceful attempts in the area. To strengthen Mr. Jarring's hand will require, especially of the big Powers, ensuring that no violation takes place in Jerusalem which would lead to a change of the *status quo* in Jerusalem, and as such violate the United Nations resolutions. Indeed, failure to take positive action is one sure way to undermine the Jarring mission. The Council's inaction will certainly play into the hands of the Israelis and help the Israeli authorities to impose their military solution.

41. Let me reiterate that the Foreign Minister of Israel has submitted a letter which reveals Israel's complete departure from all the positions taken by members around this table, reflecting the unanimous sentiment in the Council. None of the members who spoke failed to refer to the provocative nature of the parade. The United States and Brazil, which did not speak at the last meeting, supported resolution 250 (1968) and therefore endorsed all the findings of the Council. We are grateful that there was unanimity in the Council. That being the case, how can this demonstration of the power of the Israelis be interpreted other than their intention to further the impression of their conquest, to boast of their military victory and defiance of religious values? It is certainly not a thanksgiving ceremony but a crude military victory parade. What difference is there between this and the parade of the Nazi troops in Vienna in March 1938 after the occupation of Austria, intended to further the impression of conquest—both aimed at demonstrating crude military victory and both condemned, denounced and deplored by world public opinion? World public opinion has also denounced the provocative and contemptuous behaviour of both movements, Zionism and Nazism.

42. What could be worse than holding a strictly military demonstration in the very shadow of the Holy Places of the Old City? Most of this demonstration of power is going to take place tomorrow in the Old City, and the main reviewing stand will also be in the Old City, the Arab City of Jerusalem.

43. I have dwelt on one phase of the item before the Council, namely, the Israeli military demonstration, because of the new situation resulting from the Israeli refusal, rejection and defiance of Security Council resolution 250 (1968). This calls for re-evaluation by the Council. Perhaps there is still hope for stopping the parade. Perhaps there is some way to prevent further deterioration of the situation. We shall have more to say at a later stage on the other phase of this item.

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

45. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, permit me to extend to you my delegation's greetings and to assure you of our highest esteem. I should like also to express to the outgoing President my respect for the manner in which he conducted the debates in which my delegation participated.

46. The situation in the Middle East requires understanding between the parties, not vituperation. It calls for patient and steadfast efforts towards peace, not for public acrimony.

47. It is in this spirit that I should like to read the full text of the letter dated 30 April 1968 addressed by Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General:

"I have given careful attention to your cable to me of 27 April 1968 and to your report to the Security Council of 26 April (S/8561). The concern which you and members of the Security Council have expressed derives from the apprehension that the parade in Jerusalem on 2 May 1968 may 'aggravate tensions and have an adverse effect on a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area'.

"The Government of Israel sincerely desires to alleviate tensions and to promote a peaceful settlement of the regional conflict. It is our considered judgement that the ceremony of 2 May need not, and will not, have the adverse effects which have been predicted in some quarters. We base this confidence on considerations which I now submit, through you, to the understanding of the Security Council and of peace-loving mankind.

"The intention to hold a ceremonial parade in Jerusalem on the anniversary of Israel's independence has been a matter of public knowledge for several months. The plan evoked no spontaneous concern throughout the world. But for Jordan's recent representations to you and to the Security Council this brief and moving ceremony would have taken its tranquil course without arousing any international anxiety. A study of the Jordanian representative's address on 27 April confirms that his Government's objection is based on implacable hostility, not on a disinterested concern for regional peace or international harmony. His aim is not to alleviate tension but to create it. And his protest would have been registered no matter what form, dimensions or route the parade had taken. This is fully confirmed by his complaint in May 1967 in the different circumstances then existing.

"A decision to hold a ceremony of thanksgiving and deliverance at a considerable distance from the cease-fire

line does not violate any principle of international law. Such a ceremony creates no new situation. It leaves the position in the area unchanged. It endangers no lives. It injures nobody. It threatens no civic interests. And it has no relation to the duty of Middle Eastern States to negotiate agreements on the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

"The innocuous nature of the ceremony does not of course detract from its historic scope. The past year has been charged with deep emotion for the citizens of Jerusalem. On 5 June 1967 Jordanian forces opened an unprovoked assault on the city's streets and buildings with the aim of spreading bloodshed and havoc far and wide. This attack was ordered after a message had reached King Hussein through a United Nations emissary proposing mutual abstention from hostilities in Jerusalem and elsewhere. The appeal was turned aside. From gun positions, sacrilegiously established in the Holy Places, Jordanian forces rained death and destruction on our streets and homes. Hundreds of our dead and wounded bear tragic witness to the results of this wanton assault. All our citizens know that their families, children and homes have this year been saved from the brutal destruction for which neighbouring Governments hoped and worked. For the second time within two decades Jordan last year attempted to convert the Holy City into a scene of carnage. Ancient Hebrew words come vividly to life:

*"Jerusalem remembereth
"In the days of Her affliction and of Her anguish
"All Her treasures that She had
"From the days of old,
"Now that Her people fall by the hand of the adversary,
"And none doth help Her:
"The adversaries have seen Her
"They have mocked at Her desolations. . .
"Zion spreadeth forth Her hands,
"There is none to comfort Her.*

"Jerusalem was delivered from this agony by the sacrifice of young and selfless lives. Since last June a new and hopeful epoch in its history has begun. Where there has been hostile separation there is now harmonious union; where there has been constant threat of violence there is now civic peace. Above all, for the first time in twenty years Christians, Moslems and Jews now have equal access to the sanctuaries of their faith. The reunion of the Jewish people with the relic of its ancient glory at the Western Wall has stirred deep spiritual memories. Nobody with a sense of historic imagination can stand unmoved before the poignant dignity of this event.

"It is this deliverance from peril to salvation that the people of Jerusalem wish peacefully to celebrate on 2 May. They wish to address their tribute to those who gave their valour and sacrifice in their defence. And when this tribute has been paid the people of Israel will turn from the memory of past danger to the hopes and challenges of future peace.

"Tension in this area springs not from peaceful ceremonies within cease-fire lines, but from terrorist acts across them.

"Israel cannot forget that the complaint is brought by the Government which sought to drown Jerusalem in fire and blood; which has banished and separated Jews from the oldest of all the Holy Places; which destroyed thirty-four Jewish houses of worship; which uprooted and publicly defaced tombstones on the sacred Mount of Olives. The silence and inaction of all international organs in face of these outrages will long disturb those who, in future years, come to write the moral history of our generation.

"But to those in the Security Council and elsewhere who sincerely revere Jerusalem's peace I am authorized to bring the following words of reassurance.

"First, the anguish of the past year in Jerusalem fortifies our resolve to strive for the elimination of tension and violence in the Middle East. The most urgent concern is to strengthen the cease-fire by outlawing the organized terrorism now proceeding from Jordanian soil with the aid and support of the Jordan Government. Israel will honour the cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity as the starting point in the quest for peace.

"Second, we shall steadfastly maintain our pursuit of a peaceful settlement of the Middle Eastern conflict. The key lies in the promotion of negotiations which, in this as in all conflicts, is indispensable for any relief of deadlock. This very day I have continued contact with your special representative in an effort to promote a peaceful and accepted settlement which is the Security Council's declared and cherished aim.

"Third, while I have spoken of Jerusalem's special and unique place in Israel's history, we are deeply aware of the universal interests which are concentrated in the city: the equal protection of the Holy Places and houses of worship; the assurance of free access to them; the daily intermingling of Jerusalem's population in peaceful contact; the removal of the old military barriers; the care of ancient sites; the reverent desire to replace the old squalor and turmoil by a harmonious beauty—all these changes enable Jerusalem to awaken from the nightmare of the past two decades and to move towards a destiny worthy of its lineage. I reaffirm Israel's willingness, in addition to the steps already taken for the immunity of the Holy Places, to work for formal settlements which will give satisfaction to Christian, Moslem and Jewish spiritual concerns. Israel, unlike previous governments in the city, does not wish to exercise exclusive and unilateral control over the Holy Places of other faiths. Accordingly, we are willing, as I stated to you on 10 July 1967 (S/8052), to work out arrangements with those traditionally concerned, which will ensure the universal character of the Christian and Moslem Holy Places and thus enable this ancient and historic metropolis to thrive in peace, unity and spiritual elevation." [S/8565.]

48. The representative of Jordan has told the Council that he expects it to take further action on the question of the parade in Jerusalem. I presume that the Jordanian representative would wish to advise the Council why it should attach a greater significance to the resolution of 27 April [250 (1968)] on the parade than to the Security Council

and General Assembly resolutions on vital questions of peace and security in the Middle East, resolutions which Jordan and other Arab States have refused and continue to refuse to implement.

49. The attention given to, and the handling of, the Israeli-Arab problem in the Security Council during the period of the twenty-year Arab war against Israel is a matter of record. I doubt very much whether it is necessary to add to it.

50. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The Council is once again examining the question of Jerusalem, and the reason for that is certainly the recent provocative decision of the Israeli authorities to hold a military parade which will pass through the Arab quarter of Jerusalem.

51. Of course, the parade itself is not the problem with which we have to deal. As the Council has clearly specified, the real problem is that such a parade represents a flagrant and deliberate violation of United Nations resolutions regarding the status of Jerusalem. The situation thus created is extremely serious; but we must face the fact that it is so mainly because of the failure of the United Nations, and more especially of the Security Council, to see to the implementation of its resolutions with regard to Palestine, and particularly to Jerusalem.

52. Obviously, the primary cause of the situation with which we are faced is the fact that Israel has always displayed open contempt for the recommendations, resolutions and decisions both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, following what has now become a classic pattern.

53. First, there is provocation by Israel, which brings in its wake the adoption of various resolutions or decisions. In the second stage, Israel deliberately violates these resolutions and creates a tension leading to war. The third stage is the creation of a *de facto* situation favourable to Israel and, finally, the calling into question of previous resolutions. The same pattern is repeated at regular intervals, so that we are now once again witnessing Israeli acts of provocation and violations of the General Armistice Agreement, permitting the creation of a new *de facto* situation and providing an opportunity to call into question the Armistice Agreement and all the relevant United Nations resolutions.

54. Whether Tel Aviv likes it or not, Armistice Agreements do exist which define Jerusalem's status. None of Israel's claims, here or elsewhere, has any basis, and the settlement of immigrants in the city by the Zionist authorities to the detriment of the indigenous population is only designed to complicate the search for a final just solution and, in some measure, to allow the Israelis to convince themselves of the permanence of their presence in the occupied Arab territories. Israel pretends to believe that the Armistice Agreements were concluded outside the United Nations, whereas in fact they were drawn up under the latter's auspices. The United Nations saw to it that the Agreements contained certain provisions relating to the *ad hoc* bodies which were to implement them. In doing so, the United Nations

assumed the responsibility for safeguarding those bodies and ensuring their proper functioning.

55. The fact that the Zionist authorities today disdain to have recourse to the bodies provided for in the Armistice Agreements is something which concerns them alone. The normal application of the relevant rules of international law cannot be disturbed by the whims of those who apply the law only when it works in their favour.

56. Having been brought into being, albeit subject to certain conditions, under the auspices of the United Nations, Israel is today pursuing its measures for annexation and for the expulsion of the indigenous inhabitants of the City of Jerusalem and engaging in illegal acts of expropriation which are the logical consequence of its continued policy of armed aggression.

57. In paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 2253 (ES-V), and in paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 2254 (ES-V), adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session, the international community clearly proclaims its opposition to these measures. Today the Security Council must comply with the wishes of the General Assembly as expressed in those two texts. It must decide upon the measures to be taken to ensure respect for the decisions and authority of the Organization and to prevent a *fait accompli* in Jerusalem from frustrating the one inevitable solution.

58. In fact, a new *fait accompli* is taking place before our very eyes and, step by step, the Tel Aviv authorities are instituting what they believe should be Jerusalem's permanent status. Although no spectacular measures have as yet been applied, progressively but ineluctably a qualitative change is taking place in the status of Jerusalem. It would be deplorable if the Council, or the United Nations in general, were to react only after the Zionist authorities had confirmed their hold upon the city by annexing it once and for all. Here again, Rhodesia provides a meaningful example, for by not having acted in time the international community must submit to a *fait accompli*. It is obvious that this *diktat* cannot affect the legitimate inhabitants of the city or the patriots of Palestine and that, far from preventing conflict, inaction can only strengthen the resolve of the resistance fighters in Palestine to win back their rights.

59. A dilatory attitude in this matter will not, in any case, cause any of the interested parties to renounce their position; it will only make it more difficult to reach an appropriate long-term solution.

60. I repeat, the annexation of the City of Jerusalem is the chief and immediate objective of Israel's policy, which is based on the principle of territorial expansion. All the recent events in that region provide ample proof that this is a real objective, for the Israeli authorities are following a pre-conceived plan to replace the indigenous population of Jerusalem by a foreign population. Every day the press and radio inform us of measures taken to that end, either through the expulsion of the indigenous inhabitants and the expropriation of their lands or through the building of reception centres to house the new immigrants.

61. Of course, following the logic of their policy of annexation, the Zionist authorities today feel the need to give some legal basis to their acts of spoilation. In this connexion, I should like to point out a curious aspect of the statements made two days ago by the Tel Aviv representative, who alluded to "self-determination". We for our part do not believe that the allusion was fortuitous.
62. On the one hand, we are witnessing a systematic policy of expropriation and expulsion, both in Jerusalem and in the rest of Palestine; on the other hand, we see the continuation and intensification of a campaign to increase the immigration of Jewish settlers, chiefly from the western countries, a campaign which has been initiated for reasons in keeping with the logic and structure of Zionist society; and now for the first time, as I have just pointed out, we have heard the representative of the Israel authorities refer to self-determination.
63. Does this mean that after having shown contempt for so long for the resolutions, recommendations and decisions of the United Nations, Israel is at last coming round to the recognition of the basic principles of the United Nations, and particularly that of the right of peoples to decide their own future? After having ignored self-determination for twenty years and having from the very outset deprived the people of Palestine of the natural and exclusive exercise of that right, does Israel, now that it has destroyed the sacred entity represented by Palestine and the Palestinians, intend to invoke the self-determination, independence and integrity of the usurpers?
64. Thus, after having witnessed the reign of terror which has lasted for years in various parts of Palestine and which has become even more acute in the recently occupied territories, we must now expect, especially with regard to Jerusalem, that Israel will put an end to this problem by organizing, either under the auspices of the United Nations—something Israel doubtless would like, but does not count upon—or on its own, a so-called referendum, which would be imposed on us and whose aim would be to settle the fate of Jerusalem once and for all.
65. Need I say that such an operation would be null and void in the eyes of the international community, and that it is the Council's duty to warn the Israel authorities against such a step, the preparations for which are now nearly complete?
66. If the right of self-determination is one day to be put into practice, that can only be done by consulting the true inhabitants of Palestine, including the people of Jerusalem, and not an imported population. The examples of Gibraltar and of Rhodesia should teach us something in this respect.
67. In short, the Council must face up to two facts: the situation in Palestine shows that henceforward the chances of reaching a settlement are very slight, owing to Israel's expansionist policy; and no *fait accompli* resulting from that policy can or will be accepted. With those two ideas in mind, the Security Council should now focus its attention on the central problem, that is, the urgent need to persuade the aggressor to withdraw its troops from the occupied territories, that being a *sine qua non* condition for the restoration of peace in the Middle East.
68. The present situation being what it is, the Council must consider immediate action in the light of the problem's two aspects.
69. First, the Council must enforce respect for its decisions. The Israeli authorities have made it clear that they reject outright resolution 250 (1968) which the Council adopted on 27 April 1968. This is an obvious challenge to this body, which must therefore condemn Israel's attitude of obstinate refusal and consider suitable measures to deal with it.
70. Secondly, the Council has before it the entire question of Jerusalem, and we consider that the Council should determine its action in the light of the following facts: first, Israel's occupation of Jerusalem was brought about by armed aggression; secondly, since the occupation of the city, the Israeli authorities have put into effect measures for annexation and expropriation, on the one hand, and expulsion of the native population, on the other. Such open aggression deserves the Council's most categorical condemnation, since under the Charter territorial conquest by force is inadmissible and all the steps taken by the Israeli authorities with the aim of changing the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid. Finally, the Council must issue a serious warning to Israel not to continue its policy of annexation.
71. Today, when the international community has become aware of the seriousness of the problem posed by Israel and of the machinery which Israel set in motion and which may shake the authority and prestige of the United Nations, the problem of Jerusalem goes beyond a violation of the city's status and becomes a real test of strength: either the Council will take the adequate and effective measures required and the international community will not lose faith in the possibility of a solution in keeping with the doctrine, spirit and philosophy of the United Nations; or else, on the contrary, the Council will take unworkable decisions, in which case the international community will realize that here, as in many other places in the world, only the re-establishment of a balance in favour of the Palestinians—the kind of balance that exists in Viet-Nam today and will exist in South Africa and Rhodesia tomorrow—can give renewed vigour to the particular conception of international life and relations to which we adhere.
72. Mr. Y. A. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before proceeding to my statement on the substance of the question under discussion, Mr. President, I should like to avail myself of the opportunity you have kindly afforded me to express my gratitude for the words you addressed to me.
73. From what I have been told of you and your career, I am inclined to believe that you combine the liberalism of a Labourite with the conservatism natural to a lord. I therefore have confidence that in carrying out the lofty and honourable mission of President of the Security Council you will not find it necessary to turn either to the left or to the right.
74. At this stage the Security Council is facing two very important issues of great importance for the cause of peace,

not only in the regions directly involved but also in the world at large. I have in mind the problem of the Middle East, particularly the situation in Jerusalem. The second issue is that of Southern Rhodesia. I should like to express the hope, Mr. President, that under your Presidency both of these problems will be solved through a greater application of socialist, rather than conservative principles.

75. As for Mr. Goldberg, I believe that it is rather premature at this time to take leave of him. As far as we know, Mr. Goldberg will continue to be our colleague in the Security Council and in the General Assembly for a considerable period of time, and we shall have an opportunity later to say some kind words about him as well.

76. At the request of Jordan the Security Council has under consideration the question of the situation that has arisen in Jerusalem as a result of Israel's aggression against the Arab States and the subsequent rapacious acts of the Israeli authorities in that city. The attention of the United Nations and of world public opinion has long been focused on what is happening in that city under the conditions of foreign occupation.

77. At its 1417th meeting on 27 April 1968, the Security Council considered only part of the problem posed by the situation in Jerusalem, namely the hostile and provocative intention of the Israeli authorities to hold a military parade in the Jordanian sector of the city on 2 May. Realizing, for very good reasons, that the intended parade was a provocative act that would complicate the achievement of a political settlement in the Middle East, the Security Council, at that 1417th meeting, unanimously and rightly adopted resolution 250 (1968) calling on Israel to refrain from holding the military parade in Jerusalem and thereby to avoid complicating the situation in the Middle East. An urgent appeal to the same effect was likewise addressed to the Government of Israel by Secretary-General U Thant, on 20 April 1968, in a note dealing specifically with this matter [see S/8561, para. 3]. The representative of Israel, however, in response to the Security Council's resolution and the Secretary-General's note, has in the course of that very meeting of the Security Council defiantly and cynically stated that Israel does not recognize the resolution of the Security Council and will not give up its hostile and provocative intention to hold a military parade in the Arab part of Jerusalem. This is a challenge not only to the countries of the Arab world, but to the United Nations as well. Following this, the Prime Minister of Israel came out with a similar statement.

78. Now we are presented with an official document signed by the Foreign Minister of Israel in which the Israeli Government officially expresses the same position [see para. 47 above]. In this letter a futile attempt is made to justify the holding of the military parade in Jerusalem, on the grounds that this provocative military demonstration planned by the Israeli authorities will take place at a considerable distance from the cease-fire line and that the holding of the parade will not, so they say, lead to increased tension in that part of the world. Which of the members of the Security Council that voted for resolution 250 (1968) appealing to Israel to refrain from this provocative action would agree to the interpretation given to this

action by the Foreign Minister of Israel? I do not think there is anyone at this table who would, although there may be one or two exceptions.

79. It is quite clear that such assertions are related to the design of the Foreign Minister of Israel and the Tel Aviv Government to consider the cease-fire line as a final frontier between Israel and Jordan. This cannot be apprehended or qualified other than as a new instance of the expansionist policy of the Government of Israel, which considers the occupied part of Jerusalem as Israeli territory. The Security Council must firmly reject this interpretation of the cease-fire line put forth by Israel and the Foreign Minister of Israel inasmuch as the resolutions of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly on 4 July and 14 July 1967 [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] clearly and definitely requested Israel to rescind all measures which would alter the status of Jerusalem.

80. The Israeli Government knows full well that none of the decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council give it the right to play the master and to hold military parades in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem. In taking such actions, the Israeli Government clearly has in mind that a show of military might will support its annexation of the foreign soil which it has forcibly seized in Jerusalem.

81. Nor can we fail to note the following point. In the Israeli Foreign Minister's letter, which in a defiant tone disregards the decisions of the Security Council, an attempt is made to accuse other countries—Arab countries—of disregarding the appeals of the United Nations. This is a well-known tactic: to accuse others in order to hide one's own guilt.

82. A third aspect of the letter also calls itself to our attention. Although he is obliged to recognize in the letter that the aim of the Security Council is to secure a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, the Foreign Minister of Israel refrains from officially stating that Israel, too, holds this aim. Moreover, in this official communication from the Israeli Foreign Minister there is still, as in previous official communications and statements of the Israeli Government, no indication that Israel recognizes Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and is ready to proceed to its implementation, including the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from Arab territories, as required under that resolution.

83. It is well known that the United Nations and one of its principal organs, the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority of the votes cast by Members of the Organization, categorically condemned—as did world public opinion—the arbitrary and lawless activities of the Israeli authorities and the Israeli Parliament in changing the status of Jerusalem. The fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly categorically condemned those actions in the special resolutions to which I have already referred, and demanded that Israel rescind any measures it had taken to change the status of Jerusalem. The record shows that more than a hundred States Members of the United Nations voted for those resolutions. This is clear and convincing evidence of the position taken by the United Nations in this

matter, a position of absolute condemnation of the illegal activities of Israel in this connexion.

84. The Israel Government, however, disregarded the resolutions of the General Assembly and thus hurled a challenge in the face of the United Nations and world public opinion. Literally a few days after the adoption of these resolutions, the Prime Minister of Israel stated, after Israeli troops had seized all the territory of Jerusalem, that this question was not subject to further discussion. This is a statement devoid of all foundation, and it cannot fail to arouse the indignation and condemnation of the United Nations of all those States Members of the Organization which voted in favour of the two General Assembly resolutions.

85. In October last year the Israeli Foreign Minister also came out with similar statements. He made a statement in Washington, defying the United Nations. Seconding him, the Ambassador of Israel to the United States, General Rabin, who had been the Chief of Staff of the armed forces of Israel before he was appointed to his diplomatic post, recently made a similar statement in Washington. He made it abundantly clear that Israel would keep the occupied Arab territories for ten to twenty years and would not give up an inch of what it had gained. These bellicose and aggressive statements by the Foreign Minister of Israel and the Israeli Ambassador to the United States were made in Washington, as I have said. Apparently, in making those statements both speakers counted on the sympathy of the audience they were addressing.

86. At a previous meeting of the Security Council the representative of Israel repeatedly said that the Arab population of the occupied territories, in his view, enjoyed civil rights and freedom. He tried in vain to represent the Israeli aggressors and occupiers as little short of benefactors to the Arabs living in the occupied territories. But not one whose homeland has been subjected to foreign occupation can ever believe such assertions.

87. It is the duty of the Security Council to demand that Israel should cease such unlawful activities in Jerusalem; I refer in particular to its intention to stage a military parade and a military demonstration. It is essential to put an end to this situation in which Israel brazenly disregards the United Nations and the decisions of its principal organs. The statements by Israel's leaders with regard to Security Council resolution 250 (1968) forbidding them to hold a parade in Jerusalem are further confirmation of the fact that Israel's extremists pay no heed to world public opinion and the decisions of the United Nations. We are convinced that under the United Nations Charter, the Security Council is able to take this over-weening aggressor to task. The Council cannot tolerate disregard for its decisions, and it is obligated to do its duty in eliminating the consequences of Israel's aggression and the restoration of peace and security in the Middle East. If it fails to do so, the peoples of the world may be faced with more far-reaching crimes on the part of the aggressor, the pernicious effects of which would be difficult to predict.

88. The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in any measures which the Security Council as a whole, including

the permanent members of the Security Council, may find it necessary to adopt in accordance with the Charter in order to prevent such a course of events in the Middle East and to curb the aggressors.

89. The fundamental and principal condition for a Middle East settlement, as is reflected in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, is the immediate withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all occupied Arab territories. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation once again would like to reaffirm the position of the Soviet Union. That position is that the aggressor, Israel, must vacate all Arab territories which it has seized and withdraw its troops to the 5 June 1967 line. This is the principal and primary precondition for a political settlement in the Middle East.

90. The Israel aggressors are mistaken in believing that they have superiority in military strength. If they do not vacate the occupied Arab territories, they will be making the greatest mistake in the history of their State. The people of Israel would not forgive their Government for such a mistake.

91. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I take hope from Ambassador Malik's promise that he will have the opportunity to say complimentary things about me—not now, to be sure, but before I leave. Since I shall be here for four weeks more it would be obviously too much to expect that he will say only complimentary things about me throughout that entire period, but I am reassured by his remarks today that there is hope that I shall end on that note.

92. It is the profound conviction of the United States that what is imperatively required is peace in the Middle East, the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Not further invective, not further charges and counter-charges, not the one-sided recalling of certain resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and the ignoring of others; conciliation, impartiality and magnanimity are the needs. Co-operation with the Secretary-General's representative, Mr. Jarring, in his difficult peace-making endeavours is a necessity. Surely, any objective person listening to our debates must come to the conclusion that we are dealing too much with a tortuous and tragic past. The time is overdue to deal with the present and to look forward to a hopeful and better future.

93. My Government has repeatedly pointed out our concern about the status of Jerusalem, that Holy City sacred to Moslems, Christians and Jews, and we have likewise pointed out what is an obvious fact: that a just settlement of the status of Jerusalem is inseparably connected with other aspects of the problems which still defy solution. That is not just the observation and conclusion of my Government; that is the clear import of the unanimous resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] adopted by the Security Council.

94. There is one overriding lesson to be learned from the history of the Middle East since 1948 and from the Council's efforts to deal with the situation there during the past two decades: peace will not and cannot be achieved by

a patchwork of resolutions adopted in the Council dealing with one or another of the symptoms of tension and discord. Some of the resolutions have been adopted; some have been vetoed; some have been complied with and some ignored or disregarded by both Israel and the Arab countries. This piecemeal approach has been tried in the Council time and again, and the approach has failed time and again. It has failed partly because it sought to deal with the symptoms of trouble, not the source of trouble, and partly because the Council's appeals, decisions or resolutions have fallen upon ears made deaf, both Arab and Israeli ears, by years of conflict and hostility. We are afraid that we are on the verge of drifting into the same situation again.

95. The basic grounds for concern and care among all members of the Council and of the international community should continue to be to foster the success of the peace-making process the Council set in motion in November 1967. I refer, of course, to the effort of Mr. Jarring, who has been trying against the greatest of odds to fulfil the mandate given him: that of promoting agreement on a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

96. The history and experience of the last twenty years demonstrates that the Council, despite the best will and despite its best efforts and wisdom, cannot impose the terms of a peace settlement upon the parties. The Security Council has tried to do so with the active support of my Government. We have not succeeded. As I said on 22 November last [*1382nd meeting*], we embarked upon a new approach to engage the parties themselves in the peace-making process with the help of a United Nations representative. If we are to avoid repeating the errors of the past and serve the cause of peace, in which the peoples of the Middle East of all its countries, more than anyone else, have such a precious stake, our duty is to keep our minds focused constantly on the ultimate objective: the success of Mr. Jarring's mission—and I quote resolution 242 (1967)—“to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution”.

97. It is only by so doing that we shall be successful in replacing relations based on the premise of a temporary respite in hostilities by relations based upon mutual tolerance and a mutual willingness to accept one another and to live in peace, permanent peace. Our every move must be measured against that standard. It is not an exacting or unreasonable standard. It asks no more of the parties in the Middle East than we expect of Members of the United Nations in other areas of the world. Our debate should be in that spirit.

98. Our objectives should be without malice to any of the countries in the area and with magnanimity towards all of the countries in the area to help bind up the wounds of the tragic conflicts, recent and past, and to achieve a just and lasting peace between the countries in the area which will contribute so much to the peace and well-being of nations and peoples throughout the world.

99. The PRESIDENT: The list of speakers for this afternoon is exhausted, but I have two requests to speak in exercise of the right of reply. First, I call on the representative of Jordan.

100. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I intend only to answer a single question raised by the representative of the United States and earlier by the representative of Israel. A few moments ago we heard a reference made by the representative of the United States to charges and counter-charges. He said that some parties referred to one resolution and ignored others. The Israeli representative said: “I presume that the Jordanian representative would wish to advise the Council why it should attach a greater significance to the resolution of 27 April on the parade [*250 (1968)*”—that is, the resolution adopted last Saturday—“than to the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on vital questions of peace and security in the Middle East” [*see para. 48 above*].

101. In the first place, let me say that the delegation of Jordan never has referred and never will refer to one resolution, ignoring others. We refer to all resolutions. We reaffirm our adherence to every single resolution, whether adopted by the Security Council or the General Assembly. We adhere to the Security Council resolution [*62 (1948)*] which called for the adoption of the Armistice Agreement; we abide by it. We reaffirm our adherence to the Armistice Agreement; we abide by it. Let it not be said that we are referring to one resolution and ignoring another.

102. But let the Israelis come here and show that they adhere to all United Nations resolutions, whether adopted by the General Assembly or the Security Council—the resolution calling for the Armistice Agreement or the Armistice Agreement itself. When Mr. Tekoah speaks about my attaching importance to the 27 April resolution and ignoring others, this has no foundation. We have abided by all resolutions. The Council will recall that it was the delegation of Jordan which, on 23 March 1968, challenged Mr. Tekoah to accept the resolution of 22 November 1967 [*242 (1967)*], to which reference was made by the representative of the United States, and announce his Government's agreement to implement that resolution. You all remember what the answer was: “we do accept the goal of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 to establish a just and lasting peace by agreement” [*1406th meeting, para. 52*].

103. The Council will recall that on that very day from this seat I challenged Mr. Tekoah to come before you and say openly and clearly that he would accept your unanimous decision of 22 November 1967. The Israelis refrain from implementing resolutions. For twenty years, despite United Nations resolutions, they have refused repatriation of the legitimate people of Palestine simply because of their religion, simply because they are Gentiles and the Israelis call for a State for the Jews only. Having done that as regards all the resolutions, they do not come here with clean hands; they cannot preach about resolutions which they have not implemented nor announced their willingness to implement.

104. We ask sincerely that the Israelis should, by their behaviour in this Council and by acts and deeds, show a

genuine desire to do what we have announced: adhere to all resolutions without exception, accept the resolution of 22 November 1967, accept and implement the resolution unanimously adopted by the Council on 27 April 1968. When I refer to the 27 April resolution, I am not standing alone; I am reflecting the will announced by the Security Council unanimously. I am guided also by a statement which the Security Council has endorsed, namely, that the holding of the parade will increase tension and also—and this is a reminder to the United States, which endorsed the resolution—that it will affect the efforts for peace now going on in the area. So when I insist on that resolution, I am trying to save something which the Security Council itself has endorsed. No member of the Council accepts the idea that military force should be substituted for resolutions of the Security Council.

105. As long as Israeli troops remain in our area, occupying our territory, to which their only claim is that of military force, and as long as they refuse to accept the resolution prescribed by the Council for peace, in all honesty and sincerity, how can there be a possibility of peace? I feel sorry for Mr. Jarring. He is doing constructive work. Who is obstructing his efforts? The one who is asking the Council to help Mr. Jarring or the one who is committing the acts in the area to obstruct his constructive efforts? If we are going to look not to the past but to the future, are we to consider Council's resolution of 22 November 1967 part of the past or of the future? If it is the past giving guidance for the future, we have to speak about it. If we are expected to forget about it, let us know. Resolution 237 (1967) was also adopted by a unanimous vote and it called on Israel to ensure the welfare and security of the inhabitants of the occupied area. Israel has not abided by the Council's will. People are being expelled every day. It was also unanimously requested that the inhabitants be permitted to return. Israel is not permitting them to return. Yet in its statement this afternoon Israel says that I am referring to one part and ignoring the other. That is not the case. The delegation of Jordan has a clear stance. It is on record. Mr. Jarring, in making his contacts, received the answers of the Arab Governments which he contacted. We have made our stand clear in official documents. I sincerely hope that the Security Council will provide an adequate and effective remedy in regard to this issue.

106. These questions are not before the Council at this stage but they have been injected—I do not know why—and I have to answer them to keep the record straight. What is before the Council now is the provocation of tomorrow's parade. What is before the Council, to come at the second stage, is the situation in Jerusalem.

107. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

108. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is with regret that I find myself compelled to make again an observation on the Soviet representative's statement. I can assure him that whenever his statements become based on equality of treatment and fairness of judgement I will have no need to do so. The representative of the Soviet Union referred to the fact that, as he expressed himself, Israel accuses the

Arab States of non-compliance with a long list of United Nations resolutions. These are not accusations; these are facts which constitute part of the United Nations record. As the Soviet representative undoubtedly recalls, there was a time when the Soviet Union was not loath to point this out with force and conviction in United Nations organs. The subsequent change in the Soviet attitude towards these facts cannot, of course, affect their truth or their validity in the present deliberations.

109. Mr. President, I was greatly impressed by the sudden solicitude displayed by the Algerian representative for the moribund Armistice Agreements under which Israel and the Arab States had undertaken to conclude treaties of peace a long time ago and which the Arab States themselves destroyed. On the eve of the June hostilities—on 4 June 1967—when the Arab States were about to launch their final onslaught against Israel's existence, President Boumediene, privy to the Arab plans of aggression, declared: "The true freedoms of the entire homeland must be won through the liquidation of the State of the Zionists and the expulsion of the Americans and the British from the area." Three months later, on 15 September 1967, President Boumediene stated: "The liquidation of Israel is the only solution." As is generally known, Algeria till now refuses to accept the cease-fire established by the Security Council, despite the communications addressed to it by the Secretary-General. Algeria continues to give support to and train terrorist units which carry the war into Israel territory.

110. I have already drawn the attention of the Council, at the 1417th meeting, to the fact that Algerian policy and actions of war are in flagrant violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and that Algeria's membership in the Security Council is not in conformity with Article 23 of the Charter. I trust that members of the Security Council understand that the presence in this organ of States such as Algeria cannot but detract from the political, moral and juridical value of our deliberations and affect the validity of resolutions adopted by the Council.

111. In declarations and statements made publicly and to Mr. Jarring, my Government has indicated its acceptance of the Security Council resolution [242 (1967)] for the promotion of agreement on the establishment of a just and durable peace. I am also authorized to reaffirm that we are willing to seek agreement with each Arab State on all the matters included in that resolution. More recently, we have accepted the proposal of Mr. Jarring to bring about meetings between Israel and each of its neighbours under his auspices and in fulfilment of his mandate for the purpose of reaching a peaceful and accepted settlement. No Arab State has yet accepted this proposal. The Arab Governments continue to assert that they are bound to the Khartoum conference resolution which says: "No negotiations with Israel, no recognition of Israel, and no peace with Israel". Their policy is in flagrant contradiction of the spirit and the terms of the resolution which they pretend to accept.

112. Will any Arab representative specifically and unequivocally declare that his Government is prepared to establish a just and lasting peace with Israel, to promote agreement

with Israel on a peaceful and accepted settlement, to recognize Israel's sovereignty, independence and right to live within secure and recognized boundaries to be worked out as part of the peace-making process, and to meet with Israel's representatives under Mr. Jarring's auspices?

113. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Algeria in exercise of his right of reply.

114. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The monotonous repetition of the baseless accusations levelled by the spokesman for the Zionist authorities do not, of course, make any impression or any impact, on the Algerian delegation at any rate.

115. I presume that the spokesman for the *de facto* authorities ensconced in Palestine has been trying, since coming to represent them in the United Nations, to practice the old Goebbels technique of constantly and indefatigably repeating the same clichés. My delegation and my Government have explained their position in every discussion of the Palestine problem. I think there is little to add in clarifying Algeria's permanent and consistent position with regard to the Palestine problem, since that position rests solidly on the past experience of the Algerian people. It is out of loyalty to our history that we have adopted this position on the Palestine problem. It is out of loyalty to our position on problems related to colonization, whether in Palestine, South Africa, Rhodesia or elsewhere, that we have adopted this particular stand and I must add, in all modesty, that the Algerian people is proud of it.

116. We have said time and time again that we stand for the liquidation of the Zionist régime, just as we stand for the liquidation of the *apartheid* régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia.

117. To listen to the spokesman for the Zionist authorities, one would think that it is Algeria which is in the dock in the Security Council. We are met here as a result of a complaint brought by Jordan against Israel. Ever since 1962, when Algeria became independent, no one has complained of Algerian policy. Algeria has not threatened world peace. It is Israel which has again and again threatened the peace of the world, and that is the problem with which we are faced today. Algeria presents no problem to the Security Council. If the Security Council is continuously in session, if the General Assembly is continuously in session, if public opinion has lost all hope of finding a solution and is concerned about the authority of the United Nations and the future of the world, the one and only reason has been, is, and will continue to be the behaviour of the Zionist authorities.

118. Regarding Algeria's admittedly modest participation in the work of the Security Council, the representative of the Zionist authorities has repeated what he said at the last meeting, namely, that Algeria should not be a member of the Security Council. He said that our membership was a violation of Article 23 of the Charter which lays down that the non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected by the General Assembly, "due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contributions of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security". I replied then, and I should hardly need to repeat, that it is the 110 Member

States—to which we are grateful—against whom charges should be brought for having elected Algeria to the Security Council. If we are to follow the bizarre logic of the spokesman for the Zionist authorities, then that huge majority has violated the Charter in electing Algeria. That huge majority elected Algeria in order to threaten world peace. That huge majority elected Algeria to jeopardize and undermine the prestige and authority of the Security Council. This seems to be the reasoning of the Zionist spokesmen. We know that our contribution is a very modest one, but as you all know, we are doing our best.

119. As to the validity and effectiveness of the decisions which the Security Council has taken with the doubtless minimal participation of the Algerian delegation, I leave that to the real members of the Security Council to judge. They know better than anyone the value and validity, the effect and the impact of the decisions they have to take.

120. With regard to assistance to liberation movements, here again we are, or try to be, true to ourselves. While some helped the Algerian people to recover their national independence, the Zionist leaders, including high officials, gave notorious assistance to the well-known secret army organization that sowed terror among the Algerian population. We have aided, are aiding and will continue to aid all movements of national liberation, whether in Palestine, South Africa, Rhodesia or anywhere else.

121. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Jordan who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

122. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I have raised the question about the acceptance and implementation by Israel of the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967. I have received only an evasive or qualified answer. That is not unusual because I had a similar answer earlier. The resolution is very clear. It has specific paragraphs. It calls for specific action, and the first step is acceptance and implementation of the resolution *in toto*. Specifically, paragraph 1 calls for withdrawal. I heard nothing from the Israeli representative about this question. However, I shall not waste the time of the Council in dwelling on this.

123. The PRESIDENT: I have no other requests to speak this afternoon and it is, consequently, necessary to consult the Council about our further work. I have received a request for a meeting of the Council on this item tomorrow morning and I have consulted the members. Most members agree with that request. Therefore, unless any objection is raised, I shall announce that the Council will meet on this subject tomorrow morning at 10.30.

124. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I apologize for speaking yet again, but I shall be very brief. In the course of his first statement, the Jordanian representative referred to some photographs which had been discreetly circulated among Council members. I wonder if it would be possible for the necessary arrangements to be made to have the photographs appended to the record of this meeting.

125. The PRESIDENT: I am not sure what our practice is in such matters, but I shall consult the Secretariat and report tomorrow morning to the representative of Algeria.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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