

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1421st MEETING: 3 MAY 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1421)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
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)	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 TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 3 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/1421)

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).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda 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)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision previously taken by the Council, I shall now 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 discussion.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it.

3. Yesterday evening the representative of Jordan spoke to us on the question of an invitation to Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to speak to the Council. Members of the Council have seen the letter of 2 May 1968 [S/8570], which the representative of Jordan addressed to me as President of this Council. I have been able to consult all members of the Council. I

find that there is agreement among the members of the Council that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib should be heard by the Security Council under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, which reads as follows:

“The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence.”

If I hear no objection, I shall accordingly invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

4. I call on the representative of Algeria on a point of order.

5. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): In a communication dated 2 May 1968 [S/8570] from the Jordanian representative addressed to the President of the Security Council—a communication which was in fact read out at the Council's last meeting—the Permanent Representative of Jordan requested that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, should be invited to make a statement to the Council under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. You indicated, Mr. President, that there was no objection to inviting Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to speak under rule 39 of the Security Council's provisional rules of procedure. If we are to apply the rules, and particularly rule 39, in full and without any mental reservations, it should be clearly understood by the Council that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib is being invited in his capacity as the elected Mayor of Jerusalem. This, I repeat, is in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, which clearly states: “The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent...”. In my delegation's view, the word “competent” is extremely important and that is why we wanted to express our opinion on this matter.

6. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for what he has said, but since he raises the matter on a point of order, I think perhaps I should reply to him. I myself do not consider that it is necessary or desirable for the Council to pronounce on this. The agreement which I secured, after consultation with all members of the Council, was that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib should be invited in accordance with rule 39; that is to say, as a person whom the Council “considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence”. The rule, it seems to me, with all respect, is clear, since it refers to inviting “members of the Secretariat or other persons”.

7. It was in accordance with that rule that I consulted the Council and obtained the approval—so I had imagined—of all members. Consequently, I would propose to proceed accordingly. Unless there is objection, I shall invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to appear and speak before us.

8. I give the floor to the representative of Algeria.

9. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I apologize for speaking again on such a minor point and for delaying the long awaited appearance of Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, to make his statement. However, my delegation has not quite grasped the full import of the statement you have just made, Mr. President. The Council has decided, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, whom it considers competent on the question of Jerusalem, to provide it with information about Jerusalem. His competence is based solely upon the fact of which we are aware and which is mentioned in document S/8570, namely, that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib is Jerusalem's elected Mayor. I do not see that there is any objection to inviting him under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure in his capacity as the elected Mayor of Jerusalem. I am convinced that all members of the Security Council, in the light of their vast experience and the objective manner in which they have approached such questions in the past, will recognize, as my delegation does, that when Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib is invited to speak under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, it is in his capacity as the elected Mayor of Jerusalem.

10. The PRESIDENT: I always listen with great respect to the interventions of the representative of Algeria, particularly on matters of Council procedure. He has spoken, however, on a point of order and I am required under the rules, when a point of order is raised, to give a ruling. The ruling I give is that I propose to call on Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to address us, as I had stated, in accordance with the consultations which I have undertaken under rule 39 of our provisional rules of procedure, and I would propose to call on Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to appear before us unless my ruling is challenged.

11. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Your last statement, Mr. President, was quite clear. You quite obviously implied that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib is being invited to speak in his capacity as Jerusalem's elected Mayor.

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

13. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to make the following observations. When your representative consulted our delegation the question was raised as to whether Mr. El-Khatib would be invited in his capacity as Mayor of Jerusalem. He holds no other post. We issued this invitation on the understanding that Mr. El-Khatib would make a statement in the Security Council in his capacity as Mayor of Jerusalem, particularly since, as is well known, the pertinent General Assembly resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] state that there shall be no change in the status of Jerusalem. If Mr. El-Khatib were a private individ-

ual, the question of his invitation would not have arisen, but he has come here in his capacity as Mayor of the City of Jerusalem, and the consultations between the members of the Security Council were based on the assumption that he was to be invited in that capacity. Therefore, whether you say so or not, it is our understanding that he will speak to the Council in his capacity as the Mayor of the City of Jerusalem.

14. The PRESIDENT: Two points of order have been raised in this Council: first of all, by the representative of Algeria, and now by the representative of the Soviet Union. Therefore, I am doubly required to give a ruling. I shall read the rule again and I shall state my ruling, and I shall proceed accordingly unless challenge is made. The rule in question is rule 39 which I have already quoted to the Council. It reads as follows:

"The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."

15. Following on the application made and the consultations which I undertook, my ruling is that I should now proceed to invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, in accordance with rule 39, to appear before us and speak to us. I call on the representative of Pakistan.

16. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Since the question has been raised about the competence of Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, it is necessary for my delegation to state that there can be no question that the reason why the Council will consider Mr. El-Khatib as "a competent person" in the sense of rule 39 is that he is the elected Mayor of Jerusalem.

17. Reference has been made by the representative of the Soviet Union to the two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session concerning Jerusalem which declared that all measures already taken to alter the status of Jerusalem should be rescinded and that no further action should be taken which would alter its status [resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)].

18. In accordance with these resolutions, and by reason of the fact that Mr. El-Khatib is the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, I do not see why there should be any difficulty in stating that the Council has agreed to invite and to hear Mr. El-Khatib as the Mayor of Jerusalem.

19. The PRESIDENT: I take it that the representative of Pakistan is also raising a point of order and, therefore, it will be necessary for me to repeat the ruling which I have already given, and I would proceed accordingly to carry out the ruling which it is my duty to give when points of order are raised in this Council.

20. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): We have waited for quite a long time to be able to discuss the problem of Jerusalem in detail, and my delegation wishes to express its gratitude to the delegation of Jordan for having requested the Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, to come to present the case before the Council. I think that the examination of this question in an objective manner will be

greatly enhanced and our discussion only more authoritative if the venerable Mayor of Jerusalem is heard before our Council in his official capacity as such.

21. Thus my delegation wishes to underline the importance of this development in the work of our Council and to support fully the opinions expressed by the representatives of Algeria, the Soviet Union and Pakistan.

22. The PRESIDENT: I would say again, in answer to the point of order that has been raised, that when a point of order is raised it is necessary for me to give my ruling. The opinions expressed by members of the Council are their own, and every member of the Council is entitled to his own view. Question may well be raised about substance in the discussion of points of order which I do not think we have the right or, indeed, the duty to pursue at this stage.

23. We are not dealing with questions of substance; we are dealing solely with a question of procedure and the points of order which have been raised. I believe it would be in the best interests of our work and of the respect we have for those whom we invite to appear before us if we might now proceed in accordance with my ruling to invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to appear before us and to speak to us.

24. That is the ruling I have given, and I believe it is in accordance with both our practice in the past and the clear provisions of the rule under which we act. I propose to proceed accordingly.

25. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I shall comply with the statement you have just made and your appeal to the members of the Council not to continue to pursue this point of order—which, incidentally, was not one, for my delegation had had no intention whatsoever of raising a point of order.

26. In view of the respect which, as you yourself have pointed out, we owe to a person "competent" with regard to the Jerusalem question which is before the Council; in view of the fact that this competent person can supply us with extremely valuable information and can, we know, assist us in our consideration of a question which comes within our competence; in view also of the fact that the ruling which you intended to make could have established what some might regard as dangerous precedent, thereby challenging the wisdom of a presidential ruling; and in view of the very fact that we are acting in accordance with rule 39 in inviting someone whom the Council regards as competent—and in what way could Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib be regarded as competent, except as the elected Mayor of Jerusalem?—I do not understand why, Mr. President, on the one hand, you desire to give a ruling and on the other hand, the supplementary suggestions put forward by various delegations, including mine, could not, for the sake of the harmony we all seek, be combined in a single decision.

27. I am convinced, Mr. President, that the desire to be objective by which you have always been guided and the desire to avoid a presidential ruling which could be wrongly used in the future, will lead you and the other members of the Council to ensure that rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure is applied properly and without any reservation.

28. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for the way in which he has spoken and the desire he has expressed that we should proceed in harmony and, indeed, with respect for anyone invited to appear before this Council as competent to give us information which we wish to hear from him. I would suggest that there could be no one better qualified and more competent to speak than the gentleman whom we propose to invite. I therefore propose, in accordance with the ruling which I have been required to give by the points of orders raised, to proceed now to invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to appear before us and to speak to us and explain to us, as he no doubt will, the reasons for his coming and the competence for his giving us the information we require.

29. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I very much regret that so much valuable time should be spent during this meeting of the Security Council in considering a procedural question which we had not thought in the least controversial or liable to be misunderstood. You yourself said a few moments ago, Mr. President, that there is not, and could not be, a person more competent in this matter than Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib. And why is he competent? Some things are beyond the understanding of the Algerian representative in the Security Council. We have always believed that a person was competent by reason of his experience in a given field, by reason of his qualities, or because of his office or occupation.

30. We are inviting Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to speak because the Security Council considers him competent with regard to the question of Jerusalem that is before us. There is no argument about that. If he is competent, it is because he is Jerusalem's elected Mayor. There may, of course, be other reasons; if so, my delegation would like to be enlightened on the matter.

31. In my last statement I tried to make it clear that my delegation did not raise a point of order; it merely expressed an opinion. It did so in the hope that you, Mr. President, in your wisdom would either accept it or submit it to the kindly consideration of the Council. Our suggestion was merely designed to complement the fair and appropriate decision which the President felt it his duty to take.

32. With all due respect to you, Mr. President, my delegation would insist that it should be stated clearly, without misunderstanding or controversy, and in full agreement, that the Council, in accordance with rule 39, is inviting Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, in his capacity as Mayor of Jerusalem, to supply it with information and assist it in its consideration of the question of Jerusalem, which lies within the competence of the Security Council. You will observe Mr. President, that I have followed rule 39 to the letter.

33. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): In the view of my delegation, Mr. President, my earlier statement did not refer to the substance of the matter; it was rather a procedural statement aimed at promoting understanding in order to facilitate the work of the Council. While we are dealing with procedural matters it is very difficult to avoid mentioning words relating to the substance of those

matters. In fact, rule 39 contains several words which relate to the substance of problems under discussion. It raises the question of competence, it raises the question of information, and it raises the question of the examination of matters by this Council. I was referring to the matter we are now discussing, to the way we can gather information, and to the competence of the Mayor of Jerusalem, who can supply us with the best kind of information, thus facilitating the work of the Council. Since rule 39 expressly mentions the competence of the person who is to appear before the Council, I think that competence can be described and clearly expressed, and that it is indeed proper to do so, by mentioning that the person appearing before the Council today is Mayor El-Khatib of Jerusalem.

34. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): It seems to me, Mr. President, that you, in your patience, have stated the invitation to the very distinguished gentleman who has come to visit us in a manner which, as far as I can see, does not prejudice the position of any delegation or of anyone around this Council table. The proposal that you put to us was that he be forthwith invited to address the Council on the matter on which we would like to hear him and concerning which we wish to receive information. I would hope, Sir, that we could proceed to do that in accordance with the way in which you very wisely and tactfully put the matter to the Council, and that we could do so without further delay.

35. The PRESIDENT: I regret that we have been unable so far in this Council to proceed with the business before us. I had been anxious, by consulting all members of the Council, to avoid any delay or disrespect to our distinguished visitor. If, in speaking to members of the Council, I failed to make clear the question I was putting to them, then I can only apologize to them. But I was quite clear in putting the question to all members of the Council that we should invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to address us today, and I understood that the reply of all concerned was that they agreed with the proposal that I had put. It was on that basis that I came to the Council and expected that we could proceed at once to hear Mr. El-Khatib, and I hoped that we might immediately do so.

36. I would most respectfully put it to my fellow members of the Council that it is neither necessary nor desirable that we should attempt to reach conclusions on matters of substance or matters of representation. We know very well why the proposal was put to us that Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib should appear before us. We were of one mind in agreeing that we should hear him. We know very well the competence that he brings; otherwise it would not have been the universal opinion that we should welcome him and hear what he had to say to us.

37. I would put it to the Council that it would be in the best interests of all concerned, and indeed would show respect to the person whom we are today inviting to speak to us, that we should proceed without further delay to invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to sit with us and to speak to us. Each member of the Council will listen to him respectfully this afternoon and each member of the Council will have his own views on the matters which he raises and on the explanations which he gives and on the justification for his coming. It is on that basis that I hope that we can agree and go forward, and since I have no alternative but to

endeavour to reach a conclusion and to proceed, I would, unless there are further objections or challenges, proceed to issue the invitation accordingly.

38. Hearing no objection, I therefore, in the name of the Council, invite Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib to take a place at the Council table and to speak to us.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib took a place at the Council table.

39. Mr. EL-KHATIB: I convey and extend to you, Mr. President, to your colleagues members of the Security Council, to the people and the Governments which all of you represent, and through the courtesy of your Council, to all lovers of the Holy City, greetings.

40. In the name of Jerusalem and its residents whom I represent as Mayor by election, I thank you, Mr. President, and the Council for the opportunity you are offering me today to speak before you and to give first-hand factual information about the tragic picture of the Arabs in Jerusalem and the city itself since the Israeli occupation.

41. Before I begin, allow me to state right away that I have never been a politician in my life, nor do I claim experience in the political field. In making this admission, it is essential for me to explain that my former activities have been centred around public service, particularly that of Jerusalem: first as a member of its Municipal Council, starting on 1 January 1949, and then, during the last ten years as Mayor of the city.

42. It was this latter function that was the direct cause of my expulsion from the city where I have spent the 54 years of my life, and where my family has lived continuously for the past 800 years. It is this expulsion that has permitted me to appear before you today.

43. The information I am presenting today is quoted from my own notes, which I tried to put on record during my presence in the city for the nine months following the Israeli occupation. News of last month was collected by me from various reliable neutral sources arriving from Jerusalem in Amman, where I am temporarily living.

44. To begin with I have to go back to the first week of the occupation and summarize as follows. The Israeli authorities started by spreading horror in all corners of the city, outside the walls and inside, in the mosques as well as in the churches, occupying large buildings and hotels, raiding houses, shops and garages, looting whatever came into their hands, treating cruelly anyone who showed the slightest sign of dissatisfaction, gathering the inhabitants from their homes under severe and arrogant measures, keeping them standing for hours, irrespective of age or sex, and gaoling hundreds and up to thousands for unlimited periods and for no reason whatsoever. In a nutshell, the Israelis were creating waves of fear and terror to force people to leave.

45. By the end of a week of their occupation the Israeli authorities started a new campaign directed this time against the buildings and the residents of the Maghrabi quarter. That quarter belonged to the North African

Moslem communities including those from Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya. Here the Israelis bulldozed 135 houses belonging to the Moslem Waqf—Moslem Trust—named after a very respected North African pious Moslem and religious leader called “Abu Madyan el-Gouth”. The houses were demolished and razed within two days, at a time when the curfew extended eighteen hours a day giving the poor residents a warning of only two to three hours. The poor bewildered people were lost and many of them were unable to save more than what they could carry—and that only if it happened that they had no children to look after. No response came to my quick appeal and that of the Municipal Council through the Army liaison officer who was attached to us. The bewildered inhabitants were scattered in the adjacent lanes and streets and some at a later stage found refuge in the neighbouring villages. The total number of persons affected by this campaign was 650. Two small mosques were amongst the demolished buildings. A few days later, a modern plastics factory, owned by an Arab and quite near to the former buildings, was burnt and destroyed by the Israeli armed forces. Two hundred labourers, maintaining 200 families, became unemployed. Until I was forced to leave the city, and to my knowledge, no compensation was paid to the owner. Similarly, the Israeli authorities continued to occupy many large buildings, including tourist hotels, looting articles therein and adding to the increasing numbers of unemployed Arabs.

46. In the second week, the Israeli authorities and Jewish religious bodies directed a third campaign against the inhabitants of the neighbouring area of the Western Wall of the Al Aqsa Mosque, popularly known as the Wailing Wall and legally proved to be Moslem property. That campaign was later extended to cover wider areas in the heart of the Moslem quarters and, to some extent, the standing houses in the old Jewish quarter, 80 per cent of which is Arab property. Inhabitants of that area, comprising some 650 families, constituting around 3,000 inhabitants, were given a warning by Israeli religious bodies—later confirmed by the army authorities—to evacuate within three days at the maximum. That poor group was forced to leave, adding more sorrows to the atmosphere of the city and its embittered residents. Appeals were again submitted by the Arab Municipal Council, which was still operating, but with no response from the Israelis. The destiny of the second group was no less tragic than the former.

47. At the end of the third week the most effective blow was directed at the entity of the Arab status in Jerusalem. On 27 June 1967, the Israeli Parliament issued a decree of death to the Arab status of Jerusalem by passing an illegal act through which it announced the annexation of Arab Jerusalem to Israel. That act continued the defiance of General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967 respectively. A day later—that is, on 28 June 1967—the Israeli Minister of Internal Affairs, relying on the former act of the Israeli Parliament, issued an order by which he merged the town planning area of the two sectors of Jerusalem, irrespective of the legal presence of the Arab Municipal Council and against the will of the Arab residents.

48. On the following day—that is, 29 June 1967—the Israeli forces completed their plan and issued a Military Defence Order calling for the dissolution of the Arab

Municipal Council and dismissing the Mayor and members of the Council. This order was conveyed to a few of us in an urgent and dramatic way—by bringing us from our homes and gathering us in a hotel room occupied by the Israeli forces, where the Israeli Assistant Military Governor of the area then read the contents of that order in Hebrew, with a simultaneous interpretation by their Military Liaison Officer. A copy of the Arabic translation was prepared on the spot and given to us upon our demand by the same Liaison Officer. I still have that document in my possession; a photostatic copy, marked Exhibit I, is presented to the Council. It reads in translation:¹

“In the name of the Israeli Defence Army, I have the honour to declare to Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib and to the Members of Jerusalem Municipal Council, that the Municipal Council is hereupon dissolved. The Municipality employees, of all departments including administrative and technical, are, hereupon, considered as temporary employees in Jerusalem Municipality until their employment is decided by the Jerusalem Municipality after they submit written applications for employment.

“In the name of the Israeli Defence Army, I call upon the Municipality employees to continue their necessary services to the inhabitants of the City.

“I thank Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib and the members of the Municipality for their services rendered during the transitional period commencing upon the entry of the Israeli Defence Army up to today.”

49. The document was dated 29 June 1967; it was read by the Assistant Military Governor of Jerusalem, Yacoub Salman and translated by Army Liaison Officer David Farhi.

50. We were subjected to intimidation, and could not show at that time any resistance against such Israeli measures. The only thing left to us was to advise our employees to continue their services for the welfare of the population and the upkeep of the city.

51. In this respect I am bound to explain that the Arab Council and myself have spared no effort in quickly resuming our responsibilities and duties right from the second day of the Israeli occupation. We managed to see that services in the fields of sanitation, water supply and electricity were put in order and that shops were reopened, and particularly that food-stuffs were within reach of all residents. We did this in spite of all the difficulties encountered.

52. The Arab Municipal Council, the various Arab unions and religious representatives in Jerusalem and the west bank of the Jordan have objected and protested in writing against the Israeli destructive measures. Originals of their memoranda were presented to the Israeli military authorities, and copies were handed over to Mr. Ernest A. Thalmann, Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, when meeting our representatives in Jerusalem in August 1967. Texts of these memoranda are to be found in Mr. Thalmann's report to the Secretary-

¹ See document S/PV.1421/Add.1.

General [S/8146] of 12 September 1967. Full texts of those memoranda are also included in Arabic basic documents under the title: "The Resistance of the Western Bank of Jordan to Israeli Occupation 1967." A copy of this booklet in English, marked Exhibit II,² is hereby presented for the information of the Council.

53. Since the taking of those destructive measures, the situation in Arab Jerusalem has been deteriorating Day after day the Israeli authorities are taking one measure after another, carefully planned and quickly executed. It is greatly feared that the Israeli acts will create more bitterness in the hearts of the Arab population, Christians and Moslems, and will incite the feelings of the Moslem and Christian worlds against such measures; it is feared that these may obstruct the mission of Mr. Jarring and may add fuel to the fire in the Middle East.

54. The Israeli authorities have by their inaction authorized the desecration of Christian and Moslem Holy Places and have permitted access by Jews to these Holy Places during hours of prayer. This complete lack of respect has grossly offended the religious sensitivities of the believers of both religions.

55. The Holy Places, Christian and Moslem alike, were subjected to repeated desecration not familiar to us. An example was the infamous burglary of one of the largest and holiest of churches in the world, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The priceless diamond-studded crown of the statue of the Virgin, Our Lady of Sorrows, on Calvary was stolen. Priests have been victims of aggression, offences and maltreatment by the Jews of Israel. These and similar acts would not happen under Jordanian rule.

56. The Chief Rabbi of the Israeli Army, Brigadier Goren, with his escort and other Jews, on 15 August 1967 mounted to the Dome of the Rock area with rabbinical vestments and prayer-books. They conducted a prayer lasting two hours within the confines of the Mosque of Omar area, thus infringing the inviolability of a most Holy Place venerated by Moslems. The Israeli Minister of Religion announced at another time that that Moslem Mosque was Jewish property and that sooner or later they would rebuild their Jewish temple thereon, paving the way to creating the opportunity for laying hands on and destroying the Dome of the Rock, the second holiest place after Mecca for Moslems. Buildings belonging to Islamic Waqf, an Islamic religious institution, adjacent to the Mosque area have been demolished, as stated earlier, with the idea of setting up a Jewish praying centre thereon. What has been Moslem Arab becomes Jewish and Israeli.

57. In August 1967 the Israeli army confiscated the keys to one of the gates of the Al Aqsa Mosque. They opened the door to Jewish visitors, or, to be more accurate, Jewish vandalism and desecration. The Israelis made it a point, when visiting the Aqsa, not to miss the Moslem prayer and so disturb those who prayed. The Israeli authorities did not even care to reply to a protest submitted by Moslem religious authorities against such Israeli behaviour. The keys to that gate are still in Israeli hands.

58. A girls' school building belonging to Moslem Waqf was confiscated by the Chief Rabbi and turned into the High Court of Appeals for Jewish Religious Affairs, inside the city walls. Again, those in charge of Moslem Waqf protested, but in vain, and again what is Moslem and Arab becomes Jewish and Israeli.

59. Following the annexation of the Arab sector of Jerusalem by Israel, the Israeli Municipality and various Israeli ministerial offices started to apply Israeli laws and regulations and instruct the Arabs of Jerusalem to observe and abide by those laws and regulations. Israeli currency, customs duties, excises and income taxes, traffic, telephone rates, municipal taxes and by-laws were imposed. Hebrew school curricula were applied for Arab schools and students. The worst of all laws applied was the one called the "Absentees' Property Law". This law entitled the Israeli authorities to lay full hands on all movable and immovable properties of absentee Arabs. The so-called "absentee Arabs" included those working in one of the Arab countries or deserting after 5 June 1967. That illegal practice swallows a great deal of the Arab property in the area and is one of the means intended to be used to liquidate the Palestinians and the Palestine case.

60. The Israeli Cabinet has recently taken a decision to turn a newly built Arab hospital which was to accommodate patients from Jerusalem and the neighbouring villages into an Israeli police headquarters.

61. The Arabs of Jerusalem were mostly dependent on the tourist trade. In the past twenty years they succeeded in establishing over fifty hotels and developed a number of tourist agencies, souvenir industries and hundreds of tourist cars and pullman buses, employing over 2,000 employees in those trades. The building industry, with all its branches, was also progressing, recruiting into it about 6,000 employees. Other trades and industries employed about 4,000. The effects of the war, the closing of Arab banks and the confiscation of their cash money, the unbearable conditions imposed by the Israeli authorities for restoring their operations, the stoppage of the flood of cash investments and deposits sent by Palestinians working abroad, the continuous drop in the tourist industry and the closing down of Jerusalem Airport—all those factors have reduced Arab employment by more than 50 per cent. Both Arab investors and employees are suffering heavily and the result is serious and dangerous. As a result of all these economic and political pressures, over 8,000 persons have had to leave their city—Jerusalem—and cross the Jordan River.

62. What is more, merchants of the city sold their goods within almost the first month after the occupation. Israeli trade regulations force them to limit new purchases to articles and goods produced and manufactured mostly in Israel. They are finding themselves dragged under the Israeli national economy umbrella and automatically bound up with the expansionist policy of Israel. Arab wealth and capital are being absorbed and are vanishing in the ocean of Israeli rules and regulations. It is because of such measures and others that the Arabs feel insecure that their lives and property are in danger, that more signs of danger and expansion are to come and that what is Arab becomes Jewish and Israeli.

² See document S/PV.1421/Add.2.

63. I am taking the liberty of delivering two photostatic copies of two new Israeli plans which were disclosed and distributed in Jerusalem early last March.³

64. The first plan, marked Exhibit III, is a survey plan of the northern part of Jerusalem. In the centre of the plan there is a dark patch which represents the first area of land which the Israelis have selected for the construction of the first Israeli quarter to be established on the recently seized Arab lands.

65. The second plan, marked Exhibit IV, is, as you can readily discern, a town planning scheme of the site on which the first Israeli quarter will be constructed. The plan defines the roads, open spaces and building units. Those two plans have been extracted from an official Israeli pamphlet in Hebrew. I am not aware if the same document is available in Arabic or English for the benefit of the Arabs or others in the occupied territories. It is certain that the publication was originally issued in Hebrew on purpose for the benefit of the Israelis and nobody else. The document contains details of the housing project and methods of appropriating housing sites and building the housing units with long-term and low-interest loans. It is clearly stated that the price of each site is only nominal. Elsewhere in the document are examples of the application forms and advice about the possibility of completing the necessary transactions before the end of March 1968.

66. The lands concerned are part and parcel of Arab lands and properties in Arab Jerusalem. The Israelis seized these lands under the stress of military occupation. These lands were "seized" because the lands involved were pillaged and confiscated from their rightful and established owners as far back as 11 January 1968, in accordance with a so-called Expropriation Bill issued by the Israeli authorities. I present to you a copy of this Bill as an addition to the plans; it is marked Exhibit V.

67. The area of the land seized is 3,345 *dunums*—a *dunum* is equal to 1,000 square metres—and is roughly equal to 848 acres. During the Security Council meeting of 27 April 1968, the Israeli representative claimed that:

"Most of the land involved in the reconstruction projects is not Arab—, but Jewish-owned and public domain. [1416th meeting, para. 88.]

He further claimed that:

"The land records happen to be in Jerusalem, not in Amman." /Ibid./

On the other hand, the Israeli authorities in Jerusalem told another story. They said: "One third of the area belongs to Jewish individuals, one third to the Jordan Government and the last third to Arab individuals and corporations."

68. Both Israeli claims are unfounded and certainly untrue. Official records in the Department of Land Registry in Jerusalem, identical copies of which are available in Amman and London, show beyond any doubt that Jewish organizations and individuals do not own more than 250 *dunums*, or less than 8 per cent of the total area seized. The

Jordan Government owns less than 50 *dunums* and this is far less than 1 per cent, the remaining area, exceeding 3,000 *dunums*—or roughly 91 per cent—belongs to Arab individuals, families and companies in Jerusalem.

69. Israel seized these lands in order to build up a Jewish housing area; the initial project covers 600 *dunums* for about 2,500 housing units. It is reported that construction will be starting very soon.

70. The present Israeli project is obviously a part of an Israeli expansionist plan designed to build up a belt of Jewish houses, extending from the perimeter of the Jewish quarter in western Jerusalem and heading northeast through the heart of Arab lands and housing areas, with the clear purpose of setting up a fence or rather a dam to separate the Arabs of Jerusalem from their Arab brethren in adjoining villages and other Arab towns to the north of Jerusalem. This project will annul the Arab development plan, which the Arabs have been preparing for a number of years.

71. The map showing the plan and the land expropriated is also presented, as Exhibit VI.

72. The Israeli project will also contain the Arabs of Jerusalem in a limited space, which will ultimately reduce their numbers and afford Israel the opportunity to bring in new immigrants and make Jews the majority of the population in Arab Jerusalem in a few years.

73. The construction of the new Israeli quarter, and the other similar quarters which are intended to follow it, confirms and proves the anxiety and fears of the Arabs that Israeli leaders are planning and working for expansion, and that shows clearly and glaringly that their plea for peace, which they so frequently repeat, is nothing more than a cover for their real expansionist intentions. It is indeed, as time and events have proved, a hypocritical plea.

74. This Israeli project, like their other projects and designs, is most oppressive. It suffocates the attempts and endeavours being made by a number of peace-loving quarters to achieve peace for the area. It in fact impedes and destroys the mission of Mr. Gunnar Jarring the representative of the United Nations.

75. The Israeli project further shows beyond any doubt that Israel aims at defeating any just solution, in spite of the repeated allegations of its leaders that they co-operate with Mr. Jarring and support his mission.

76. The Arabs of Jerusalem have raised their voices against the seizure of these lands and branded the Israeli measures as a violation of the United Nations resolutions, of international law and of the Geneva Conventions.⁴ They confronted the Israeli authorities with a memorandum on 14 January 1968 protesting against this seizure and demanding its annulment. They also forwarded copies of this memorandum to the representatives of the foreign Governments residing in Jerusalem, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to his personal represen-

³ See document S/PV.1421/Add.1.

⁴ Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of war victims.

tative, Mr. Jarring. A copy of this memorandum is now being presented to you as Exhibit VII.

77. In addition, the proprietors of the lands concerned have made a similar protest. They totally rejected the seizure of the lands; and a copy of their protest is also presented to you as Exhibit VIII.

78. We consider the Israeli housing project and the Israeli insistence on carrying it out as fast as possible to be an act of extreme arrogance, calculated, as indeed it is, to disregard and show disdain for the resolutions of the United Nations and strongly infringe the rights of civilian Arab inhabitants. It is an act of aggression against the rights of a sovereign nation, Member of the United Nations.

79. We also see clearly in this project Israel's deliberate and determined policy to change the outlook and character of Jerusalem and consolidate Israel's territorial expansionist gains, which were brought about by aggression, as the Council is already aware.

80. Yesterday's military parade is another dagger directed at the core of our hearts and at the prestige of the United Nations. Every Arab in Jerusalem is threatened with being the next victim and every resident in Arab Jerusalem has but one choice: stay and live in misery and oppression, or leave.

81. The Arabs of Jerusalem raised their voices and protested against the parade. A copy of their protest is hereby presented to the Council as Exhibit IX. The Arab ladies of Jerusalem protested and demonstrated on 25 April 1968. Their demonstration was broken up by Israeli police forces. A copy of their protest, together with a set of nine photographs showing the mistreatment by the Israeli policemen, was presented to the Council by the Permanent Representative of Jordan, Mr. El-Farra, on 1 May 1968 [S/8568].

82. Last but not least, the Israeli authorities refused to implement the Council's resolution 237 (1967), unanimously adopted on 14 June 1967, calling upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities.

83. All the above-mentioned Israeli measures of desecration of Holy Places, of expropriation and annexation of Arab property and land, of confiscation of the so-called absentee property, of refusal to permit Arabs to go back to their houses in Jerusalem, of arresting and arbitrarily detaining thousands of Arabs, of expulsion of many dignitaries of Jerusalem against their will, of dynamiting and bulldozing Arab houses, of building new Jewish settlements within and around Jerusalem, and imposing harsh economic pressures—all these acts and measures are most oppressive; they are designed to change the identity and character of Jerusalem, to turn what is Arab into Jewish and Israeli, and to ensure that the Arab majority there becomes a minority. These unlawful Israeli procedures will continue and will gain momentum as long as the Israeli occupation of our Holy City and Arab territories

continues. The so-called "Land of Israel Movement" calls for the establishment of Jewish settlements, in what they call the "liberated area", as first priority. The motto of this movement is: "The land is ours if we will occupy it and build it up". That is exactly what the Israeli Government is engaging in, without saying it out loud.

84. The inhabitants of the Arab sector of Jerusalem and those of the west bank resolutely proclaim their opposition to all measures which the Israeli occupation authorities have taken and which those authorities regard as constituting a *fait accompli* not subject to appeal or reversal, namely, the "unification" of the two sectors of the City of Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty. They proclaim to the whole world that this annexation, sometimes camouflaged under the cloak of administrative measures, was carried out against their will and against their wishes.

85. We consider the Israeli acts of annexation, confiscation and Jewish settlement in Arab land as acts of extreme aggression, calculated, as indeed they are, to disregard and strongly infringe the rights of Arab civilian inhabitants.

86. The Arabs still have faith in the United Nations, but for how long this will continue is another question.

87. Mr. President, members of the Council, thank you.

Mr. El-Khatib withdrew.

88. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Before commencing my statement on the subject now under discussion, allow me, Mr. President, to take this opportunity to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Malik, of the Soviet Union. Much has already been said about the exemplary manner in which Mr. Malik conducted our proceedings during his term as President of the Council. It is difficult indeed to add anything to the words of praise of my colleagues except perhaps to say that in displaying his competence, patience and fairness, he has set a high mark for future Presidents of the Council.

89. Having said that, I wish to express a few words of welcome to you, Sir, on your assumption of this high office. Your high qualities of statesmanship, your frequently displayed eloquence and ability as a debater, coupled with an excellent sense of humour, will certainly help us, we trust, in achieving success in the arduous tasks facing us.

90. I wish to express my delegation's satisfaction that, in the very difficult conditions prevailing, Mr. El-Khatib, Mayor of Jerusalem, could find it possible to come to the United Nations to give us a first-hand account of the situation in Jerusalem, thus making a highly valuable contribution to our discussion. We have indeed been gratified by his important and lucid statement and we were deeply impressed by his personal serenity.

91. The Hungarian delegation has already set forth its views on various occasions on the problem of Jerusalem. The latest of these statements was made at the 1417th meeting of the Council. We have stated clearly that the status of Jerusalem was regulated by an international instrument, the General Armistice Agreement, which re-

mains valid until modified or suspended by the two signatories, Jordan and Israel. We have also pointed out that no unilateral renunciation is provided for in the text of the Agreement.

92. Israel, which has embarked on the road of a unilateral renunciation of the Armistice Agreement, is thus not acting in good faith and is violating the letter and the spirit of that instrument. It is to be regretted that in so doing it enjoys the support of a great Power, the leaders of which not long ago openly declared their support in maintaining the territorial integrity of all Middle Eastern States.

93. To effect the changes that it desires in the status of Jerusalem, Israel has used force. It is by means of war that Israel has tried to bring about the annexation of Arab Jerusalem. This is not the approach of the Charter of the United Nations; it is the approach of what a widely read American publication called "a Modern Sparta"; it is the approach of a militaristic régime which is bent on dictating territorial changes to its neighbours by the use of naked force. It is an approach with which membership of our Organization is incompatible.

94. When asked to explain its anachronistic approach to the territorial integrity of its neighbours, and thus to Arab Jerusalem, the Government of Israel puts forward at least three sets of arguments. First, it says that Jordan has no right to Arab Jerusalem because Jordan, so it says, has acquired control over it through military conquest. One marvels at the lack of consistency in this statement when one recalls that Israel claims rights to Arab Jerusalem on the very same basis.

95. In denying Jordan's rights in Jerusalem, Israel is in effect trying to invalidate an abiding international agreement, namely, the General Armistice Agreement. Israel, its argumentation continues, had acquired rights to Jerusalem on historic grounds by the fact that Jerusalem was the capital of a State which existed 2,000 years ago. Israel apparently expects us to take this argument seriously. But one is bound to ask: is it an argument at all? How about the other peoples who controlled Jerusalem before or after the Jewish State? What are the criteria for choosing Israel as the allegedly rightful owner of the city? Is Israel prepared to apply this test to determine the status of other territories? What would happen to all—and I repeat all—frontiers were such standards to be applied to determine the territory of modern States? Or is it the contention of Israel that one set of rules applies to Israel, and another to all other sovereign States? It is sufficient to raise these questions to see the whole burden of the Israeli assertions.

96. A second argument which Israel feels militates in favour of its contention is the criticism which it levels against the conditions which, allegedly, characterized the conditions in Arab Jerusalem before the June aggression. Apart from the unfounded allegations advanced in its favour, this line of argumentation is first of all a clear-cut case of interference in the domestic affairs of another Member State—a practice to which the representative of Israel has resorted increasingly in the course of our discussions.

97. He is obviously hoping that others, unlike him, will respect the Charter and abstain from quoting the numerous cases of discrimination, oppression and murderous assaults on political figures which are so well known in Israel's political life.

98. But let us examine this so-called argument. Is it the contention of the Israeli Government that a Member of the United Nations which is critical of the conditions prevailing in another Member State is entitled to annex that territory to improve those conditions? Does Israel recognize the right of others to invade other countries for similar reasons, or is this a privilege that is apparently reserved to Israel alone? I do not think that these questions need any answer.

99. Finally, Israel contends that Jerusalem belongs to it because, as the representative of Israel said at the Council meeting on 27 April last, "For 3,000 years Jerusalem has been the focal point of Jewish history, civilization and religion." [1416th meeting, para. 91.]

100. In reply, I wish to quote the representative of France who, speaking on Jerusalem, correctly said: "The main point is still the question of sovereignty." [1417th meeting, para. 51.]

101. In this connexion I feel compelled to say a few words on the attempts of the representative of Israel to transform this Council into a forum of religions. Time and again, we have heard the Israeli representative say he is speaking on behalf of the Jewish people, refer to Jewish blood, and so on. I find these references absolutely out of place in this Council. We represent no religions in this Organization. We represent States in which people with various religious or other convictions live. No one has the right here to speak on behalf of religions, especially if the members of certain religious communities have, as in fact they do have, different nationalities.

102. We thus categorically reject the attempt of the representative of Israel to speak here on behalf of what he calls "the Jewish People". It is, to take only one example, for the Hungarian delegation, and the Hungarian delegation alone, to speak here on behalf of the Hungarian citizens of Jewish faith, and no one is entitled to arrogate this right of ours. I would add that my delegation has no knowledge whatsoever of any other Government having given authorization to the representative of Israel to represent their citizens of the Jewish religion.

103. The representative of Israel speaks here on behalf of the State of Israel, and not a religion. Instead of approaching the issues of war and peace from a position of mediaeval religious exclusiveness, we have to apply, in our quest for peace, the general guidelines of international life, international law, treaties and agreements, including, first of all, the United Nations Charter, the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and, in this specific case, the Armistice Agreement, the Covenant on Human Rights, and so on.

104. Now that I have dealt with the transparent arguments put forward by Israel to justify its policy of conquest in Jerusalem and elsewhere, the question naturally emerges: what kind of approach is needed to find a political solution

to the Middle East crisis? In his statement before the Council on 1 May 1968 the representative of the United States said that what we need is:

"... 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" [1418th meeting, para. 92].

105. I feel bound to ask: Did the United States Government feel that conciliation, impartiality and magnanimity were the orders of the day when in 1941 it was the United States of America—and not the Arab States—which was the victim of sneak attacks? Did the United States practise impartiality and magnanimity when the Japanese invaders occupied its territories and instituted a reign of terror against its populations? Everyone knows that the United States did nothing of the kind. Instead, it resisted the aggressors. In this connexion one feels compelled to ask: Where does the Charter of the United Nations ask for impartiality and magnanimity when a Member State has been attacked and its territories occupied? Is it the duty of other Members to call for surrender in the face of the aggressor, or is it rather to give support to the victims of aggression? Does it help if we try to equate the aggressor with the victim, in a false spirit of impartiality?

106. We would expect the United States, a permanent member of this Council, to abide by the resolutions of the Council. The United States voted for this Council's resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which, *inter alia*, demanded the withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from territories occupied during the conflict.

107. The United States Government would do a great favour to peace and security in the Middle East if, instead of providing excuses for the Israeli invaders, it would put its considerable influence behind the principle of the independence and territorial integrity of all Middle Eastern States. Instead of supporting Israel in its continuation of the occupation of other peoples' lands and its violation of the human rights of the peoples of the occupied territories, the United States should impress upon Israel the need to comply with our resolutions, including those relating to Jerusalem.

108. During the past days the Council has been kept busy with the issues raised by the provocative military parade organized by Israel in Jerusalem in violation of the Armistice Agreement, General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) and Security Council resolution 250 (1968) of 27 April 1968. Yesterday the Security Council took a decision which in fact amounted to the condemnation of Israel for holding a military parade on 2 May 1968 in disregard of the decision unanimously adopted by the Council on 27 April 1968. The parade was only the last in a chain of Israeli defiance of our Organization, and this underlines once more Israel's consistent policy of placing itself above the law of all nations. Israel continues to profit from its membership of this Organization, without recognizing any obligation deriving from it.

109. The Israeli policy of non-compliance with United Nations resolutions is perhaps most clearly seen in the

policy of Israel in Jerusalem. We have just heard the very informative statement by the venerable Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. El-Khatib, on this subject. My delegation has already had occasion to point out how all United Nations resolutions on this matter are being flouted by Israel. The systematic demolition of entire quarters, the blowing-up of houses, the forced settlement of Israeli citizens in the Jordanian part of the city, the deportation of leading Jordanian citizens, and, in fact, of masses of the Jordanian population—all these testify to the fact that Israel is actively engaged in the illegal annexation of east Jerusalem.

110. The provocative parade which, by all available accounts, was intended to be a massive show of military might, was part and parcel of this policy. All freedom-loving persons, recalling the tragic spectacle of similar parades of intimidation in occupied lands, know how to assess the significance of this challenge thrown in the face of the United Nations and of all civilized mankind.

111. The policy of Israel in Jerusalem and elsewhere is one of substituting military might and terror for the Charter of the United Nations. This is an anachronistic approach, as Israel may still learn to the regret of its people.

112. The delegation of Hungary is convinced that the clue to a political settlement of the problems of the Middle East is to be found in resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. That resolution, in line with the two resolutions of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], excludes territorial aggrandizement. Compliance by Israel with those resolutions and the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from Jerusalem are the only possible way to find a satisfactory solution to the problem of Jerusalem and of peace in the Middle East.

113. The PRESIDENT: I wish to say a word of gratitude to the representative of Hungary for his personal reference to me. I hope only that I can justify that generous reference, and I hope, as I am sure he hopes, that I shall do better as I go on.

114. I now call on the next speaker, the representative of Israel.

115. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, ever since the Roman conquest in the first century of this era, history seems to have reserved a distinct destiny for the Hebrew people, my people: oppression, denial of rights, martyrdom. The Prophet Jeremiah said:

"... the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together. . . .

"All that found them devoured them; all their adversaries said, We are not guilty . . .".⁵

116. We have survived through defeat and enslavement by Imperial Rome, through the rebellions against the foreign conquerors, through the centuries of dispersion of the people and occupation of the land by a succession of invaders, through the massacres of the Crusaders, through

⁵ Jeremiah, Chapter 50:4 and 7.

the *autos-da-fe* of the Inquisition, the pogroms, the blood-libels, the holocausts. We have survived and regained our national freedom and re-established our sovereignty in our land. Yet, Jeremiah's prophecy is not of the past; some still try to devour us and then say, "We are not guilty". In certain parts of Europe the Dark Ages are not over for the Jewish people. In the Arab States the spirit of the Damascus blood-libel is still alive. This is the spirit that shapes and guides Arab policy toward Israel. This is the spirit that dominates the Arab attitude in the United Nations. Today they have chosen Jerusalem as the object of their blood-libel—Jerusalem, sanctified and revered as Rome and Mecca are.

117. There is an old Hebrew saying: "Ten measures of beauty came into the world; Jerusalem received nine measures, and the rest of the world one. Ten measures of suffering came into the world; Jerusalem received nine, and the rest of the world one."

118. However, whether in bliss and beauty or in suffering, Jerusalem has always remained Israel's eternal capital.

119. By the time it was conquered in the year 70 of the present era by the legions of Rome, Jerusalem had served as Israel's capital for more than a thousand years. Though defeated, the people of Israel refused to be subdued, and in the year 132 rose in revolt against the Roman invader. Jerusalem was freed and the nation's leader, Bar-Kochba, set his government up in the capital. He struck coins inscribed "Jerusalem" and "Year 1 of the liberty of Israel". He succeeded in holding out for three years until the weight of the Roman cohorts overcame the Jewish people again.

120. Then followed a long period of Roman and Byzantine rule. In 614 the Jewish population helped Persia to dislodge Byzantium, and for a while Jews governed Jerusalem again. Then, in the year 638, Jerusalem was captured by the Arabs who had come from Arabia. Jerusalem was under Arab domination till the year 1077, but the Arab conquerors never made it a seat of government, not even of provincial administration. They ruled the area from Damascus, from Baghdad, from Ramle. In 1077 the Seljuk Turks conquered the land and the city of Jerusalem. It never returned to Arab rule again except for the nineteen years of grim Jordanian reign in part of the city.

121. In 1099 the Crusaders succeeded in wresting Jerusalem from the Turks. They put the entire Jewish and Moslem population to the sword. They maintained their power, except for a brief interval during the time of Salah ed-Din, until 1244, when they lost out to the Tatars. These were followed by the Mamelukes, who, in turn, were conquered by the Ottoman Turks in 1516.

122. Like the Arabs, neither the Mamelukes nor the Turks ruled from Jerusalem. Under the Mamelukes the seat of provincial government was Gaza; under the Turks—Acre. In 1917 the Turks were ousted from the land of Israel and from Jerusalem by the allied forces which included a Jewish legion fighting under Israel's colours.

123. Jerusalem has never ceased to be part of the Jewish saga. It was no more Arab by virtue of the Arab conquest than Turkish when the Turks occupied it or British when

the British ruled in it. Arab annals record the Arab conquest of Jerusalem. Jewish history is permeated with the memories of Jerusalem's defence, the desperate attempts to preserve its Jewishness, the destruction of the Temple, the fast and mourning that the Jewish people have observed ever since on the ninth day of the month of Ab.

124. Jerusalem's name is Hebrew. "Yerushalem", the City of Peace. One cannot separate Jerusalem from Hebrew history, martyrdom and redemption. However, it is with profound respect that we recognize the universal interests in Jerusalem. Jerusalem is venerated by three great religions and all three share in the city's glory. The people are the city, and the Jews have never left Jerusalem. Even after the most sanguinary of massacres they came back to it—the heart of Judaism—again and again, to heal the city's wounds and rebuild its ruins.

125. Jerusalem repaid the love and loyalty of its people. It remained for ever faithful to it. It served as the capital of one nation, and one nation alone—the capital of the Jewish people.

126. Since statistics of Jerusalem's population have become available it has been evident that Jews have for generations constituted a majority in the city. In 1844, of a total population of 15,510, there were in Jerusalem 7,120 Jews, 5,000 Moslems, and 3,390 Christians. In 1876 there were 12,000 Jews, 7,560 Moslems, and 5,470 Christians. In 1896 the Jewish population rose to 28,112, the Moslems numbered 8,560, the Christians 8,748. The number of Jews in Jerusalem reached 40,000 by 1905, in a total population of 60,000; the number of Moslems declined to 7,000. In 1910 there were 47,400 Jews, 9,800 Moslems, 16,400 Christians. By 1931 the Jewish inhabitants of Jerusalem numbered 51,222; there were 19,894 Moslems, and 19,335 Christians. In 1948 Jerusalem was a city of 100,000 Jews, 40,000 Moslems and 25,000 Christians. On the eve of last June's hostilities, 200,000 Jews, 54,903 Moslems, 12,646 Christians resided in Jerusalem. Today Jerusalem, a living city again in its freedom and unity, is the hearth of more than 200,000 Jews, about 60,000 Arabs, and 6,000 of other nationalities.

127. What precept of law, what tenet of justice, what principle of morality would deprive Jerusalem's citizens—Jews and Arabs alike—of their rights to the happiness and beauty and inspiration of their city as a whole? Why should those who have treasured Jerusalem for 3,000 years as their chiefest joy be shorn of the fullness of it? Why should Jerusalem's Jewish and Arab inhabitants be despoiled of their heritage in the city's unity? Does a conquest in defiance of the United Nations, a nineteen-year occupation unrecognized by the nations of the world including the Arab States themselves, give Jordan the right to oppose Jerusalem's revival in integrity and radiance? Does the presence of 54,000 Moslems and 12,000 Christians, in addition to the more than 200,000 Jews necessitate a bisection of the city's body?

128. King Solomon's biblical judgement between the two contesting women cries out to us through the ages. Could a real mother ever agree to have her baby cut in two? Could a people ever accept that its eternal capital be divided? There are many cities in the world with large national or

religious minorities. Have such communities ever claimed that their cities should be artificially divided and separate public services set up for them?

129. Jerusalem has existed for thousands of years, and it was only during the brief nightmare of Jordanian occupation that part of it was carved out and wrested away from the city and its people. A crime that the world witnessed in silence, a transgression that brought death and destruction, terror and desecration to Jerusalem—how can Jordan now come and demand approval of it? History, justice and faith will never pardon the nineteen years of darkness, profanation and ruin in eastern Jerusalem.

130. In preceding meetings of the Security Council I have described fully the Jordanian reign of vandalism. The ruins of the Jewish quarter, the tombstones torn up on the Mount of Olives, the grim tragedy of the humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus, the hundreds of dead and wounded in 1948, in 1967 and in the intervening years—all these will not allow us to forget. Nor can Jordanian distortions, born in hate and bloodthirst, distort the reality of today. The entire world knows what the Jordanians were preparing to bring down upon the Jews of Jerusalem had the fortunes of war gone differently. The orders to the Jordanian army, such as those to the Reserve Battalion of the 27th Brigade, to kill all Jews in captured areas, are a matter of public record.

131. The textbooks teaching Arab children that it is a virtue to hate and kill Jews; the school posters, the newspaper cartoons showing how to do it; the blood-chilling cries broadcast over the radio, "Kill! Kill! Kill! Butcher! Butcher the Jew!"—all this will for ever be remembered, not only by my people but by humanity as a whole.

132. Let not the Jordanians come now and speak of Israeli behaviour in terms of the sanguinary bloodbath they were preparing for us. The facts are there for all to see. Let others bear witness.

133. In the January 1968 issue of the Franciscan Order's publication "La Terre Sainte" we read:

"We must voice our opinion on the taking of Jerusalem . . . It is not true that a massacre of innocents was the price for the safety of the Holy Places. In Paris, too, during the Liberation on 25 August 1944, there were people killed—women, children, unfortunate civilians—but no one dared say that spilt blood has saved Notre Dame or Montmartre. . . . Every war has its horrors, its victims—and on both sides. . . ."

134. The Mayor of Hebron, Sheikh Muhammed Ali Jabari, a former Minister of Education of Jordan, proclaimed on 30 July 1967:

"I swear by Allah that no Israel soldiers harmed any of our residents . . . Before the war began we expected a mutual slaughter between our people and the Israel army. You can imagine how pleasant was our surprise on the 8th of June when we discovered that the victorious army was a well-organized, disciplined body like the armies of the West."

135. The situation soon after the cease-fire was described in the report submitted by the Secretary-General on 12 September 1967. The findings of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Ernesto Thalmann, based on a visit to the area as far back as last August, include the following:

"... the Personal Representative was struck by the great activity in the streets of the city. . . .

"Uniforms were few and weapons fewer. . . . The picture of the crowd in the Old City was dominated by the tourists. Arabs and Jews were mingling. . . .

"Most of the hotels had reopened. Before dawn and during the day the muezzin could be heard, as well as the church bells.

"The Arab personnel of the Old City was absorbed in the equivalent departments in the Israel municipality. . . .

"It was reported that from the time that access from Israel to east Jerusalem had become free, the shopkeepers there had been unusually active, selling at the rate of 2 million Israel pounds a day in the first month and at a steady rate of 1 million Israel pounds a day at present. . . . Service establishments were reported to have greatly increased their activities. The workshops, after an initial period of dislocation, were said to have all reverted to routine and normality and to be going through a process of adjustment to the new marketing conditions. . . .

"The Personal Representative was told that the policy will be to pay Arabs employed in Israel enterprises salaries equal to those received by their Israel counterparts. As regards Arab enterprises, salaries would be calculated according to the economic solvency of the enterprise. Salaries would be raised gradually so as not to disrupt the Arab economy and to allow it to adjust to the conditions prevailing in Israel. . . .

"At present over 2,000 workers from east Jerusalem, including some 400 municipal employees, are employed in the Jewish sector of the economy. . . ."⁶

136. I should like to add that an invitation was extended to Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib and members of his council to join the Jerusalem Municipal Council. Mr. El-Khatib, for reasons which will become obvious in the course of my statement, refused.

137. Since then the situation has improved. The public services are operating normally. In all of east Jerusalem, school studies are running smoothly. In all private schools and those of Moslem institutions there has been no change in curriculum. In municipal schools the curriculum current in Israel's Arab schools, which include studies in Arab history and Islam, is followed. The minds of children are no longer poisoned by hatred of their neighbours as had been the case under Jordanian rule. All Moslem institutions, such as the Sharia courts, the Waqf administration, the Red

⁶ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1967, document S/8146, paras. 19-21, 29, 67, 92 and 93.

Crescent, charitable organizations, and hospitals are pursuing their activities without hindrance, under the same leadership, with the exception of one person. This applies, of course, to Christian institutions as well.

138. This how Bishop Dom Jose Gonçalves da Costa of Brazil paints the situation in Jerusalem in the *Jornal do Brasil* of 30 September 1967:

"For many hours I walked through the streets of Old Jerusalem and watched the faces of the merchants and peddlars; I went into bars and into shops. They all looked lively and very much satisfied with the excellent business they were doing. I felt no signs of anxiety or hate on the part of the Arabs in Jerusalem, Jericho and Bethlehem.

"The Government of Israel immediately put the municipal services of the great City of Jerusalem on a joint basis. There is no doubt that the ridiculous situation of before the war must not recur, where a street dividing two countries passes through a single city, and soldiers armed to their teeth faced each other from the rooftops, looking at each other with hate. The Mandelbaum Gate, of which little is left now, was a serious obstacle for Christian pilgrims."

139. The atmosphere of the city was best reflected when the Christian communities, joined by thousands of tourists from abroad, including visitors from the Arab States, celebrated recently the Easter festival. The Moslem community celebrated the holidays of Id el-Fitr and Id el-Adkha in accordance with its own traditions.

140. On 27 April 1968 the Latin Custos of the Holy Land wrote:

"Thanks be to God, pilgrimages to the Christian Shrines are increasing in number from day to day, and pilgrims make their visits as they did a year ago. Only occasionally they are advised, though not prevented by force, to omit the visit to the River Jordan, on account of some danger of shooting in that zone.

"All the services (I mean religious services) are going on as usual in the Christian Churches. It would be enough to mention how orderly everything was during the recent celebrations of Holy Week and Easter.

"As I had the occasion to state on previous occasions, practically none of our Holy Places and churches were damaged or destroyed during the Six Day War. In one or two places minor damage was caused, because the fight went on in the immediate vicinity of the church or monastery. One place which suffered quite a bit was our monastery on Mount Zion.

"What I have stated so far are facts that everybody can check. Of course a war is a war; yet in general we must be grateful to Almighty God that the Holy Places were preserved from destruction, and almost in all cases from damage, even small. I suppose that all can see for themselves in what conditions are our churches. And again I should say 'Thanks be to God!' that Christians and pilgrims have been able to continue their divine

worship in our churches, practically without any break since last June."

141. An abusive reference was made here to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. A reference was made to the burglary of the jewelled crown from the church shortly after the hostilities. Mention however was conveniently omitted of the fact that the crown was recovered from the thieves and restored to the church in a ceremony of reverence joined by many. I believe the Koran says: "He shall not prosper who deviseth lies." That applies not only to the distortion concerning the burglary mentioned.

142. At the 1417th meeting I brought before the Security Council the testimony of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch, the Armenian Patriarch, Protestant theologians and others, all confirming that the situation in the city is peaceful, the conditions of the Holy Places satisfactory, the relations between the various communities harmonious.

143. A manifesto on a united Jerusalem by America's leading Christian theologians, published in *The New York Times* on 12 July, stated *inter alia*:

"During the past twenty years the City of David has experienced an artificial division. This has resulted in a denial of access to their Holy Places for all Jews and for Israeli Arabs of the Moslem faith. It has also severely limited accessibility to Christian shrines for Israeli Christians. This injustice, we must confess, did not elicit significant protests on the part of the religious leaders of the world.

"We see no justification in proposals which seek once again to destroy the unity which has been restored to Jerusalem. This unity is the natural condition of the Holy City, and now once again assures the world's religious peoples the freedom of worship at the shrines which remain the spiritual centers of their faith."

This manifesto was signed by theologians representing the entire spectrum of American churches.

144. The Moslem Kadi of Jaffa, Sheikh Toufiq Assliya, summarized his impressions of united Jerusalem as follows:

"We prayed today with our Moslem brethren of Jerusalem in the blessed Al Aqsa Mosque. This is a great day for us to be able to pray at the site for which we were yearning for many years. I pray to the Almighty that He may bestow peace upon our region.

"We are convinced", he went on to say, "that these Holy Places continue to be closely guarded, as they were before. From here we send our blessings to all our Moslem brethren and request of them that they be reassured in the knowledge that the Holy Places are in faithful hands. Let it be known to every Moslem in the world that religious freedom, which we have enjoyed since the establishment of the State of Israel, will continue forever."

145. These are significant testimonies of non-Jewish leaders. They leave little doubt as to the true situation in Jerusalem.

146. I should like, however, to emphasize again Israel's policy as elaborated in Mr. Abba Eban's letter to the Secretary-General:

"...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./

147. What are the basic complaints of the Jordan Government? First of all, it apparently takes exception to Israel's efforts to ensure not only the welfare of the population of the entire city but also its security. There is, for instance, the case of Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib. Mr. El-Khatib was an appointee of the Jordanian Government to the post of Mayor of eastern Jerusalem, not an elected mayor. He was a member of the Preparatory Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization led by the notorious Ahmed Shukairy, the man who last May declared that not a single Jew would remain alive after the Arab attack against Israel. Mr. El-Khatib remains a member of that organization's National Council. As an agent of the Jordanian Government, which on 5 June 1967 rejected Israel's call for peace and launched the attack against Israel and in particular west Jerusalem, Mr. El-Khatib continued to promote tension and public unrest after the establishment of the cease-fire. He maintained contact with the Jordanian Government and acted as an intermediary for the transmission of directives and instructions from Amman and for the transfer and distribution of funds for the purpose of promoting breaches of public order. Realizing that he failed to enjoy public support, he increasingly tried to revert to illicit pressure and threats against local inhabitants. We understand the displeasure of the Jordan Government that such activities have been terminated and Mr. El-Khatib was ordered to cross the cease-fire line.

148. The same measure had to be taken in respect of three other persons who had been pursuing similar activities. If one recalls the number of demonstrations, the suppression of riots by force, the arrests of hundreds and the banishment of scores of persons from east Jerusalem during Jordanian rule, one realizes how limited the steps taken by Israel are in comparison. In any event, the Jewish as well as the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem cannot be expected to

tolerate within their midst elements which are intent on pursuing their goals of aggression and hostility instead of working for understanding and peace.

149. Then there are the Jordanian allegations regarding urban development, slum removal, clearance of ruins and new construction. This applies to three particular projects. The first one is the plan to develop the area of the Jewish quarter from its western edge to the Western Wall. This is the area destroyed by the Jordanians during their 1948 onslaught on Jerusalem and immediately thereafter and includes the houses in the Maghrabi quarter adjacent to the Wall, a district which the Jordan authorities allowed to deteriorate into a slum.

150. A delegation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization visited this area in 1960. The annual report of the Director-General of UNESCO for that year emphasized the danger of leaving the area in such a condition. The report stated *inter alia*:

"There should be no deception about the necessity of large-scale future improvements to prevent parts of the Old City becoming ever-increasing slums."

151. In 1963 the Brown Engineering International submitted a report to the Jordanian authorities stressing the need for urban development.

152. For example, recommendation No. 5 of the report reads: "Construction of shell public housing units to facilitate the clearance and reconstruction of deteriorated houses in the Old City." Recommendation No. 6 reads: "Reconstruction of destroyed areas along lines similar to the original." Recommendation No. 2 reads: "Removal of temporary structures in the courtyards of the Old City, after a rehousing programme has provided living space for the inhabitants of these structures in public housing units." All—I repeat "all"—the inhabitants affected by this project have been provided with alternative housing by the Israel authorities.

153. A second area is a complex of about 3,345 *dunums*—or about 800 acres—in and around the Hadassah Medical Center and the Hebrew University compound on Mount Scopus stretching from there through vacant land westward. Here, in addition to the rehabilitation of the humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus and the construction of the Truman Centre for the Advancement of Peace, new housing construction is planned on empty land for Jews and Arabs. The development of this area is based on a master plan prepared by a British engineer, Mr. Kendall, in 1946, who was engaged for that purpose by the Mandatory authorities well before the Jordanian occupation. Moreover the Brown Engineering International recommended specifically housing developments in this very area.

154. The third urban development project concerns the area of the Jewish village of Neveh Ya'acov in the northern part of east Jerusalem. This village was razed to the ground by the Jordanian Army in 1948.

155. I reiterate: most of the land in question is Jewish property and public domain. No photo-montage charts, no

allegations made here away from the records can change this fact. All private claimants would receive compensation. Indeed, this is the fact that necessitated the announcement concerning acquisition of the land and the intent to compensate private owners.

156. The Jordanian Government is apparently not satisfied with the destruction it has brought upon the City. According to Jordan the destruction, the desecration, the humiliation must not be touched by anyone, it must remain Amman's forever. The Book of Kings in the Bible states: "Thus saith the Lord: Hast Thou killed, and also taken possession?"

157. This is what we ask of Jordan today. Is it not enough that you have shattered, killed and destroyed? Do you also want to take possession? Should our synagogues remain ruined and defiled? Should the tombstones of our forefathers continue to serve as stepping stones and pavements? Must the Hebrew University and Hadassah hospital on Mount Scopus remain paralysed in squalor? Should construction stop in the City? Should slums remain uncleared and gardens not planted? All this only because the lust of war and bloodshed and annihilation still hovers over the region?

158. Is there any juridical technicality, any private claim that would be allowed anywhere in the world to stand in the way of urban reconstruction and improvement? Why should we allow this to be the case in efforts to heal the wounds inflicted on Jerusalem?

159. Israel's aim remains peace with its neighbours. Israel shall continue to pursue it steadfastly. It is convinced that this aim can be attained. It is certain that it will bring vital benefits to all nations of the Middle East.

160. If there is to be progress toward understanding and agreement, active warfare must cease. If the nations of the Middle East are to move toward a peaceful settlement, warfare by terror, warfare by threat and warfare in the international organs must stop. We have faced acrimony in the Security Council, in the General Assembly and in other organs of the United Nations for twenty years. For the good of our peoples we must not continue on this course. Their interest lies on the road to peaceful agreement.

161. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

162. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): The Security Council started its meeting this afternoon with a procedural debate. Of course as a non-member of the Security Council I had no right to discuss procedure. But now that I have taken the floor to speak on my complaint, I am certainly entitled to refer to a question which at this stage is a question of substance. When I formally requested the issue of an invitation to the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, to be heard by the Council, I made it very clear that I was requesting an invitation to the Mayor of Jerusalem. Certainly it followed that the consultation, unless the request—which was indivisible—were amended, would be based solely on my request. My delegation knows of no amendment to or change in my request—and I take it that the United Kingdom did not amend my request. In

that case the President had no right to consult on anything but my request, which was indivisible. I am sure that this was the subject of the consultation, because the fourteen members of the Council—which were among the ninety-nine Members of the Assembly that voted for the resolutions calling for no change in the status of Jerusalem—certainly would accept my request as being in conformity with the decision of the Assembly. I say that, Mr. President, because your statement was not very clear to me, but at a later stage I saw that it was my request that had been the basis of your consultation.

163. Having said this, I now turn to the many distortions we heard this afternoon from Mr. Tekoah. It is not the first time that Mr. Tekoah has taken the floor to inject something irrelevant. In fact, for a while I thought I was sitting in a synagogue listening to the preaching of Mr. Tekoah. Of course, on the question of a synagogue or church or mosque, I can answer in the same terms, bringing in the Old and the New Testament, the Bible and the Koran, but I do not think that this forum, this august body, is meeting to hear preaching.

164. This forum is meeting not to consider history but to determine rights. No matter how Mr. Tekoah attempts to distort it, the issue is very clear. Can the Israelis acquire territory by force? Is force the criteria or is the Charter the criteria? That is the issue and the only issue before the Security Council. The Council has before it a complaint by Jordan based on General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V). They were adopted by 99 votes to none, with only 2 abstentions—those of the United States of America and Israel. Now, the Security Council is meeting to consider violations of those two resolutions and is called upon to take action vis-à-vis the continued violations. That is the only issue before the Council, and I beg the Council not to permit, and I hope that you, Mr. President, will not permit—I know that you are very careful about procedure—any foreign substance to be injected into our deliberations.

165. What is before you is a clear and simple question. And let me remind you, Sir, that you have answered this question—by "you" I mean the fifteen members of the Security Council—when, on 22 November 1967, in resolution 242 (1967), you decided unanimously that the Council

"Affirms that the fulfilment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace . . . which should include the application of . . . the following principles: (i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict".

166. Why did the Council decide that? The Council stated the following in the preamble of that resolution:

"Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace . . ."—

"The inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war". That is before the Council, and that is the problem I am bringing to the Council.

167. The Council has heard the elected Mayor of Jerusalem. I will have more to say about the fabrications of

Mr. Tekoah on Monday, but I want to assure the Council that when Mr. Tekoah said that Mr. El-Khatib was an appointee he was not stating a fact. All members of the Municipal Council were elected. Of course, according to our laws, the Government then appoints one of them as the Mayor. But he was elected by the people.

168. We have heard a great deal about this campaign of hate, which is repeated time and time again. I know what is behind it. It is not meant for the Council. The Council has the facts, has the proof, has the documents; it has the documents submitted this afternoon by the Mayor of Jerusalem. I hope that these will also be made part of the documents—I do not know in what form—of the Security Council. They are going to be of great guidance and help to the Council. They are authentic. They rebut the charges and fabrications of Mr. Tekoah. The Council will find them helpful.

169. Why is it that we are hearing of this campaign of hate? It is simply because Mr. Tekoah is aiming at achieving two purposes: first, to confuse the issue, and secondly, to use this forum for fund-raising in the United States of America. I have already stated what the issues are, and no fabrication should be permitted to waste the time of the Council.

170. The approach of Mr. Tekoah to the question is not unique in the history of aggressions. The memory of Europe and nazism is still fresh in the minds of members around this table. Then the Nazis used to follow and adopt the very same line, saying that everything was nice and peaceful and that life was very happy there. Also the idea of unity was used—before Mr. Tekoah—by the Nazis. When Hitler occupied Czechoslovakia and Poland, what did he say? He also said: “Now our unity has been accomplished.” This is not something new. Mr. Tekoah is simply adopting a policy used by a similar—identical, I would say—ideology. I say “identical” because let us look at the facts. Do not both of them, nazism and Zionism, hold to the concept of race? That is factor number one. Secondly, do they not both hold to the concept of supremacy: Nazis supreme, Zionists the chosen people? Is not this second factor identical between the two ideologies? Thirdly, do they not both work for *Lebensraum*? Zionism wants a part of the Arab world as an accommodation for the in-gathering of the exiles. Fourthly, do they not both have a fifth column—pressure groups and a fifth column? Pressure groups are performing miracles. They are using every means under the sun, especially in election years, to bring about something that is threatening the very existence of this great body of the United Nations, the Security Council. Pressure groups are working not in the interest of the State of which they are supposed to be citizens, but for a foreign

country. And if the price is the Security Council, pressure groups do not mind.

171. I say this because I have in mind the League of Nations. The League of Nations died because of a similar act of aggression, and the victim was Ethiopia. The failure of the Council brought about the end of the Council.

172. Now the Security Council is facing a challenge and it has one single issue before it. I beg members to confine their consideration and discussion to this one issue. There should be no room for publicity, no room for cheap propaganda.

173. The PRESIDENT: I have no further speakers on my list for this evening—

174. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I apologize for interrupting you, Mr. President. In the course of his noteworthy and duly noted statement, Mr. El-Khatib, the Mayor of Jerusalem, referred to certain documents. The Jordanian representative said that those documents should be brought to the notice of members of the Council. Therefore, in accordance with established practice, my delegation would ask you to make the necessary arrangements for the documents to be annexed to the verbatim records of this Council meeting.

175. The PRESIDENT: I had asked to see copies of the documents referred to in the statement we heard today. They are extensive and include a book which I think it would be difficult to circulate with the verbatim record. But if it is the wish of the Council, I shall consult the Secretary-General as to how we can arrange for the distribution of the documents by the most convenient and rapid means available.⁷

176. Does any other representative wish to express his views?

177. Since no one else wishes to speak, I take it that the Council has no objection and indeed wishes me to go forward in consultation with the Secretary General as I suggested. I shall proceed accordingly.

178. I have consulted members of the Council about our next meeting, and it is the wish of those who have expressed an opinion as to date and time that we should resume our debate on Monday morning, 6 May, at 11 o'clock. Since I hear no objection, it is so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

⁷ See documents S/PV.1421/Add.1 and 2.

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. Получите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или напишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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