

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1422nd MEETING: 6 MAY 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1422)	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-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 6 May 1968, at 11 a.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/1422)

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 seats 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 Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to make a short report to the Council on the request made by the Ambassador of Algeria for the circulation of certain documents to which reference was made at our last meeting.

3. I wish to report to the Council that eight of the nine exhibits will be circulated tomorrow as an addendum to the provisional verbatim record of the 1421st meeting. I understand that 200 copies of the book entitled *The*

Resistance of the Western Bank of Jordan to Israeli Occupation 1967 are to be provided to the Secretariat. Accordingly, the booklet will be made available to delegations in the very near future.

4. The Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it. The first speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Soviet Union.

5. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council is continuing its consideration of the situation which has developed in Jerusalem as a result of the acts of aggression committed by Israel against the Arab States last June and of the illegal measures undertaken by the occupation authorities in annexing the Arab sector of Jerusalem. As you know, the most recent of these measures was the military parade held by the Israel authorities in that part of the city on 2 May, in violation both of the General Assembly resolution on the inadmissibility of changes in the status of Jerusalem adopted at the fifth emergency special session [2253 (ES-V)] and of the Security Council resolution calling on Israel to refrain from holding the military parade [250 (1968)]. This was a provocative demonstration of policy from a position of strength. By holding that parade, Israel pursued its purpose of strengthening its illegal claims to the Arab sector of Jerusalem.

6. Through the Secretary-General's report and the annex thereto [S/8567] the Council was officially informed that all types of troops of the Israel army, including the air force, took part in this parade, and that detachments equipped with tanks, heavy weapons and missiles and rockets were brought into the occupied Arab sector of the city.

7. Israel's attitude to the relevant Security Council resolution clearly exposes the real aims of the Tel Aviv authorities in their Middle East policy. These actions show yet again that Israel is still pursuing the course of aggravating tension in the Middle East and organizing further acts of provocation in an attempt to impede and frustrate the Security Council's attempts to reach a political settlement in that part of the world.

8. At the Council's last meeting we heard a statement by the Mayor of Arab Jerusalem, Mr. El-Khatib, on the situation in that city. In this connexion, I must again point out that, irrespective of the verbiage used by the President of the Security Council in expressing his reluctance to refer to Mr. El-Khatib as mayor, the Security Council in fact invited and listened to Mr. El-Khatib not as a private

individual, but as a competent official, as the mayor of the Arab sector of Jerusalem, in which, until its occupation by the Israelis, there lived more than 70,000 people.

9. We also listened with great attention to the representative of Jordan.

10. The information submitted to the Council by the Mayor of Jerusalem and the Jordan delegation, together with the facts already known, shows that the Israel aggressors are still pursuing a policy of tyranny and violence against the peaceful Arab population in the occupied sector of the city. They are driving the Arabs out of their native city, subjecting them to terror and violence and depriving them of their fundamental human rights.

11. In violation of General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 July and 14 July 1967 respectively, the Israel Parliament adopted a decision to extend the laws of Israel to the Arab sector of the city of Jerusalem and to include this sector in the Israel municipality of the city. The Israel Government, spurning the appeals of the United Nations, has issued a number of statements declaring its intention of "israelizing" the occupied Jordanian sector of Jerusalem and of adopting measures which would permanently deprive the city of its Arab character and essence.

12. The Israel authorities have followed up these annexationist statements with the practical measures so eloquently described here, at the 1421st meeting by the Mayor of Jerusalem. The illegality of these actions is obvious. The occupation of Arab lands and the coercive measures used against the Arab population are acts of aggression, violating the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These actions are also in flagrant contravention of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—covenants of which Israel was one of the signatories. But what is Israel's attitude towards its international obligations, particularly those deriving from these covenants?

13. Let us consider what rights are enjoyed by the Arabs living in the occupied sector of Jerusalem and in the other territories invaded by Israel. They have no rights of freedom or of personal inviolability. From the information given by the representative of Jordan and from documents submitted to the Security Council, including the report of the personal representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Thalmann, dated 12 September 1967 [S/8146], it is evident that the slightest disagreement with the policy of the occupation authorities results in either the arrest or the forcible eviction, or both, of the person concerned. Many political and public figures have been expelled from Arab Jerusalem for refusing to co-operate with the invaders. An example of the persecution of the indigenous Arab population for refusing to co-operate with the invaders and become collaborationists is the expulsion of the Mayor of Arab Jerusalem from his native city. In this connexion, it should be recalled that similar methods were widely used by the Hitlerite annexationists in the territories that they occupied during the Second World War.

14. The representative of Jordan adduced numerous facts to show that religious freedom is being suppressed among Arab Moslems in occupied Jerusalem. These actions of the Israel invaders affect the interests of citizens of many countries, whose religious feelings are offended by the aggressor's atrocities and by the desecration of cherished historical monuments in Jerusalem.

15. The real nature of the so-called "new order" established by the Israel invaders in Jerusalem can be judged by the cruelty with which they suppressed a peaceful demonstration of Arab women who were protesting against the holding of a military parade in the Arab sector of the city. The Council has learned of this from official documents submitted by the representative of Jordan on 1 May 1968 [S/8568].

16. In this connexion, I must recall also the special telegram sent to the Government of Israel in March 1968 by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which read:

"The United Nations Commission on Human Rights is distressed to learn from newspapers of Israeli acts of destroying homes of Arab civilian population inhabiting the areas occupied by the Israeli authorities subsequent to the hostilities of June 1967. The Commission on Human Rights calls upon the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from indulging in such practices and to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms."¹

17. That Commission also adopted a resolution [6 (XXIV)]² containing a demand that the Government of Israel "should take the necessary measures in order to facilitate the return of those inhabitants to their own country without delay".

18. When he spoke here, the representative of Israel made vain attempts to refute all these facts. He chose an unappealing and unconvincing method of doing so: he delivered a lecture to the Council—and this is not the first time he has done so—on the ancient history of Jerusalem, making out that the numerical preponderance of the Jewish population in Jerusalem at present gives Israel the right to appropriate the whole of this city, which does not belong to Israel. Nor did he shrink from distorting history by omitting to mention the well-known fact that before the State of Israel was created the Arab population of Jerusalem was not smaller than the Jewish population. Throughout its history, Jerusalem, with its historical and religious monuments of three religions, has been a multi-national city. As for his reference to the fact that the Jews at present constitute the majority of the population in Jerusalem, here again, he is, to put it mildly, guilty of inaccuracy. He attempts to gloss over the well-known fact that, if there is now a certain numerical predominance of Jews over Arabs in Jerusalem as a whole, this does not date back to the ancient past to which Mr. Tekoah refers us but is simply the result of the forcible expulsion of the indigenous inhabitants, the Arabs, from the western part of

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 4*, para. 400.

² *Ibid.*, p. 151.

Jerusalem when it was captured by Israel in 1948. The lands and parts of the city wrested by force from the Arabs have been just as illegally settled by Israeli immigrants.

19. In this connexion, the Security Council cannot ignore the report received from the representative of Jordan, which states that after last year's aggression the activities of extremist circles in Israel and Jerusalem were stepped up, and they adopted a slogan calling for the creation of a "greater Israel" at the expense of the occupied Arab territories. In this matter, the Israel extremists are imitating the practices and methods of the Hitlerites. Their slogan: "This land will be ours if we occupy and appropriate and develop it" conjures up the dark days of the Hitlerite aggressors who unleashed the Second World War under the slogan of creating "greater Germany" by conquering other people's lands. We all know what fate awaited the instigators of this inhuman ideology.

20. In his statements in the Council the representative of Israel invariably talks about the hardships of the Jews during the thousands of years when Jerusalem was under foreign domination, from the time of the Roman Empire and the Roman legions to the reign of British imperialism in the Middle East. He has rightly described all these foreign invaders as tyrants and oppressors of the people of occupied Jerusalem; but he has tried to convince the Security Council that the Israel invaders and occupiers are benefactors concerned for the welfare of the Arab population in the territories occupied by their troops. Why did Mr. Tekoah have to tell us all these fairy tales? Obviously, to divert the Security Council's attention from the acts of tyranny and lawlessness which the Israel occupiers are perpetrating today in Jerusalem and the other occupied Arab territories. This is not the first time the aggressors have used this tactic. The representative of Israel spoke to the Council about a far-reaching housing programme, which he represented as an act of benevolence towards the Arab population of Jerusalem. But the facts tell a different story. The foreign invaders have brought the Arabs not prosperity and progress, but eviction and suffering; the new houses are being built not for Arabs, but for Israel settlers on land taken away from Arabs, on the sites of demolished Arab houses. Arab dwellings are being demolished and destroyed by bulldozers. The population is being driven out of the city, adding to the vast numbers of Palestinian refugees who have been deprived of their land, their houses and their means of livelihood.

21. These are just a few examples of the tyranny of the Israeli occupiers in Jerusalem. It was reported in the press in March 1968 that 265 plots of land had been taken away from the local Arab inhabitants in the Arab sector of Jerusalem, and these were all given to Israel settlers. Preparations are being made to transfer another 500 plots. A special plan has been devised for the mass eviction of Arabs from Jerusalem and for resettling about 10,000 Israelis in the Jordanian part of the city in the very near future. These are the so-called acts of "charity" which the Israel occupiers perform for the Arab population.

22. The Council is considering not the ancient history of Jerusalem but the situation which has been created in that city, as indeed in the other Arab territories occupied by

Israel, as the result of Israel's aggression and the annexationist policy of the occupiers. Israel's policy of aggression has been condemned by the United Nations, by the Security Council and by world public opinion. The situation created in Jerusalem by the occupiers' tyranny and unlawful actions is increasing tension throughout the Middle East. The facts show that the ruling circles in Tel Aviv are continuing their policy of expansion, invasion and appropriation of other people's lands, without considering the fatal consequences of such a policy for the State of Israel itself.

23. We have already stated, and we consider it necessary to emphasize again, that the responsibility for the delay in a political settlement in the Middle East lies wholly and entirely with Israel and with those imperialist circles which protect the Israel aggressors.

24. It is the Security Council's duty to demand that Israel should desist from such illegal acts. In accordance with the United Nations Charter the Council should take all necessary steps to eliminate the obstacles to a political settlement in the Middle East.

25. As many members of the Security Council have repeatedly pointed out, the basic condition for a settlement is the immediate withdrawal of the Israel troops from all the Arab territories they have occupied, in accordance with the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)]. The sooner this is done, the sooner it will be possible to bring about a settlement and restore peace in the Middle East.

26. In regard to the situation in Jerusalem which is here under discussion, the Soviet delegation would like to reiterate that the Soviet Union will continue to give all possible support and assistance to the Arab States in their legitimate struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israel's aggression.

27. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The situation in the Middle East continues to pose the gravest threat to peace and cause profound concern throughout the world. It cannot be resolved unless adequate action is taken with regard to each of its three component elements. These are: first, Israel's refusal to withdraw its forces from the Arab territories which it overran in June 1967; secondly, Israel's military reprisals and persistent violations of the cease-fire; thirdly, Israel's attempt to annex the Holy City of Jerusalem. The three elements are interrelated. Each requires full consideration by the Security Council.

28. The Council dealt with the first element when it adopted resolution 242 (1967). This resolution enunciated the basic principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, and called for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories—which means all territories—occupied in the recent conflict. That resolution has not yet been carried out. The Council still awaits Israel's unequivocal declaration that it accepts the resolution in its entirety and will co-operate in its implementation.

29. The second element was dealt with by the Council at a series of meetings in March when it adopted resolution

248 (1968) of 24 March 1968. This resolution condemned a large-scale military action launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire and declared that such actions of military reprisal could not be tolerated.

30. We are now dealing with the third element, which pertains to Jerusalem. The Holy City of Jerusalem is, of course, included in the territories from which, under the United Nations Charter and specifically under resolution 242 (1967), Israel has the inescapable obligation to withdraw. But Jerusalem has become the focus of the Middle East conflict because it has tragically fallen a victim to a special and wholly illegal annexationist move by Israel.

31. This move must be reversed and the measures it entails rescinded if the prospects of peace in the Middle East are not to suffer irretrievable damage.

32. My delegation believes—and the belief is widely shared—that Israel's actions in regard to Jerusalem constitute the most acute threat in the Middle East situation. The threat is directed not only against the Arab nations, but also against the hundreds of millions of adherents of Islam, Christianity and Judaism. The special and unique importance of Jerusalem for the international community has been repeatedly emphasized by the United Nations. Any arbitrary act with regard to the status of the city of Jerusalem is an assault on the most cherished sensibilities of the followers of these three world religions.

33. Since June 1967, Israel has embarked on a series of arbitrary acts designed to change radically the national and historical character of the Holy City. These acts have been extensively reported in the world press and also brought out in the report submitted by the personal representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Thalmann [S/8146]. They have been described to us with clarity and in convincing detail by the Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, to whom my delegation would like to pay tribute for a presentation as factual as it was free from vehemence. These acts can be summarized as follows: first, the enactment on 27 June 1967 of legislation enabling Israel to annex the old city of Jerusalem and its environs; secondly, the creation of a climate of terror in the old city to bring about the exodus of its inhabitants; thirdly, immediately after the occupation, the dynamiting and bulldozing of 135 houses belonging to the Moslem Waqf in the Maghrabi quarter adjoining the Haram Ash-Sharif. Paragraph 20 of the Thalmann report states: "To the destruction of the war new destruction had been added." Fourthly, we have the dissolution of the Arab Municipal Council and the banishment from their city of the Mayor and other religious and political leaders, and fifthly, acts of disrespect in the Holy Places. The authorization given to the Chief Rabbi of the Israeli army and others to conduct prayers in the sanctuary of Haram Ash-Sharif, the thinly-veiled intention to rebuild the Jewish temple within the sacred precincts of the Al Aqsa Mosque and intrusion into the Holy Places during hours of prayer are examples of such disrespect which cannot but constitute provocations detrimental to peace. It was under the Israeli régime that the gold halo and tiara were stolen from the statue of the Virgin Mary in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which was the gift of Queen

Maria of Portugal as far back as 1624. The stolen objects are reported to have been subsequently restored. Nevertheless, the fact that such a theft, which would have been inconceivable under the Islamic régime, occurred under Israeli occupation, is clearly symptomatic. Sixthly, we have the expropriation of 838 acres of the areas adjacent to the old city and the uprooting of the Arab inhabitants for the purpose of building homes to settle Jewish immigrants. This, like the demolition of homes in the Maghrabi quarter, was a clear violation of Article 53 of the Geneva Convention,³ which expressly prohibits any destruction of real or personal property belonging to private persons or to the State or public authorities or organizations. The seventh instance is the policy of demolishing the homes of so-called "suspected terrorists". Such a pretext can be used to justify any act of extreme repression.

34. All these acts culminated in the military demonstration held by Israel in the old city of Jerusalem on 2 May. Since it was this culmination which brought the situation in Jerusalem compellingly to the Council's attention, my delegation considers it necessary to make some observations about it here.

35. This demonstration was but the latest example of the impunity with which Israel defies the resolutions of the Security Council. Mr. Eban attempted to justify this defiance in his letter to the Secretary-General of 30 April 1968 [S/8565]. That remarkable document, however, despite its arguments, failed to explain why Israel's ceremony of thanksgiving should take the form of a massive display of military might. Was it necessary for Israel to overawe and try to humiliate the vanquished in the City of Peace, which for thousands of years has been hallowed as the City of God, and at whose portals even conquerors have become pilgrims and, halting their cohorts, have walked in humility?

36. We were moved by the ancient Hebrew words of lamentation quoted by Mr. Eban in his letter; but was it not incongruous that the lament which was evoked by the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans 2,000 years ago should be directed against those who for centuries have been the loving custodians of the city and have practised tolerance and demonstrated their veneration for Jerusalem? The picture that Mr. Eban tried to conjure up was one of Zion spreading forth her hands in helplessness. But in reality the picture was one of the uncoiling of an endless column of lethal weapons and the crash and thunder of the infernal machines of war.

37. In passing, I must observe here that Mr. Eban's letter did not even mention Security Council resolution 250 (1968), which was adopted unanimously on 27 April 1968. But, apart from this, there were two fallacies in that letter: first, the question at issue was not whether the provocative parade held by Israel was within or across the cease-fire line; the question at issue was what right Israel had to brandish its military might in a city over which it can claim no sovereignty and whose status it has been

³ Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973).

expressly called upon not to alter; secondly, the whole basis of Mr. Eban's letter was the unexpressed premise that in matters affecting international peace and security, and those which exercise the universal conscience, it is Israel's prerogative, by virtue of its military power and its victory, to act without the slightest regard for the unanimous recommendations of the Security Council or for the conscience of mankind as voiced by the General Assembly. There can be no question that this premise is fatal to the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

38. Let us be clear about the nature of Israel's act, which, superficially, might appear to be a mere celebration. If Israel had chosen to comply with the Council's resolution, would it have entailed any sacrifice of its interests, any renunciation of its claims? Certainly not. All that Israel was asked to do was to abstain from a provocative act and to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind. All that it was urged to do was to restrain a certain exuberance. That Israel will not exercise even this modicum of restraint in deference to the Council's call gives us only too clear an idea of how it conceives its policies towards the issues of war and peace. It is indeed tragic that belligerence and vehemence rather than reason should animate Israel's pronouncements in regard to Jerusalem.

39. In dealing with the situation, my delegation must stress that the Council is dealing with matters of a legal and political nature. The General Armistice Agreement of 3 April 1949, article XII of which provides that it "shall remain in force until a peaceful settlement between the parties is achieved",⁴ regulates the present status. General Assembly resolutions 181 (II), 194 (III) and 303 (IV) recognize the special importance of Jerusalem to the international community. General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) have declared invalid the measures taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem, and have called upon Israel to rescind these measures and to desist from any action which would alter the status of the Holy City.

40. These provisions, backed by the incontestable legal principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, prohibit any attempt by Israel to establish sovereignty over Jerusalem. They are further reinforced by the clearly expressed will of the population of the old city of Jerusalem. In paragraphs 131-133 of the report of the Secretary-General [S/8146] under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V), based on the mission of his personal representative, it is stated:

"131. The Personal Representative was told that the Arabs recognized a military occupation régime as such and were ready to co-operate with such a régime in dealing with current questions of administration and public welfare. However, they were opposed to civil incorporation into the Israel State system. They regarded that as a violation of the acknowledged rule of international law which prohibited an occupying Power from changing the legal and administrative structure in the occupied territory and at the same time demanded

respect for private property and personal rights and freedoms.

"132. It was repeatedly emphasized that the population of East Jerusalem was given no opportunity to state for itself whether it was willing to live in the Israel State community. It was claimed that the right of self-determination, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had therefore been violated.

"133. In conclusion, it was pointed out that the Arab population places its trust in the United Nations and relies on the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly."

In paragraph 135 of the same report, we read:

"... one detected concern for the future. Would the situation remain as it was, or were further convulsions to be expected? What would be the consequences if the Holy Places were under the sovereignty of a State which identified itself with one religion and which had never concealed the fact that, where Jerusalem was concerned, its political objectives coincided with the religious objectives?"

41. Thus we see the situation in Jerusalem in its legal and political aspects. These alone concern the Council. It is therefore nothing but deliberate obfuscation on the part of Israel that it should draw our attention to an aspect of the situation which, to put the best interpretation on it, is wholly subjectivist. I repeat: we are dealing with matters of a legal and political nature. A rational disposition of these matters cannot but be prejudiced if we inject into the discussion the elements of a mystique, the assertion of an exclusive primordial right which is inimical to a peaceful international order.

42. We have the greatest respect—and I say this in all good faith—for the religion and culture of Judaism and for its sentiments regarding Jerusalem. But it is not permissible to cite the name of this religion and culture and invoke its memories or emotions in order to lend justification to acts which are wholly illegal and which indicate a complete rejection of the decisions of the United Nations. Such attempts at justification, besides doing a disservice to the religion itself, can only make the conflict implacable, the problems insoluble and bring to naught any attempt to restore even a semblance of peace to the Middle East.

43. The outstanding theme in Israel's case regarding Jerusalem is that the Jewish people have a special attachment to the Holy City. The question then arises: does this mean that in total denial of the sovereign right of the people of Jerusalem itself, with total disregard for the universal vocation of the city and in total defiance of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, Israel should be allowed to annex Jerusalem? What basis is there to the claim that Israel represents the entire Jewish population of the world? Even if, for the sake of argument, this groundless claim were accepted, what justification is there for the assertion that the Jewish right to Jerusalem is superior to the Islamic or

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

the Christian right? Above all, what is there in this right that is superior even to law?

44. Two facts were established by the Commission appointed in 1930 by the United Kingdom, as the Mandatory Power, with the approval of the Council of the League of Nations. First, the legal proprietary right to the Wailing Wall belongs exclusively to Moslems. Secondly, during more than twelve centuries of Islamic sovereignty over Jerusalem, free access for the Jews to the Wailing Wall for devotional purposes was recognized as a right *ab antiquo*. Whatever the persecution suffered by the Jewish people elsewhere, it is an unquestionable historical fact that they enjoyed tolerance, asylum and freedom of worship and devotion in Islamic Jerusalem. This is the maximum scope of their rights in the Holy City.

45. The spokesmen of Israel try to make capital of the fact that they were deprived of these rights for the years 1948 to 1967. What brought about the collapse of the heritage of tolerance? Is it to be expected that those who are subjected to cruel injustices should show benevolence to those who inflict them? It was the sanguinary circumstances of 1948 and the refusal to permit the repatriation of Arab refugees that forced upon the Jordanian authorities the most unpalatable security precaution of forbidding the entry of Israelis into the Holy City. The fact that they also excluded the Arabs living in Israel shows that there was no discrimination against Jews. Besides, we have no grounds to assume that the Government of Jordan ever intended that such a precaution, taken in exceptional circumstances, should become part of a permanent régime. King Hussein of Jordan has said that Jerusalem belongs to the world. This is a fitting recognition of the universal vocation of Jerusalem. It certainly implies that the Jewish people should be given the same access for devotional purposes to the Wailing Wall as they enjoyed throughout Islamic rule. It implies nothing more.

46. Let me now briefly turn to the arguments advanced by the Israeli representative at our meeting on Friday. If I refer to them only briefly, I wish it to be understood that this is not a recognition of their validity. One has only to hear these arguments to be impressed with their incompatibility with any rational criterion for determining the national status of territories.

47. First, the Israeli representative propounded the doctrine that the national status of territories should be determined by their original inhabitants, who preceded the population movements which have taken place throughout history. He in fact went so far as to imply, in a previous statement, that the peopling of Palestine and of Jerusalem by non-Jewish inhabitants for 2,000 years was a form of colonialism. If that is so, then I am afraid the United Kingdom and the United States, to name only two countries, are still groaning under colonial rule. The theory of decolonization advanced by Israel would demand that the United Kingdom be purged of both Saxons and Normans, the United States of all the European and African immigrants and their descendants, and—if I may come nearer home—that the bulk of their populations be evacuated from both India and Pakistan. Surely it is a rather radical programme that Israel seems to have in mind for reordering the ethnic demography of the whole world.

48. Secondly, the Israeli representative is not even consistent with his own doctrine. What point in history does he regard as the final determinant of the national status of a territory? In the case of Palestine, if his doctrine be accepted, why should the determinant be the point at which the Jewish people conquered it and not the preceding period when it was inhabited by other peoples?

49. Thirdly, the Israeli representative tried to show that Jerusalem had not been Arab. What else has it been since the seventh century? The fact that it was under the rule of Ottoman Turks—an Islamic people—for centuries made it no less Arab than if it had been consistently under Arab rule. Surely the Israeli representative would not expect us to forget that we are dealing here with periods of history when national differentiations had not yet crystallized and the living organism was not a nation but a civilization.

50. Fourthly, the Israeli representative tried to lend some strength to his argument by stressing the fact that the Arabs never made Jerusalem their capital. His very citing of this fact shows how unaware the Israeli leaders are of the sense of sanctity with which religious cultures are imbued. The holiest place in Islam, Mecca, was never a capital of Islamic rule. What does that indicate? It indicates that, in Islam, Mecca is so holy that it is improper to convert it into a seat of temporal power. The Arabs and other Islamic peoples showed the same veneration for Jerusalem. It is a veneration which has been expressed by a respected religious leader of the United States, Cardinal Cushing, the Archbishop of Boston. Writing in *The Pilot* in July 1967, he said regarding the Holy Places in Jerusalem: "There should be no place here for either politics or power, for violence or for strife, for destruction or for death. It should be a place of peace." These words strike the deepest chords of sympathy and reverence in the hearts of mankind.

51. Fifthly, the Israeli representative sought to establish at one and the same time that Jews were persecuted in Jerusalem before the creation of Israel and that Jerusalem remained consistently Jewish. He quoted census figures for Jerusalem under Ottoman rule. Assuming these figures to be accurate, they prove nothing but the tolerance of the Islamic rulers of Jerusalem towards the Jews. On the basis of the facts cited by the Israeli representative, the Jewish attachment to the Holy City has never been violated and did not remain in need of a fresh vindication by a militant movement.

52. Sixthly, the Israeli representative emphasized the fact that the very name "Jerusalem" is Hebrew. What does that mean? This is only one of its names current in the Western world. For the Arabs it is "Al Quds"—the Holy. The original name of a city is no indication of legal title.

53. These are arguments, however, which need to be disposed of only to prevent confusion. They do not bear upon the issues of international peace and security which are posed by the situation in Jerusalem and which demand effective measures by the Council. We see a drift towards disaster in the Middle East. If this drift is to be halted, the Council must call upon Israel to respect the resolutions of the General Assembly concerning Jerusalem, to rescind all measures taken to alter the status of the Holy City, and to

refrain from such actions in the future. No settlement of the Middle East conflict which militates against those resolutions will be politically viable or morally defensible. The resolutions constitute the expression of opinion of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations. They embody a commitment made by most members sitting in the Security Council. They have been hailed by peoples all over the world. They cannot be relegated to oblivion. Since Israel has refused to comply with them, the Security Council must lend the full weight of its authority to securing their observance.

54. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel to exercise his right of reply.

55. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Pakistan's attitude towards Israel is well known. Pakistan belongs to the group of countries of dubious distinction which deny the right of a Member State of the United Nations to exist. Pakistan has supported and identified itself with the Arab war of aggression against Israel since 1948. Pakistan now supplies arms to the terrorist organizations operating against Israel. The Lebanese daily newspaper, *El-Safa*, reported on this in some detail on 26 April 1968. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan declared on 24 April 1967: "Israel's existence is the greatest of evils." The statement delivered just now by the Pakistani representative is but another expression of this attitude.

56. Above membership in the Security Council there is the Charter of the United Nations; above hatred there is justice; above slander there is truth. Israel, as a Member of the United Nations, challenges and rejects Pakistan's right to speak in the name of Charter principles or in the name of human rights, in the name of universal religious interests, in the name of the philosophy of history or in the name of peace.

57. Does the representative of Pakistan really conceive that the world does not know, that the world does not remember, what Pakistan stands for? Here, for instance, is what the Argentine daily newspaper, *El Tribuno*, wrote on 23 February 1964:

"Over 60,000 men, women and children, mostly of Christian tribes, fled from Pakistan in recent weeks. The exodus, due apparently to religious persecution, began suddenly on 18 January. Good luck did not always accompany the fugitives: on 6 February some 3,000 Pakistanis fell in an ambush prepared by the police of Pakistan which degenerated into a veritable slaughter."

58. The Reverend N. A. Kirkwood, Liaison Officer for the Church World Service, states in his report of March 1964:

"A book could be written on the atrocities, shooting, bayoneting, baton attacks and raping inflicted by the East Pakistan Rifles and Anzar personnel of the East Pakistan border forces upon the fleeing refugees. Stories of looting and of the abduction of tribal maidens by Muslim men of the area are common."

The Danish newspaper, *Berlingske Tidende*, of 27 February 1964, writes:

"The Danish Church Relief Committee, whose president is Bishop Gudmund Schilor, has received reports of

burned-down villages, rape, kidnapping of women and many killings. The new wave of flights is considered a link in the huge stream of refugees who have had to leave Pakistan since 1947 because of religious persecution. In the state of West Bengal alone they have, during the last sixteen years, received 3,400,000 refugees."

59. Israel may at times appear alone in its struggle for life and in its efforts to ensure its fundamental rights to equality, security and peace. However, there must be at least a modicum of decency and veracity in international relations, especially when a State claims, as Pakistan does, the privilege of being a member of the Security Council.

60. Membership in the Security Council imposes a special responsibility on States. This responsibility assumes crucial importance in the case of permanent members of the Council and their attitude towards peace and international security. The Middle East has for a number of years had a full taste of the Soviet Union's policy on these vital matters. This policy has found expression in Soviet vetoes cast against water development projects in the area, against the reaffirmation by the Security Council of decisions on freedom of navigation, against any attempt to censure the murder of Israeli citizens in Israeli territory. This policy has been followed through unlimited arms supplies to Governments openly avowing aggressive intentions, through encouragement of intransigence and belligerency. What the Middle East, however, still has not received from the Soviet Union, what the Middle East still awaits from the Soviet Union, is a sign of peace and understanding. Even five months after the adoption of the Security Council resolution which called for the establishment of a just and lasting peace and for the promotion of agreement between the parties, the Middle East has not heard a single word from Moscow indicating that the Soviet Union is interested in a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab States, that the Soviet Union supports the attainment of an agreement between Israel and the Arab States.

61. Instead, singling out one point in the resolution [242 (1967)] of last November, the Soviet Government demands that we deal with it and ignore all the others. This is what it calls a political solution. However, the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967 referred not only to withdrawal. Withdrawal is one of a list of principles on which a just and lasting peace is to be based. We still eagerly await a pronouncement on the part of the Soviet Government that it favours a just and lasting peace agreement in the Middle East, that it supports the establishment of secure and recognized boundaries to replace the cease-fire lines and the demarcation and truce lines which preceded them, that it ranges itself on the side of the internationally accepted right to freedom of navigation.

62. The Soviet representative has also made certain allegations regarding the conditions of life among the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem. The Security Council would undoubtedly be expected to consider any such allegations with due attention were it not for the strange anomaly in the Soviet attitude towards human rights. The discrimination and disabilities from which the Jews of the Soviet Union suffer are generally known. In Moscow alone . . .

63. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

64. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): What we are supposed to be discussing here is Israel's aggression and illegal activities in Jerusalem. The arrogant and cynical intrusion of the representative of Israel into the internal affairs of other States—Pakistan, the Soviet Union and other members of the Security Council—is impermissible. Its sole purpose is to divert the attention of the Security Council and of world opinion from all that Israel is doing to prevent a settlement in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The members of the Security Council, including the Soviet Union, voted in favour of that resolution and consider it binding upon Israel. The attempt to divert the Council's attention to what has been done or is being done in Pakistan, the Soviet Union and other States has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject under discussion. The Security Council must demand an answer from the representative of Israel to all questions arising from the acts of tyranny, terror, violence and lawlessness perpetrated by the Israel occupation authorities in the occupied Arab territories. This is the subject under discussion in the Security Council.

65. The PRESIDENT: I will ask the representative of Israel to continue. I will also ask him, as I would ask all members of the Council, to ensure that what we say in this debate is specifically directed to the subject before us as stated in our agenda.

66. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Thank you, Mr. President. I do beg your indulgence to be able to finish my statement as other speakers before this Council have done before me. I do not think that the Security Council will accept that the representative of the Soviet Union has more right to speak of the situation of the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem than the Israeli representative has to express his views on the situation of Jews in Moscow.

67. In Moscow alone there are half a million Jewish citizens, not 60,000 . . .

68. The PRESIDENT: I have been asked to deal with a point of order which was raised in this Council, and in accordance with the ruling that I must give I would ask that the representative of Israel confine his comments in his speech to the subject before us.

69. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): May I suggest, Mr. President, that, as there has been no interference on points of order with expressions of views heard in this Council ranging far and wide in history, policy and philosophy, I should be allowed to finish my statement which questions the right of the Soviet Union to speak on behalf of the human rights of the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem. The questioning of the credibility or the qualifications of any member represented here and taking the floor is, I believe, a legitimate right of the representatives of any State Member of the United Nations. If I may, I shall now proceed in this spirit.

70. As I pointed out, there are half a million Jewish citizens in Moscow, and not 60,000, the number of Arab inhabitants in Jerusalem . . .

71. The PRESIDENT: I would appeal to the representative of Israel to proceed, certainly, with his statement,

but if he requires me to be more specific I would ask him to confine his comments to the question of Jerusalem, which is before us, and not to import into our debate other questions which are not on our agenda.

72. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, if I may be allowed to proceed it will become clear that I am referring to the question on the agenda and drawing a comparison—a legitimate comparison—between the situation of the Arab inhabitants in Jerusalem and the unfortunate situation of half a million Jewish inhabitants in Moscow and other cities in the Soviet Union.

73. The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of Israel to proceed, certainly, with his statement, but since he makes it impossible for me to do otherwise I must rule that we are not discussing any other question than that before us on the agenda. I would therefore ask him to confine his comment to that question.

74. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I was about to ask a question, I believe a simple one. How can the Security Council consider as of any interest or validity Soviet views on the unhindered continuation of Arab cultural, religious and public life in Jerusalem if the Jewish citizens of Moscow are deprived of such freedom? How is the world expected to consider the objections expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union about the operation of Moslem religious institutions . . .

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

76. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I strongly protest against the attempts made by the representative of Israel to divert the Security Council's attention from the subject under discussion. I fully support your ruling, Mr. President, that he should confine himself to the substance of the question under discussion. We are discussing Israel's aggression against the Arab countries, we are discussing the lawless activities of Israel and the Israel authorities in the occupied Arab sector of Jerusalem. There is no connexion between this matter and the status of Jews in the Soviet Union or in any other country. To raise these questions is simply to divert the Security Council's attention from the subject under discussion. Members of the Security Council have frequently noted the Israel representative's arrogant and cynical attempts to speak on behalf of Jews throughout the world. No one has ever given or will ever give this right to Israel.

77. In regard to the status of Jews in the Soviet Union, they enjoy the same rights as all citizens of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the attempt to divert the Security Council's attention to this matter is an impermissible method of discussing the Security Council items which are on the agenda.

78. The PRESIDENT: I have listened to the point of order raised by the Soviet Union, and I have given the ruling which I am required to give as a result of that point of order, and I will now ask the Ambassador of Israel to proceed. Certainly in this Council it is our custom to allow

wide latitude in debate; I would not seek to interfere with it. However, when a point of order is raised concerning the relevance of the questions before us, it is necessary for a ruling to be given; I have given that ruling. I will ask the Ambassador to proceed, to state his case, and I will not seek to interrupt him again. Nevertheless, I must again remind him that we should take special care to confine what is said in this debate to the subject on which we are called. I ask the Ambassador to proceed.

79. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Thank you, Mr. President. Moslem religious institutions in Jerusalem, Arab schools, Arab clubs continue to operate normally. The Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem enjoy full freedom of movement; not only are they allowed to move into any part of Israel, they are permitted to visit Arab States; there is a regular daily bus service between Jerusalem and Amman. More than 6,000 Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem have availed themselves of these services in the last few months. The Arab citizens of Jerusalem are free to visit their families anywhere in the world, including the Arab world. The Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem are free to communicate with their families, to reunite with their families. When the Soviet Government grants similar rights to its Jewish citizens, we in the world at large shall be able to recognize its right to speak on behalf of human rights.

80. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, we have had quite an outburst from the representative of Israel. I do not wish to reply to him. But, lest the Council be under any wrong impression as a result of his statements, let me say that I shall be glad to submit to the Council statements made by respected leaders of the Christian community, and other minorities in Pakistan, about the treatment that they have received from the Government of Pakistan and the people of Pakistan and about the respect that we have for their human rights. I might point out in parentheses that the Chief Justice of the Islamic State of Pakistan for many years was a Christian. He was the supreme interpreter not only of all our laws—including the law of the Constitu-

tion—but also of matters which regulate the personal status of the Muslim community. He was the chief interpreter of the law as applied to the Muslims.

81. I can also quote statements made by the leaders of these minority communities about certain happenings which took place. But I should like to know where this newspaper, *El Tribuno*, is published in Argentina, and what its circulation is. Against what has been quoted from such dubious sources, I can place authentic and authoritative material.

82. My statement was based on certain arguments brought forward by the representative of Israel. I had no desire to go into the philosophy of history, but it is not the exclusive prerogative of the representative of Israel to quote or to expound philosophies of history which are attempts to undermine the positions of other States. I was therefore merely replying to the matters that he himself had raised.

83. I should like to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for intervening to uphold the Charter principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. The subject before us is Jerusalem—the status of Jerusalem, the situation in Jerusalem, the Thalmann report—and my statements and remarks were confined exclusively to this subject. And I should hope that we will all confine ourselves to the point, to the main question before the Security Council, which is that of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, by force, by military conquest.

84. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers on my list for today. I have consulted members of the Council as to our next meeting, and I understand that it is generally agreed that we should adjourn our present meeting and meet again tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock. If I hear no objection, I shall proceed accordingly.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишете 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.
