



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1484th MEETING: 2 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1484)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 26 June 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9284)	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 EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 2 July 1969, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Ibrahima BOYE (Senegal).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1484)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 26 June 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9284).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 26 June 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9284)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the previous decisions of the Council, I invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Morocco, Iraq, Indonesia and Lebanon to participate in our debate, without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table, and Mr. A. El-Erian (United Arab Republic), Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria), Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco), Mr. A. Raouf (Iraq), Mr. H. R. Abdulgani (Indonesia) and Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Furthermore, I have just received a request from the representative of Malaysia [S/9302] asking that he be allowed to participate in the debate of the Security Council. If there are no objections, I shall invite him to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, and to take a seat at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when the time comes for him to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. Hashim (Malaysia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, on whom I now call.

4. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): I have asked for the floor to make a few brief comments in exercise of my delegation's right of reply. The representative of Israel in his statement yesterday, regrettably, reached the height of his melodramatic, arrogant and abusive performances, which, notwithstanding the fact that the Council has by now become accustomed to them, continue to be wearying and tedious. In that statement the representative of Israel poured out the venom of his hate and the wrath of his bitterness at a number of countries, including the United Arab Republic. Apparently he was disturbed by the statements made in the Council in which the illegal nature and lawless character of the offences committed by the Israeli authorities in Arab Jerusalem were exposed.

5. It comes as no surprise to us that Mr. Tekoah finds our statement disturbing, just as the authorities he represents find our stand and our policies equally disturbing, inasmuch as such statements and policies oppose Israeli aggression, denounce Israel's violations of the basic norms of contemporary international order and express our determination to defend our rights.

6. I shall not take up much of the time of the Council in replying to the slanderous lies spoken by the representative of Israel against the United Arab Republic, since they are self-refuting. Therefore I shall confine myself to taking up a few of the points contained in the speech of the representative of Israel, since they reveal the real character of Israeli policies and practices. The representative of Israel alleged in his statement yesterday that: "Egypt has made half a million of its citizens homeless and has driven them out of the towns and villages along the west bank of the Suez Canal" [1483rd meeting, para. 111].

7. It is the height of callousness and sinister behaviour for a representative of the Israeli authorities, which have committed aggression against the Arab peoples and have continued thereafter to bombard and shell the civilians of our cities along the Suez Canal, to come to the Council and not shrink from manifesting a hypocritical and deceitful concern for the Egyptian citizens of the towns and villages along the west bank of the Suez Canal. How can the Israeli

representative, of all people, arrogate to himself the right to speak about homeless citizens and their being driven out of their towns and villages? Did he ponder for a moment the fate of more than one and a half million Arabs that have been driven from their homeland by the Israelis, who have refused to comply with the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly which reaffirm the inalienable right of these Arabs to return?

8. It appears necessary to refresh the memory of the representative of Israel by recalling the circumstances in which the United Arab Republic Government took the necessary measures to protect the civilian inhabitants along the Suez Canal.

9. As early as 22 October 1967, in a letter to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United Arab Republic informed the Council that:

“... Israel has consistently attacked, bombarded and shelled the populated cities in the Suez Canal sector and the Canal's installations. These aggressive acts and violations of the cease-fire have resulted in heavy losses of civilian life and destruction of buildings and property, a fact which has lately prompted the United Arab Republic Government to evacuate over 300,000 of the inhabitants of the Canal sector.” [S/8205.]

Moreover, the representative of the United Arab Republic stated in the Council on 4 September 1968 that the Israelis:

“... have wantonly shelled the Egyptian cities along the west bank of the Canal. Without provocation they aimed their guns and flew their planes over the innocent civilian population of these cities, inflicting untold damage ... in order to apply pressure on my Government. For there were no military targets within these cities. Is it conceivable that the lives of men, women and children should be the price to be paid for the folly of the Israeli leaders? Is it tolerable that the indiscriminate destruction of buildings, whether homes, mosques, churches or hospitals, should be the toll collected for the insatiable desire of Israel to achieve its expansionist designs?

“I should like, with your permission, Mr. President, to cite a tragic result of this vicious policy of Israel. Its indiscriminate shelling of densely populated cities of the Canal area has resulted in the following: 134 killed and 329 injured in Suez and Ismailia on 14 and 15 July 1967; 50 killed and 70 injured in Suez on 4 September 1967; 2 killed and 15 injured in Kantara on 12 September 1967; 86 killed and 216 injured in Suez, Ismailia and Kantara on 27 September 1967; 3 killed and 50 injured in Suez on 24 October 1967; 50 killed and 67 injured in Suez on 3 July 1968—a total of 325 killed and 747 injured, all innocent civilians.” [1446th meeting, paras. 39 and 40.]

Furthermore, in a letter dated 15 May 1969 to the President of the Security Council the representative of the United Arab Republic stated that:

“In early March 1969, Israel intensified the fortifications of its positions in the northern sector of the east

bank of the Canal with offensive weapons, to enable the Israeli fire to reach the city of Port Said. This latest aggressive action by the Israeli armed forces has seriously aggravated the situation in the Suez Canal area to the point of a threat of explosion.

“It will not escape the attention of the Council that these Israeli attacks against the city of Port Said are an integral part of the same aggressive policy against the cities and towns of the western bank of the Canal, whose main objective is to sow havoc by the destruction of civil and economic installations and to inflict heavy casualties on the civilian population.” [S/9210.]

10. These measures which the Government of the United Arab Republic has found it necessary to take to protect its citizens from Israeli aggression seem to disturb the representative of Israel. His concept of the responsibility of a Government towards its citizens seems to suggest that it should keep them at the mercy of Israeli shelling and within the range of Israeli artillery fire. The representative of Israel finds it equally disturbing that these measures frustrate the Israeli plan to undermine the will of our people to resist Israeli aggression and force them to yield to the Israeli *Diktat*. According to Mr. Tekoah, measures which frustrate the Israeli plans of aggression constitute a failure on the part of a Government to discharge its responsibilities towards its citizens.

11. May I turn now to another point contained in the statement made yesterday by the representative of Israel, where he spoke of countries which by their behaviour have placed themselves outside the fold and deprived themselves of the right to be heard on questions of international obligations, civilized conduct or human rights.

12. One would like here also to refresh Mr. Tekoah's memory about Israel's concept of international obligations, whether emanating from the Charter or from commitments under international agreements. Israel declared its renunciation of the General Armistice Agreements between the Arab States and Israel¹, to which it had affixed its signature in 1949, when it realized that those Agreements stood in the way of its ambition to acquire territory beyond the 1949 armistice demarcation lines. Today, the Israeli officials declare that all the Armistice Agreements no longer exist. Israel proceeds on the basis that it is entitled to conclude international agreements and then to renounce them, by its unilateral will, as soon as it finds in them a limitation on its freedom concerning what it considers its right of territorial expansion.

13. Israel's renunciation of the Armistice Agreements that it had signed is in line with its renunciation of the Lausanne Protocol, which it signed with the Arab States, also in 1949.² That Protocol was aimed at the solution of the refugee problem. Israel renounced it as soon as it achieved the purpose for which it had affixed its signature, namely,

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplements Nos. 1 to 4.*

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. II, document A/927, annex A and B.*

admission to membership in the United Nations. As to Israel's violations of its obligations under the resolutions of the United Nations, a rather long inventory would be needed if one were to attempt to list them. The subject matter of the item before the Council is Israel's refusal to carry out the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council regarding Jerusalem. Its defiance of these resolutions has gone as far as informing the Secretary-General that its annexation of Jerusalem is irreversible and not negotiable.

14. This policy of defiance is manifested in the following: Israel's refusal to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967; Israel's refusal to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied as a result of its aggression on 5 June 1967; Israel's insistence on following an expansionist policy; Israel's refusal to recognize the rights of the refugees as stated by the United Nations in its numerous resolutions; Israel's continued expulsion of Arab citizens from their territories and villages, with the aim of establishing Israeli settlements therein; and Israel's resistance to the mission of the Secretary-General's special representative, charged with the task of examining the conditions of the Arab population in the occupied territories. Such is the record of Israel's disregard for its obligations. One may question the audacity, but certainly not the authority, of the Israeli representative when he speaks of countries which by their behaviour have placed themselves outside the fold and deprived themselves of the right to be heard on the question of international obligations, civilized conduct or human rights.

15. Lastly, may I say a few words on the Israeli representative's remark in his statement yesterday that the Arab countries were openly pursuing warfare and on his reference to a peaceful and just settlement. I should like to quote, in reply, from a statement my Foreign Minister made in the general debate of the General Assembly at its twenty-third session:

"While Israel continues its policy of occupying more of the Arab territories and transforming more of the Arab citizens into refugees, it has been undertaking a campaign of international deception in which it claims a desire for peace. Israel occupies Arab territories and claims peace. It resists the return of the refugees and displaced peoples, and claims peace. It carries on a campaign of terror and oppression against Arab citizens in the occupied territories and claims peace. It annexes Jerusalem and claims peace. It plunders Arab property and claims peace. It refuses to implement the peaceful settlement approved by the Security Council, and claims peace. It lays down one obstacle after another to the peace mission of Ambassador Jarring, and it claims peace.

"Peace, in Israel's view, is the surrender of the Arab peoples to its will and their acquiescence in its territorial ambitions."³

16. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Morocco, whom I

invite to take a place at the Council table. I now call on him.

17. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco and its delegation, I should like to express to you personally, and to the members of the Council, our gratitude for agreeing to permit me to express the views of my Government during this debate. I know that the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council entitle all Members of the United Nations to speak in the Council when the problem before it is of great interest to their respective governments. We have spoken in the Council on other occasions because we have felt that, for various reasons, our participation in the debate was justified. But we have never felt more closely and directly concerned by a problem than we do, for a number of reasons, by the one before you today.

18. First of all, as Members of the United Nations, we assume collective responsibility for maintaining peace and for providing evidence of what we consider to be the truth on certain problems. There have been decisions by the United Nations, and resolutions adopted by the Security Council on the question of Jerusalem. They have been violated, and this makes it our duty to come here to express our point of view on this violation.

19. We also do so for another reason. The area concerned is an Arab territory which has been plundered. We are Arabs, and this concerns us.

20. Finally, we do so for a third reason, and it is not the least. It is the Holy Places of Islam which have been plundered. I belong to a Moslem civilization, to a Moslem State, and that is another reason for my Government's participation.

21. May I be allowed to add a final personal comment? As I express the views of the Moroccan Government in this Council, I should like at the same time to express the convictions of an Arab and the faith of a Moslem concerning the danger threatening Jerusalem. I am sure there will be no objections to this last point. I remember that in the course of the debate of the Security Council in June and July 1967, a representative of Israel began his statement here by saying: "I am Jewish, and proud of it; I am a Zionist, and proud of it". My identity as an Arab and my faith as a Moslem also make me proud to participate in this debate at the gravest time in the destiny of Jerusalem.

22. But it is not only Morocco which is concerned in this matter. You have received a great many requests to participate in this debate from delegations of various continents and faiths. I think that is enough to show the importance which is attached throughout the whole world in the present circumstances to a problem which a certain sector of the press is presenting to us as merely the demolition of some old buildings, but which, in fact, concerns walls with a sacred history; it concerns the obliteration of an age-old identity and civilization in a place which has in fact been occupied only a few years.

23. The representatives of Israel have used different styles on different occasions in speaking before the Council. At

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 1689th meeting, paras. 110 and 111.

one time, when Israel still had some modesty and was making an effort to disguise its intentions, we used to hear speakers whose talent, skill, and even a certain adroitness led them to take the trouble to address the Council with some degree of subtlety. Since the events of June 1967, however, Israel has entered a phase in which its policy concerning the United Nations consists of defiance; its attitude in the dialogue being conducted here is one of arrogance; and, mobilizing all the cosmopolitan talents at its disposal, it has at last found a representative with all the qualities necessary to address the Council with indifference and arrogance. We shall not follow him in this course, but we cannot fail to point it out.

24. Every time we have been invited here to speak on a specific problem, we have either been asked by the representative of Israel to go back in history all the way to Moses, Solomon or David, in an effort to justify the claims of the people of Israel to certain lands, or we have been reminded of the crimes of nazism as though that injustice—which Israel trots out so frequently—could justify another injustice. And every time, these digressions were intended to divert the Council from specific facts which are the subject of specific documents, or of complaints by the States concerned, expressed equally clearly.

25. We have before us today the complaint by Jordan regarding specific facts, and this is what the Council must consider. In the course of the debates these last few days, Mr. Tekoah has displayed a subtlety which is wholly transparent. I shall make this clear shortly, and give a fitting reply. But what exactly is the problem we are considering here? Since the events of 1948, a series of texts have been adopted unanimously or by a majority vote of the Assembly, unanimously or by a majority of the Council. There are even bilateral Armistice Agreements. There have been some tripartite declarations which have guaranteed a certain *status quo* in the Middle East. This is the legal and political context of the debates here. From 1948 onwards, Jerusalem was a city whose status had been internationally defined by decisions of the United Nations. Israel started out by holding parades there contrary to the statute of the city. It transferred the bulk of its government machinery there, contrary to the relevant provisions of the Assembly and the Council. I know that some countries have yielded with much benevolence to Israel's invitation to transfer their embassies to Jerusalem. In doing so, they have deliberately contravened certain international decisions.

26. Since the events of June 1967, the Security Council has considered the question of Jerusalem and the General Assembly has held special sessions to deal with this problem. A series of resolutions have been adopted which have the merit of being perfectly clear and without any of the euphemisms which are sometimes found in other decisions of the Council.

27. Israel announced that it would hold a military parade on 2 May 1968; the Secretary-General, aware of his responsibilities, wrote to the Israeli Government [see S/8567]. We received no official reply, and Mr. Abba Eban felt he should wait to address the General Assembly before replying in an evasive way to the Secretary-General. The Council issued a warning [resolution 250 (1968)] to Israel

not to let the parade take place. It did take place, with a demonstration of force such as we saw in Austria, Czechoslovakia and elsewhere in those times which provide Israel with justification for contemporary theories concerning its rights.

28. Israel expropriated 500 hectares of Arab land in Jerusalem. The Council condemned [resolution 252 (1968)] this decision. In its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, the Council took care to announce, in the second preambular paragraph, that no acquisition of territory by force could be accepted as a *fait accompli*. We understood at the time that the paragraph in question had been introduced in this particular place in the resolution in order to give particular emphasis to the unanimous condemnation of all territorial conquests which had been voiced in the Assembly and the Council by the most eminent representatives of all the States concerned. Perhaps certain countries which were so anxious to accept this formula saw it only as a statement of a principle which preserves their own acquired rights, or makes it possible to restate a principle anew in order to maintain the *status quo* and positions in areas where they have direct interests. But we wish to assume that this paragraph relates to the case before us. It is contained in a resolution which concerns the Middle East, it should be applied to the Middle East; and it should not be applied there with connotations for other territories in Europe, Asia or elsewhere.

29. If Jordan has submitted this complaint today, it has done so to denounce this series of violations which are contrary to perfectly clear-cut decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. At no time have our warnings, recommendations, or diplomatic appeals through the most discreet means and channels been heeded or taken into consideration by Israel; that is what I mean by saying that its policy has now entered this phase of constant defiance and arrogance.

30. This time, the question before us is the demolition of buildings in Jerusalem. Israeli aviation is attacking the canal zone or Jordan regularly, and has destroyed a number of villages. You have had to deal with the problem of Karameh here in the Council, and you have expressed your condemnation. You have repeatedly and constantly called upon Israel to respect the cease-fire. If this time it were merely a matter of the destruction of some village, we would write it off, accepting the fact as part of the general picture of the tragic situation in the Middle East. But this time a mosque, a school, a court of justice are involved: these are all symbols both of sacred places and buildings where the children of a divided country still cling with all their might to their culture, their civilization and their faith; a court where the laws governing a peaceful society are respected and remain in force.

31. Mr. Abba Eban told us at a certain moment that the measures adopted concerning Jerusalem were merely one aspect of an administrative and municipal integration made necessary by the requirements of local administration. He has stated on a number of occasions—and at the time many representatives asked him to back this assurance by certain statements which he avoided—that the city's places of worship would be fully respected. We are confronted by a

flagrant violation of those declarations and assurances given by the spokesman of the Israeli Government, who at the time insisted on giving them in a tone of solemnity, possibly even of a sincerity which they may have possessed then but which they no longer have. The elections are approaching, and even doves are becoming vultures.

32. I think this is the problem on which the Council must express itself. Within its responsibilities for legal questions and respect for international law, it has before it texts which it has itself adopted; and it is at the same time confronted by violations which it must prevent, so that they do not afflict the victims who are suffering from them today.

33. Yesterday, we heard with great satisfaction certain statements, particularly by the major Powers, expressed in terms which had the merit of clarity or, in any case, the merit of having been made at the right time and place, as they should have been, even though at other times there was some ambiguity. If these declarations are meaningful they must lead to logical conclusions—I do not wish to judge in advance any subsequent statements by members of the Council—in a very clearly defined resolution firmly forbidding Israel to touch buildings which have the weight of historical prestige, and the sacred character of a spiritual heritage. If we close our eyes to such an attitude this time, we shall open the way in the coming weeks and months to total obliteration of the international character of the city, total obliteration of its Arab and Moslem personality and, for all we know, to some extent even of the Christian personality of the world's religious capital. So much for the strictly formal and legal aspect of the Council's work.

34. But the Council, as the organ responsible for peace, is not only a court of first instance which applies provisions in certain cases of breaches of the law. In accordance with the spirit of the Charter and the philosophy of the United Nations, international law is intermingled with its political justifications and moral aims; and these two aspects of the problem are also involved in what is happening in Jerusalem. What is happening in Jerusalem is changing the *status quo* in the Middle East, changing it legally and politically. The cease-fire, the Armistice Agreements, the resolutions which have been voted in the organs of the United Nations in these last few years, establish a specific framework which does not in any way affect these three aspects of the situation in the Middle East, and especially in Jerusalem, and gives Israel absolutely no right on any pretext to change them.

35. I said a while ago that certain statements by Mr. Tekoah were perfectly transparent. If a representative of Israel, the first time he speaks before the Security Council, considers that he should announce to us the purport of a certain meeting in Jerusalem to decide on that city's future and town planning regulations, it means he must have wished to try both to divert the Council from its main objective and to create some confusion or, by announcing such a meeting in the Security Council, to legalize it or lend it the authority of being placed on international record. But the move is too clumsy to pass unnoticed.

36. Of course, in the list of personalities meeting in Jerusalem at present, we recognize some of individual

importance, we recognize the eminence of certain personages, from Mr. Ignazio Silone to others who, on whatever grounds, have a right to accept an invitation by Israel. But even though the statement made here wilfully insinuated that there are among them personalities who are eminent as sympathizers of Islam, the authority of those sympathizers of Islam does not give them any rights, as scholars, to speak or make decisions on behalf of Moslems. To be a specialist on a civilization gives no one any right whatever to become its guide and mentor, and we most emphatically denounce this new aspect of the presence of those persons in Jerusalem.

37. Israel's guests have a right to take whatever decisions they wish. The courtesy which guests must observe will lead them to be very indulgent in making certain decisions. But these are not guests of Moslems, of the Arabs of the Arab part of Jerusalem, and what they decide will be valid only before their own conscience. I consider that those who have won world-wide prestige and a reputation of moral integrity and high intellectual and spiritual development have, by their mere presence at this meeting, destroyed that moral authority for ever.

38. Mr. Tekoah has also told us that certain Moslem personalities of Jerusalem have recently made statements expressing their endorsement of the Israeli authorities and declaring that they are happy to live under the Israeli occupation. I do not know whether Mr. Tekoah knew then, when he was in Shanghai, what was happening in Europe after 1940. At that time, countries with a glorious history and political figures whose careers had led them to the highest posts, at the centre of the stage in their countries, made statements under the occupier's authority which, at the time, were brandished and played up by the occupation authorities to salve their consciences. Those statements led some of their originators to the gallows, and, in any case, were never binding on the occupied peoples who were living under the yoke of the occupier.

39. We consider that only the legal authority which still enjoys freedom outside of any occupation, and only those who have strengthened their legitimate rights by having the courage to take up arms to reply to the Israeli occupation, are the authentic spokesmen of Jerusalem or of any inch of Arab territory occupied at present.

40. The above-mentioned personalities are free to say, under pressure or through weakness of conscience, whatever they please. But they do not possess the authority required to present themselves as the spokesmen of an occupied population, since they are at present completely controlled by the Israeli police.

41. Lastly, Mr. Tekoah also mentioned statements of Christian authorities, particularly those of a high-ranking prelate of Brazil. May I mention that high-ranking prelates of Brazil are today making statements against their Government because they are dissatisfied with their régime? Can those prelates, who today try to speak on behalf of Christianity, at one and the same time accept an occupation in the Arab world and denounce restrictions of liberty in their own country? I would certainly like to have heard the

prelate who defends Israeli legitimacy in Jerusalem also defend legitimacy and freedom elsewhere. In any case, Christians know what are their historical responsibilities in Jerusalem. They are aware of the way they must defend their heritage in that area. I shall return to this point in a few minutes.

42. The substance of what I wish to point out about these declarations is that they cannot mislead the Council, because they come from personages who are in no way qualified to speak on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. We attach to them personally, and to their priesthood, all the respect and reverence which one believer is capable of feeling about another. But in politics there are other considerations, and certain statements simply cannot be accepted because they come from persons who were not qualified to make them.

43. Finally, Mr. Tekoah spoke of the illegality of the Arab claim to Arab Jerusalem. Has Mr. Tekoah, who was born in Shanghai, or Mrs. Golda Meir, who was born in Russia, or Mr. Abba Eban, who was born in South Africa, more right to speak of Jerusalem than Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, the elected Mayor of the city, whose family have lived there for 1500 years as eternal protectors of the Temple, in the shadow of the Holy Places of Jerusalem? Whom is Mr. Tekoah trying to deceive here? Although in his cultural education his knowledge of Judaism dates from the time of his arrival in Palestine in 1948, the history of Palestine began long before that. And by what right can Israelites of the Baltic countries, Prague or the Sudetenland, or elsewhere, even though they have been badly treated there, claim to have more right to a country they have never known, where they have not lived, where they cannot establish their genealogy? By what right can they reject the legitimacy of those who, because they are reverently attached to each stone and every inch of their sacred Holy Land, have for 1500 years suffered all the vicissitudes of history, all the occupations, all the misfortunes and tragedies of that land? Those who have lived happily as bankers in Zurich, Amsterdam, Rotterdam or elsewhere should not come forward now to claim that they are the protectors of the Holy Land, and that they have more right to it than those who were born there and whose faces today reflect the very character of its soil.

44. We have been told about the unity of Jerusalem. But Israel's concept of unity is equivalent to Hitler's "New Order". If Mr. Tekoah knows the etymology of the words he uses, he must realize that there is an intrinsic, constituent factor of unity, whether national or popular: the consent of those who mean to unite. Mr. Tekoah, do you have the consent of the population of Jerusalem to occupy that city, and to claim that you have brought it a beneficial unity? You tell us with great emotion—and one would think we were hearing a trade union leader addressing the Council—"We have increased the wages of the Jordanian workers". Do you think anyone would agree to give up his dignity, to accept the occupation of his territory, in exchange for an extra 15 pence or so on his daily wage? We know that your philosophy, your Zionist ideology is based on hatred of the Arabs, and we do not question your right to hate us; but we do question your right to regard us with such contempt.

45. So much for some remarks made in the Security Council by Mr. Tekoah in order to divert the Council from the real problems it has to consider. And so much for some remarks made with that quality of arrogance I mentioned at the beginning of my statement.

46. But I am obliged to deal with yet another problem, and I ask the Council to eliminate any aspect of impassioned or religious polemics from that problem and to consider it as the reflection of a simple historical fact which none of us should forget. We are told: "Jerusalem is not Arab". But who remained in Jerusalem while you were in the Diaspora? The Arab people, the Moslem people. Who built the Mosque of Omar, the Masjid Al-Aqsa? Who built all the other Moslem Holy Places? Are they the creation of Moses' rod? Who made them? Who has preserved and cared for them? Do you mean to wipe out the entire Arab heritage by a couple of words in the Council, by saying that the Arabs have no right to Jerusalem? Was it Zionist cosmopolitanism which, over 1500 years, created that right, guarded its legitimacy, preserved the Holy Places in the Arab part of Jerusalem against all the storms of history? I have not heard you tell the Council that, on the basis of the same principle, you also questioned the legitimacy of the Christians—which should logically follow from your statement. Your silence on this score is certainly not an oversight. I can readily believe that it is calculated. I know that in recent years Israeli diplomacy has made enormous efforts in approaching the Church and the Christian world, and I must say, to your credit, that sometimes you have done so with some degree of success. But, on the same principle, why do you not say today that Christianity has no right to Jerusalem either? Are you trying to preserve an objective ally in this circumstantial division? Are you trying to assure that ally that he will have more guarantees than the Moslems? We are engaged in an open dialogue with the Church, in a spirit of tolerance and monotheistic fraternity, and I am sure that when the Church speaks of Christian ecumenism, it does not forget world ecumenism; and the current effort being made for coexistence at the ideological level, and at the level of national churches for understanding, is also being made at a world-wide level for mutual understanding among all creeds. You will not separate us from the historic fraternity we have had with Christianity. You have a habit, in more ways than one, of confusing Zionism with Judaism, with the former triumphing over the latter.

47. May I remind you that what you are doing in Jerusalem today has been done before in history, and that the consequences are still visible. Certainly, the conquest of the Christian world by Rome brought it a great deal of might and power in the early centuries of Christianity, but also brought it so many disturbances, so many divisions that the Church still bears some of the scars to this day. The capture of the Moslem world by the Ottoman Empire may also have given the latter some temporal brilliance and political power for a certain period. But every time the conqueror takes and espouses another's world and faith, he brings the latter misfortune. I am convinced that Zionism, when it takes over Judaism and becomes its compulsory and world-wide guide and mentor, is preparing some very woeful times for Judaism in the future. It is not for Zionism to wipe out what the history of Islam has left to

Jerusalem, what Christianity has done in Jerusalem. I have mentioned what the Moslems have done for 1500 years to remain in Jerusalem. But I must say that, although the crusades are a sad page in the history of mankind, nevertheless, at the cost of the blood shed in Jerusalem, they legitimized an eternal right—a right which must be preserved for ever—for Moslems and Christians alike over the high places of their creeds, and the high places of their faith. If Latin Christendom sent all that was greatest and most valiant to the crusades, if all its ruling dynasties and princely houses sent their knights to fight in Jerusalem, it was certainly not in order to be told today that Israel is there, that Zionism is there and that nobody has the right to claim that Jerusalem belongs to anyone but the Israeli world. So, although you are silent today on the subject of the Christian Holy Places, we are sure that as your policy develops you will some day find arguments to challenge the Christians too on that point.

48. This is an infinitely broad and painful subject. It would be hazardous to try to deal with all its aspects at the same time. However, in referring to a few historic facts I also mean to bring the debate back to its present context. Yesterday, when Mr. Tekoah saw in the Council a certain trend towards the desire for compliance with the decisions adopted—a trend which exists and must continue—he brandished a statement by Mrs. Golda Meir telling us that the great Powers have nothing to do with this matter. I do not think that has always been Israel's policy. This kind of rejection of intervention by the great Powers is new in its policy. After all, Israel was created and recognized by the great Powers. The great Powers guaranteed the *status quo* by the Tripartite Declaration. The great Powers supplied it with all the weapons it wished. For example, and to mention names—I know that the Soviet delegation is capable of answering the points made yesterday concerning it, although every time we meet here you challenge its right to speak because its ideas are closely in line with the legality and legitimacy of Arab rights—I do not think that President Weizmann threw Stalin's cable of recognition in the wastebasket when he received it. I do not think you scorned the intervention of the Government of Mr. Guy Mollet or of Mr. Anthony Eden when they were your accomplices in the attack of 1956. I do not think you displayed such haughtiness towards the United States when you mobilized all the electoral power of that country in order to get the Phantom jets. I do not think you disdain contact with Great Britain when you are about to negotiate to buy the world's best tanks from the United Kingdom. You want to have them beside you constantly to confirm your rights and strengthen your war machinery. But when these great Powers manifest their responsibility by espousing the rights of this very Organization, you seem to say that you do not recognize them. We have been subject to their decisions when it is we who were the victims. If a moral awakening and a change in the world situation are today leading people back to a more genuine respect for law, on what grounds do you expect us now to disdain the great Powers along with you?

49. I know that we are opposed to directorates in the world, but the Charter of the United Nations and the statute of the Security Council give the great Powers a special moral responsibility, and this is the sole legitimate

justification of their role as permanent members. Do you expect us to relieve them of that responsibility today because the attitude they are taking does not suit your ulterior motives and your objectives?

50. There are rules in this Council; it has its statute. It has adopted resolutions, and its first concern, if not duty, should be respect for their validity. And I remember many debates in the Council where, whatever the differences of political attitudes to the problems being discussed in the Council, the members of this organ were unanimous in their will to see to it that the previous decisions of the Council were complied with. Here I wish to recall certain facts—without this in any way being regarded as a statement of a political position—which simply appear on the Council record.

51. On the question of Kashmir, the Council constantly upheld respect for and the validity of the decisions of the United Nations. On the question of Cyprus, the Council constantly invoked international agreements which had received an international guarantee. On the question of the situation created in Berlin, we were on the verge of international crises and war at certain times, because nobody wished the arrangement made at a particular moment to be changed unilaterally. There has been war in Korea and Viet-Nam because the statutes which had been established following the war in Asia and in Indo-China had not been respected by either party concerned. If in those cases the Council insisted—wholly to its honour—on enforcing respect for the validity of its decisions, does it now regard Jerusalem as a corner of the world of any less significance, of less importance? And should we be asked not to engage in a debate because it might be harmful to certain talks? But the Council can only be strengthened ultimately—as would the talks now going on, to which we are the first to wish a successful outcome—if it takes a decision here reaffirming that what it has decided in the past must remain valid until such time as the Council decides otherwise.

52. That is the legal, moral and political context of the debate we are engaged in today. The delegation of Morocco wished to express its point of view concerning all aspects of this problem. We hope that today States Members of the United Nations—whatever the religion to which they belong, or whether they be inspired by a humanism deriving from other than transcendental values, so long as they have shown that they respect the beliefs of others—will not view what has happened in Jerusalem this week only as the passing of a few bulldozers over some old buildings, but as the first stage in a systematic process of destruction, of elimination of the international identity and status of the city, and the obliteration of all that is most sacred in it. And I say to you, with no claims to prophecy, that if tomorrow all that which is Christian and Moslem disappears from Jerusalem, then it will mean that atheist Zionism will have taken over Judaism and will have established its own headquarters in the place of the Wailing Wall and the other Holy Places which the world of Judaism still reveres.

53. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Allow me to express the appreciation of the Zambian delegation to Mr. Solano López of Paraguay, who last month presided over the

deliberations of the Council. We were highly impressed by his correctness and his grasp of Security Council procedures. We had added pleasure in having as President a shining representative of the Latin American continent with whom we have always enjoyed the best of relations.

54. Mr. President, I am happy to welcome you as President of the Security Council for the month of July and to offer the unreserved co-operation of my delegation in the discharge of your difficult but noble task. Knowing you as we do and knowing also your enormous diplomatic, professional and human qualities, to mention only a few, we have no doubt that you will discharge your responsibilities in such a manner as to meet our often high expectations. Your country and mine have always had fraternal relations, based on deep foundations. Our two countries are headed by leaders who have defined man in general terms and who are convinced that this gregarious animal called man is one and indivisible the world over.

55. My delegation and, indeed, my Government are extremely perturbed by the worsening situation in the Middle East. We are especially worried that the response to repeated appeals for peace by the Council and the whole world community have not led to the easing of tension. Instead the parties to the conflict have resorted to measures that are clearly designed to worsen the situation.

56. Once again the Council has been called, at the request of Jordan, to consider the alleged infringements by Israel of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 on the status of the sacred city of Jerusalem. It is not necessary for me to remind the Council of the purpose of this resolution. Representatives have before them, thanks to the excellent efforts of the Secretary-General, his report dated 30 June 1969 [S/9149/Add.1], drawing the attention of the Council to certain measures which have been taken by the Israeli Government since the adoption of resolution 252 (1968). A sober analysis of that report will no doubt confirm that there has been deliberate infringement of resolution 252 (1968). It is regrettable that, even while we sit here to discuss this matter, according to an article in today's edition of *The New York Times*, yet another measure is being undertaken by Israel in pursuit of its policy of formal annexation of the Arab sector of Jerusalem. The Israeli Government, according to this report, has decided to move the national police headquarters from Tel Aviv to East Jerusalem, which, as we all know, was part of Jordan until 1967. It may be true that Israel had intended to make this move some time back, but the move cannot be justified, particularly in the light of resolution 252 (1968). It is rumoured that other agencies of the Israeli Government may follow the police move, among these the Ministry of Justice and the Supreme Court.

57. We have carefully listened to the Jordanian complaint. Similarly, we have followed with great interest the reply by the representative of Israel. In the same spirit, we have paid attention to the many reasoned interventions made by other delegations on the matter. We have been grieved to find that, rather than trying to find a solution to the problem, indeed rather than making a gesture pertinent to resolution 252 (1968), Israel continues deliberately to defy with impunity the decisions of the Council. As a Member of

the United Nations it must recognize and accept its responsibilities flowing from the Charter. Its non-co-operation with the Security Council will, in our view, tarnish this body's reputation, and we should not allow this to happen.

58. With due respect, we do not believe that this is the right kind of approach for settling major international disputes. We sincerely believe that it must be a matter of great concern that, at a time when everyone who is interested in peace is genuinely searching for an effective formula that will bring peace to the troubled area, the parties to the conflict should proceed deliberately to aggravate the situation. It is my humble submission that, taking into account resolution 252 (1968), the recent laws promulgated by Israel are acts intended to confuse even more an already confused situation. There is no doubt that they undermine the efforts being made by the Security Council, efforts which in my delegation's view are designed towards peace and justice, not only for the Palestinian refugees or the Arab countries, but for Israel itself.

59. At this juncture I should like to restate my Government's stand on the whole Middle East question. As is well known, we have made it clear that political reality must persuade everyone to accept the independence and sovereignty of the State of Israel; but while we so believe, we have equally made it clear that we cannot recognize territorial aggrandizement. It is within the context of these two principles that we understand the meaning of the words the "right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries" [resolution 242 (1967)]. It is within that understanding that we supported resolution 252 (1968) adopted on 21 May 1968 in relation to the status of the Holy City.

60. However, we accept the fact that the status and administration of Jerusalem is only a part of the wider complex of the Middle East question. In our view, it is the solution of that whole question that will guarantee the re-establishment of justice, equality, peace and security for all the people in the area. We are opposed to annexation measures by Israel, not only because they violate the Council's resolution, but also because they are discriminatory and inhuman in character. Furthermore, they will harden the attitude of the other parties to the conflict at a time when conciliatory efforts would be expected from both sides.

61. How can we hope for a lasting and just peace when we are adding many more names to the inexhaustible list of refugees? How can we talk of a lasting and just peace when we are sequestering property from people whose only offence is that they do not recognize the military occupation of their land of birth? Is there any intention on the part of Israel to abandon territories acquired during the 1967 hostilities if it is proceeding with such measures as the transfer of its Administration to the occupied areas?

62. The Council has already called for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied during the 1967 conflict; it has also called for the termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for recognized boundaries. Surely, this systematic expropriation of Arab property, demolition of Arab houses and expulsion of Arab

nationals are likely to make our goals even more distant. *Prima facie*, the Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law of 1968 [see S/9149 of 11 April 1969] is intended to consolidate Israel's stay in the conquered Arab area and no doubt is meant to complete the process of annexation of East Jerusalem and the neighbouring areas. The laws are discriminatory, as I have said, and operate against the financial interests of the Arab people. They are against the accepted norms of international law. And all the explanations by the representative of Israel, rather than answering the charges made by Jordan, have, in fact, confirmed the gravity of the crisis.

63. My Government would like to see all the religious interests in Jerusalem live side by side in peace, and no irreversible measures taken by the Israeli authorities. I would like to reiterate the desire of the Council to find a lasting solution for the Middle East crisis; and unless measures such as those taken by Israel are stopped, the restoration of peace in the area will, for a long time, appear illusory.

64. It is time both sides listened and paid attention to world appeals for peace. Enough innocent lives have been lost. Israeli action in East Jerusalem is likely to lead to more loss of life, and the Council has a duty to call on Israel not to proceed with these measures. In our view, it is imperative that resolution 252 (1968) be implemented, and implemented now.

65. We are not impervious to the plight of the Jewish State. The problem between Israel and the Arab countries is a political one, with no military solution. In fact, the Middle East has had more opportunities than most other areas of the world to discover once and for all that disputes cannot be solved simply by the clash of arms. Yet the cycle of forgetfulness of that compelling lesson is regrettably a short one—much shorter than in Europe, for instance, where the irrelevance of war is fortunately a lesson taking slightly longer to unlearn.

66. If the Arab-Israeli dispute is more than a contest between opposing armies—or even, for that matter, between opposing societies with a strong military orientation—what is it? It is important to get away from the belief that it is another symptom of anti-Semitism of the kind one might find in British or American golf clubs. It is not specifically a product of racial incompatibility between Arab and Jew. The history of Jewish communities in the Arab world is not half so terrible as the history of Jewish tribulation at the hand of Christian societies. It is fair to say that Jewish communities have probably flourished culturally and commercially with considerably more security in the Arab world over the last twenty centuries than they have in Europe. We look forward to the day when the phrases “*Salaam*” and “*Shalom*” become a meaningful reality. Let there be peace on earth.

67. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I wish to thank the representative of Zambia for his kind words about me. As you know, the relations between your Prime Minister, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, and our President, Mr. Senghor, are based on personal understanding, which should be the beginning and the end of policy.

68. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): Mr. President, I wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council, and to assure you of the whole-hearted co-operation of my delegation in the discharge of your functions. I would also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Paraguay, for the exemplary manner in which he presided over the Council during the eventful month of June.

69. My delegation voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967, respectively. Provisions of those resolutions were later reiterated by the Security Council in its resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968. The passage of time has not caused any modification in our full support for those resolutions. My delegation continues to hold the view that all actions taken by Israel which tend to change the status of the city of Jerusalem are invalid. This position of policy is motivated, in part, by our regard for Jerusalem as the holy place for three great religions, but mainly by our recognition of the principle which forbids acquisition of territory by military conquest.

70. We appreciate and share the concern shown by delegations over the various measures taken by the occupying authorities aimed at changing the fundamental personality of the city, in contravention of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. My delegation deplores the continued disregard for the resolutions of the Council and the Assembly and is prepared to join in a further call to Israel to rescind those measures and to desist from taking similar actions which might tend to alter the status of Jerusalem.

71. The Security Council may recall that on 8 February 1969 Jordan had requested a meeting of the Council [S/8998] to consider the legislative provisions enacted by the Government of Israel concerning the city of Jerusalem. However, since Israel decided to postpone the putting into effect of those legislative provisions, it was agreed that the meeting should not be convened. We concurred in this agreement and were happy at the development. Preparations for the Big Four meetings on the situation in the Middle East were being made at the time, and although the preparations were at a preliminary stage we welcomed the fact that the Council did not need to meet.

72. Regarding the situation in the Middle East then and now, as far as my delegation is concerned, the primary concern is the withdrawal of forces from all occupied territories, including, of course, Jerusalem, as well as the termination of belligerency on all fronts. The need which appears to my delegation as supreme and paramount is the faithful implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 in all its provisions. The question of Jerusalem is no doubt important. The 22 November 1967 resolution applies to this question, as it applies to the rest of the broader Middle East question.

73. May I state again that, unlike many other problems that face the Security Council, the question of the Middle East is one for which we already know the answer concerning a final settlement. The Council's answer to this problem is the resolution of 22 November 1967 in its entirety.

74. The delegation of Nepal feels strongly about the unhappy situation which prevails in the Middle East. The whole region has been passing through a state of warfare and turmoil for a long time. Experience has shown the utter futility of all attempts to solve the question by military means. Continued occupation of foreign territories, consolidation of military conquest, hostile expeditions across the frontiers—all these actions and attitudes lead us nowhere near the final settlement. On the contrary, they make any settlement more difficult.

75. The occupying authorities have taken further measures in a clear bid to change the status of Jerusalem, in defiance of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Jerusalem is a question of acute international concern. Those measures already taken and contemplated are of such magnitude that their effect would amount to the annexation of the city. Private lands have been requisitioned, private homes bulldozed and hundreds of families evicted. All this shows not only the defiance but the contempt with which the decisions of our Organization reflecting general world opinion are treated by the occupying Power.

76. Even while the Security Council is meeting to consider the question of Jerusalem, we hear further disturbing news from Jerusalem. This is, to say the least, deplorable. We expect all parties, particularly those directly interested in the question, to show restraint, moderation and respect for the decisions of the United Nations. Our appeal for restraint and moderation, and for increasing recourse to peaceful means in this regard, is not an equation between those who pursue a policy of annexation and those who suffer from it. It is motivated by our recognition of the fundamental objective which, in this case, is the implementation of the 22 November resolution, taking into account the special status of the city of Jerusalem.

77. It is in that light that we have welcomed the current talks among the four permanent members as providing the best and the only hope for peace in the Middle East. Political solution is the only solution of the intricate Middle East question, and those Powers are eminently qualified collectively to assist in the peace efforts undertaken by the United Nations under the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967. Although we are naturally concerned at the slow pace of progress in the four-Power talks, we understand the need for very careful examination of all aspects of the problem, which has defied solution for so long. It is the duty of all Member States, and in particular of those which are directly concerned, to help the four Powers to find ways and means for the faithful implementation of the 22 November resolution. Any action on our part which was directly or indirectly aimed at wrecking the peace efforts undertaken by those Powers would be a great disservice to the cause of peace.

78. The recent developments in the Middle East are hardly calculated to further the above-mentioned objective. Violence has taken place almost daily. Acts of force aimed at the piecemeal destruction of one another, and directed indiscriminately against military and civilian targets alike, have occurred. We condemn such acts of violence. The need, as we see it, is for all of us to recognize the inescapable

lesson of contemporary events. The lesson is that we cannot solve this essentially political question either by unilateral decisions or by the use of force. We must have recourse to peaceful political means; and since all attempts have proved futile, and in the absence of dialogue among the parties themselves, it is vital now that we all put our faith in the four-Power talks as the only means likely to lead to the solution of the question, within the framework of the 22 November resolution.

79. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Nepal for the kind words he has addressed to me.

80. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Mr. President, may I associate myself with those who have preceded me in expressing warm appreciation for the outstanding performance of your predecessor, Ambassador Solano López, who presided over our debates last month so successfully, and with competence, tact and effectiveness.

81. Mr. President, it is very difficult to give proper expression to our deep satisfaction in seeing you in the Chair. Your high personal qualities of great wisdom, statesmanlike perspicacity, rich experience and sound judgement are all solid guarantees that in the month of July the gavel of the Security Council is being held by a very able diplomat.

82. The present series of meetings of the Security Council have been convened at the request of the representative of Jordan to discuss "the continued Israeli defiance of its resolution 252 (1968) on Jerusalem" [S/9284]. We all know that the situation in the Middle East continues to be tense and fraught with grave dangers. Why then, one could ask, should there be a meeting of the Council on Jerusalem only? The answer to this question lies in the peculiar nature of the problems concerning Jerusalem. These problems undoubtedly constitute an integral part of the Middle East issues facing the Council. But they are a very special aspect of it. This aspect is governed by resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council but has also been the subject of several resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, notably resolution 252 (1968), which relates exclusively to it. This is a special problem since, within the bounds of Israel's conquest and beyond that fact, Israel is creating an additional and more difficult problem by fundamentally and juridically changing the status of a part of that territory, the city of Jerusalem. Thus a special and separate question emerges; it is something which clearly requires the special attention of the Council.

83. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 provides that the Israeli armed forces must withdraw from territories it occupied during the war of 1967. Nowhere does that resolution exclude Jerusalem from this obligation. Israel is thus bound to withdraw from Jerusalem as much as it is bound to withdraw from all other territories occupied as a result of its aggression of June 1967. But to make this obligation even more specific, General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967 and Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 provide that the

United Nations can accept no change in the status of Jerusalem. The Council, in its resolution 252 (1968), referring to the violations of those resolutions by Israel, urgently called upon Israel "to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem".

84. What has been Israel's reaction to those decisions of the United Nations adopted by overwhelming majorities? To put it in a nutshell, Israel has done nothing to rescind all these measures and has done everything to change the status of Jerusalem. I do not propose to go into the details of these measures; other speakers have already done so and no effort has been made by the representative of Israel during this discussion to deny the thrust of the Israeli measures of annexation. Suffice it to say that no steps have been neglected in proceeding with the annexation of East Jerusalem, in open defiance of the United Nations. The land and property of the Arab inhabitants and institutions of Arab Jerusalem have been systematically expropriated. A large number of houses belonging to Arabs have been demolished on short notice and the rightful owners have been required to move elsewhere. Others, including some of the most prominent Arab leaders of the city, have been forcibly deported to the east bank of the Jordan. New plans have been announced to create Israeli settlements in East Jerusalem with a view to drastically altering the composition of the population, thus making East Jerusalem a city inhabited by newly settled Israeli citizens. All these brutal and arbitrary measures have been aimed at bringing about a *de facto* change in the status of the city. This, however, does not mean that no steps have been and are being taken to legalize the situation thus created and to make East Jerusalem formally a part of Israel.

85. The latest of these measures are contained in the so-called Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law, 5728-1968, which provides for the compulsory Israeli registration of Arab companies. This law, as reproduced in the report of the Secretary-General [S/9149 and Add.1] submitted in pursuance of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, states that: "the Minister of Justice may instruct by an order its [a company's] registration in Israel in accordance with the Companies Ordinance . . ." [see S/9194/Add.1, appendix A]. In this connexion the representative of Israel, speaking at the 1482nd meeting, stated that: "The pretext"—as he put it—"for Jordan's call for an emergency meeting is a year-old law which provides for the issuance of licences and permits for the exercise of commerce and professions". He went on to criticize Jordan for laying before the Security Council "technicalities of registration of commercial enterprises." It is surprising, to say the least, that emergency regulations requiring companies in the occupied city of Jerusalem to register with the occupying authorities as Israeli companies, with everything that such a move entails, should be characterized by the Israeli representative as technicalities. It is even more unfortunate that he expects the Council to take his assertions at face value. It is certainly indicative of the Israeli treatment of the Council that so transparent an attempt is deemed sufficient to mislead the Council. It is certainly not to the credit of Israel on the one hand to boast that "Jerusalem will for ever be united" and on the

other to tell us that measures aimed at bringing about this so-called unity, more correctly this annexation, are mere technicalities and that to have the Council deal with them is "the height of frivolity and irresponsible malice".

86. Locating the national police headquarters of Israel, as is reported today in the press, in the occupied city, in a building built by Jordan as a hospital, not only shows the marked difference in intentions of the two Governments as to how to care for the well-being of the civilian population of Jerusalem, but, at the moment of the present Security Council discussion, constitutes as well an act of grave provocation and not a mere technicality.

87. In brief, the measures serving as the basis for Jordan's complaint are violations of the Charter and of the resolutions of the United Nations by Israel, and the Government of Israel knows this full well.

88. The policy of armed conquest practised by Israel in Jerusalem cannot be substantiated by the provisions of the Charter. Indeed, no attempt has been made by the representative of Israel to do this. Instead, he once again shifted the discussion into the realm of mythology. Are we, from now on, to proceed on the basis of mythical theses that take us back to ancient times? Shall we agree that frontiers of modern States should be drawn on this basis? If so, what will remain of all the frontiers now existing in the world? It is sufficient to ask these questions to see the absurdity of the Israeli position.

89. It is no better when the unification of Jerusalem is put forward as justifying the annexation of East Jerusalem. The unity of Jerusalem is not before the Council. Israel knows this full well, and the choice of this code-word, "unification", is solely motivated by a desire to offer a more popular term than "annexation"; but, in fact, the real meaning is annexation. What we are concerned with here is the principle enshrined in the Charter that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible and the weight of conquest should not determine frontiers. This alone is the issue before the Council with regard to Jerusalem.

90. The policy of open annexation pursued by Israel in Jerusalem is disturbing not only for what it means for the city, but for what it shows of the true intentions of Israel in the Middle East. We have often been told by Israeli representatives that Israel has accepted resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. Does that assertion apply to Jerusalem too, or are we to understand that resolution 242 (1967) allows the Government of Israel to annex Jerusalem? Are the provisions of that resolution accepted in the same way by Israel with respect to other issues in the Middle East? Surely no one can claim that the Council has issued a licence for annexation in resolution 242 (1967).

91. Another point stressed by Israel is the idea of direct negotiations with its Arab neighbours. This proposition is put forward time and again as the only possible way to end the crisis in the Middle East. Yet, when we approach the individual issues such as Jerusalem or the Golan Heights or others contained in the declarations made recently by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister of Israel, we find

that all those issues are labelled as non-negotiable. It thus appears that the only purpose of such negotiations would be acceptance by the Arab countries, from the hand of Israel, of surrender terms embodying the annexation of Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, a large part of the Sinai Peninsula including Sharm esh-Sheikh, large parts of the west bank area, etc. Curious negotiations indeed. But it is even more curious that Israel professes not to understand the refusal of the Arab countries to enter into such negotiations.

92. The question of Jerusalem is not only of a legal and political nature, but of a psychological nature also. Jerusalem's place in the feelings of hundreds of millions of people, people sometimes far removed geographically and politically from the Middle East, is well known to everyone. It is for this reason that the insensitivity of Israel to the feelings of those people is most disturbing. It is really difficult to understand how a Government which bases its claims to Jerusalem on religious and historic grounds can fail so completely to take into account the sentiments of others motivated by the same considerations. All this is even further compounded by the denial of self-determination to the Arab inhabitants of East Jerusalem. Everything testifies to the fact that the Arab inhabitants of the conquered city, whether they be Moslems or Christians, do not wish to become Israeli citizens, do not wish to see their city become part of Israel. Is this so difficult to appreciate for those who claim their rights by pointing back two thousand years? Do they really feel that a military conquest which took place two years ago confers a right upon them for ever, when the Roman conquest twenty centuries ago was but a single historical interval? I am obliged to raise these questions because I do feel that the thoroughly unrealistic approach of the Israeli representative in our discussion as much does a disservice to the genuine interests of the people of Israel as it seriously harms the persecuted Arab population of Jerusalem. The lyrical tone of Mr. Tekoah's intervention is drowned out by the noise of the bulldozers, by the explosion of the bombs of the Arab resistance. No objective observer, not even such a normally pro-Israel voice as *The New York Times*, would subscribe to the complacent picture of Jerusalem drawn by the representative of Israel. There is no real coexistence in Jerusalem, those observers tell us, between conquerors and conquered. Israeli sources quoted by other speakers concur in this view. And yet we hear the Israeli representative, speaking in his growing isolation, putting forward the simplistic ideas of the conquerors of all times and expecting us to take them at face value.

93. The Middle East situation continues to remain explosive because the Government of Israel has been demonstrating an astonishing lack of understanding of the genuine interests of its own people. It endangers the peace and security of the whole region and, even, is not loath to draw the great Powers into this conflict. Having lost its sense of proportion in the wake of its temporary military superiority, it is dangerously out of touch with our times and with the aspirations of peoples. It is high time that it understood the dangers of its present suicidal course. But until it does, we have no alternative except to apply the provisions of our Charter and of our resolutions. The Security Council must serve notice that it will not tolerate

any further violation of its decisions. It must guarantee that Israel, just as any other Member State, lives by the laws of the United Nations. All such decisions as outlined by various speakers preceding me will find my delegation among their firm supporters.

94. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Hungary for the kind words he has addressed to me. I shall certainly need the experience and ever friendly indulgence of a diplomat like himself in order to discharge my task successfully this month.

95. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): May I, in the name of the Finnish delegation, extend our congratulations and best wishes to you, Sir, as President of the Council for the month of July. We all know the high qualities you bring to the Chair. It is a privilege for my delegation to pledge its co-operation to you.

96. I should also like to pay a warm tribute to the retiring President, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay, for the outstanding service he rendered to the Council during its meetings in June.

97. The Security Council has convened once again to consider a complaint under the general heading of "The situation in the Middle East". The representative of Jordan has requested this urgent meeting of the Council to consider the question of Jerusalem. Jordan's complaint refers to measures taken by the Government of Israel aimed at changing the character and status of Jerusalem in contravention of resolution 252 (1968) of the Security Council, and earlier resolutions of the General Assembly. The Council also has before it a report by the Secretary-General [*S/9149 and Add.1*], which reproduces the text of the Israeli law on which, among other things, Jordan's complaint is based.

98. The representative of Israel has confirmed that his Government has undertaken legislative and administrative measures, to which the Jordanian complaint and the Secretary-General's report refer. He says, however, that whatever measures the Israeli Government may have taken with regard to Jerusalem, they are aimed at assuring the welfare of the city and its inhabitants.

99. The resolutions on Jerusalem approved by the General Assembly during its fifth emergency special session in 1967 and by the Security Council in 1968 are based on legal and political considerations. They proceed from the basis that the Government of Israel can claim no sovereignty over Jerusalem and that, therefore, measures and actions by Israel cannot be accepted nor recognized as altering or prejudging the status of the city. Consequently, the General Assembly and the Security Council have declared these measures invalid, and have requested the Government of Israel to rescind measures already taken and to desist from any further measures tending to change the status of Jerusalem. My Government has concurred in this view in voting for General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V).

100. In the political context, the situation in Jerusalem is intensifying tensions in the Middle East. This gives rise to

deep anxiety, particularly at a time when the over-all situation in the area is deteriorating. The Secretary-General, on 2 May 1969, in the form of a special report [S/9188], called to the urgent attention of the members of the Security Council the critical situation in the Suez Canal sector and the danger of a breakdown in the cease-fire arrangements there; tension and violence continue unabated along the cease-fire lines and beyond them in other areas as well. All these acts in defiance of the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council make more difficult the already difficult task of promoting a peaceful settlement on the basis of the principles set forth in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The Finnish Government strongly believes that the talks between the major Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, still offer the best hope for progress towards a peaceful and accepted settlement. In our view, the Security Council, which bears the responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the area, should do everything possible to promote the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

101. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Finland for the kind words he has addressed to me and the pledge he has given me of his co-operation.

102. Mr. LIU Chieh (China): Permit me, Sir, first of all to offer you the congratulations and best wishes of my delegation on your assumption of the Presidency. We are confident that in your skilled hands the Council will be guided through a month which has begun on a note of urgency. I should like to add a word of tribute to the outgoing President, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay, who presided over the Council with such wisdom and distinction as to make our common labour a pleasant experience.

103. The Council has been called once again to consider the question of Jerusalem, a question which has been a matter of international concern since 1947 and the subject of a number of important resolutions both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. There seems to be a consensus that this Holy City, the cradle of three great religions, should, as far as possible, be kept free from international rivalry and strife. This, unfortunately, has not been the case. Instead of being a symbol of hope and peace, Jerusalem has become the battleground of national ambitions.

104. The question of Jerusalem cannot, however, be viewed in isolation. It is one aspect—a vital aspect, to be sure—of the Middle East problem. It is thus inscribed on our agenda under the general heading, "The situation in the Middle East". I believe that members of the Council are agreed that the solution of the Middle East question must be based on the principles laid down in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and no one, particularly those directly concerned, should do anything that might prejudice the efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in that sensitive area of the world. Needless to say, my delegation, in common with other delegations, is greatly disappointed at the lack of progress in the mediatory mission of Mr. Jarring and in the efforts of the interested Powers in seeking an acceptable settlement. But, pending the formula-

tion of an agreed plan for peace, any action that tends to predetermine the terms of settlement or otherwise change the status of the disputed city must meet with the unequivocal disapproval of the Council. This has been, and still is, the position of my delegation. In line with this position, my delegation gave its support to resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly in July 1967. It was also in line with this position that we voted for Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, in which, it may be remembered, the Council called upon Israel to rescind all legislative and administrative measures and to desist from any action tending to change the legal status of Jerusalem. That resolution remains binding on the Council as well as on the parties directly concerned.

105. In the present case, Jordan complains that Israel, in defiance of Security Council resolution 252 (1968), has proceeded to complete the process of unilateral annexation of Jerusalem, namely, the creation of a greater Jerusalem which includes many neighbouring villages and areas inhabited and owned by Christian and Moslem Jordanians, the confiscation and demolition of property owned by Arabs, the subordination of Arab life to Israeli laws and the gradual liquidation of the whole Arab character of the Holy City. The representative of Israel, in his statement at the 1482nd meeting of the Council, has not denied the Jordanian charges. He has, however, described the actions taken by his Government as attempts to build, to construct, to improve and to modernize rather than to tear down and destroy. The needs of a modern society must be met. The issuance of licences and permits, he argues, is not so much to subordinate Arab life to Israeli laws as to "facilitate the continued and lawful conduct of Arab business and professions in the city". The demolition of certain buildings and structures adjacent to the Wailing Wall is "aimed at ensuring the beauty, the safety and the dignity of that Holy Place".

106. However that may be, it cannot be denied that what Israel has done in Jerusalem since 1967 has not been acceptable to the Arab population and is inconsistent with the terms of Security Council resolution 252 (1968). The transfer of governmental establishments from Tel Aviv to East Jerusalem, as reported in today's press is hardly calculated to lessen the apprehensions about Israel's intentions.

107. In the present circumstances any unilateral action that tends to change the character of the city and affect its future status must be viewed as prejudicial to the rights of the Arab inhabitants in the occupied area and contrary to world public opinion as reflected in the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Certainly it cannot be to the long-term interest of Israel to persist in a course of action which will make the achievement of durable peace in the Middle East even more difficult.

108. It seems to my delegation that at the present juncture the Council should reaffirm the principles laid down in resolution 252 (1968) and urgently call upon Israel to comply with the requirements of that resolution and to desist from taking any further action that has the effect of ultimately altering the status of Jerusalem. It is difficult to

imagine that tranquillity may be restored to the Holy City unless the rights of the Arab populace are recognized and protected.

109. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of China for the kind words he has addressed to me. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Malaysia. I now invite him to take a seat at the Council table, and I call on him to make his statement.

110. Mr. HASHIM (Malaysia): Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express to you, and through you to the members of the Security Council, the gratitude of my delegation for giving us this privilege of participating in the deliberations of the Council, without the right to vote. I appear before you today as a representative of a State on the other side of the horizon, far from the actual areas of conflict, yet not unconcerned with the events which are now taking place in Jerusalem. Perhaps it is not too late to remind Israel that the status of this Holy City is not purely a matter between Israel and Jordan; nor does it concern only Israel and the Arab States; but, because of its very nature, any changes to the status of Jerusalem will have profound repercussions also among Christians everywhere, as well as among Muslims all over the world. It is because of the deep concern felt by the Government and people of Malaysia at the persistent and intensified Israeli violations of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) concerning Jerusalem that we seek your indulgence for our participation in this Council.

111. In the aforesaid resolution, the Council considered that "all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status" and urgently called upon Israel "to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem".

112. The intentions and objectives of the resolution are very clear. Yet, in utter disregard of the will of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and instead of complying with the aforementioned directives, Israel proceeded to enact legislation amounting to the virtual annexation of the Old City. We also learned from the representative of Jordan the other day of Israel's continued violation of basic human rights in the Holy City by the taking of measures contrary to the provisions of resolution 252 (1968) and the United Nations Charter. He also referred to the arbitrary arrests, detentions, torture, demolition of houses and deportations committed by the Israeli authorities. The recent eviction by force of several Arab families from the Old City of Jerusalem, including the desecration of the building belonging to the Waqf, a Moslem religious institution, is to be condemned by all, and not by Moslems alone.

113. In April this year, Malaysia played host to the International Islamic Conference. That Conference was yet another milestone in Malaysia's efforts to bring about peace and co-operation among nations. It was also a great and important step forward in bringing about fraternity and

co-operation among Muslim nations. That Conference gave delegates from many Moslem countries the opportunity to discuss issues affecting the progress and happiness of many millions of Moslems throughout the world. Delegations from Moslem countries from all over Asia and Africa converged on Kuala Lumpur to exchange views on Islamic theology and to discuss religious issues. It was by no means a political conference, yet one of the main resolutions passed concerned Jerusalem, which shows beyond any doubt the importance that is attached by all Moslems to the status of the Holy City. With your permission, I shall quote that resolution, entitled "Beit-al-Maqdis from the Islamic Point of View":

"Having carefully studied the issue of the Holy City of Beit-al-Maqdis where the Moslems have for centuries been responsible for preserving the sacred places of the Moslem and the Christian alike,

"And noting the strong sentiments expressed by delegates to this Conference,

"1. This Conference condemns Israel for having usurped the Arab territories and in particular the Holy City of Beit-al-Maqdis, which includes the first Qiblah and the third sacred mosque of the Moslems and place of ascension of the Holy Prophet;

"2. Calls upon all Moslem States and peoples to support the Palestinian people and the Moslem countries, which have been the victims of Israeli aggression, in their efforts to recover Beit-al-Maqdis and their usurped territories and for restoration of the legal rights of the Palestinian people;

"3. Appeals to all Moslem nations to hold as soon as possible a Conference at high political level to discuss the issue of Beit-al-Maqdis in all its aspects;

"4. Appeals to all nations of the world to uphold the Charter of the United Nations which clearly condemns the acquisition of territories by force and denies the fruits of aggression to the aggressor".

The above-mentioned resolution is also in conformity with General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) of 14 July 1967, and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968.

114. From what I have said it will be clear that if Israel continues to defy the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly affecting Jerusalem, it will have to contend not only with its Arab neighbours and the Moslem world, but also with the political and moral force of the United Nations itself.

115. Since June 1967, the Israeli Government and its military occupation authorities, by assuming a wide variety of responsibilities on the territories newly annexed, have indicated beyond doubt that the occupation of the Arab lands will not be short. In the Old City of Jerusalem itself, the Jordanian educational, judicial and administrative systems have been uprooted and replaced. The Israelis have always pointed out that their object has been to "integrate"

East Jerusalem; they carefully avoid the term "annexation". The people of the territory who refuse to accept "integration" are told to leave, and later forcibly evicted; those who resist are warned and then apprehended. Israel has all along claimed the entire city as part of the new Jewish State and its status as non-negotiable. This is done in utter defiance of the General Assembly resolution [2254 (ES-V)] of 14 July 1967—sponsored by Malaysia, Pakistan and six other Member States—which called on Israel to rescind all measures it had taken to alter the status of Jerusalem; in spite of two further resolutions by the Security Council, Israel remains adamant and continues to strut in arrogance.

116. The other day Mr. Tekoah emphasized that the so-called legislative acts were necessary for the smooth running of Jerusalem as a whole as a modern city. These, he claims, were essential for the purpose of issuance of licences and permits, payment of rents and rates, and so on. But as correctly pointed out by the representative of the United Kingdom, the question of Jerusalem cannot be solved by administrative acts alone; there are also political, social and economic issues to be considered, all of which are of considerable importance in maintaining peace and security in the area.

117. Mr. Tekoah has also painted a glowing picture of Jerusalem under Israeli occupation. He talks of the prevailing good weather, the warm sunshine, the bustling trade and industry of Jerusalem today. Yet in this context his argument is extremely unconvincing. The fact that Israel is now administering the whole of Jerusalem does not confer on it the badge of legality. In so far as Malaysia is concerned, in line with various resolutions already passed, it condemns Israeli annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem. It was and still is Arab territory, and because of that, Malaysia cannot condone this act of blatant aggression.

118. I reiterate what my delegation stated during the fifth emergency special session in June 1967: that it is the hope of Malaysia that, in matters concerning war and peace, the United Nations could still provide the means to tilt the balance in favour of a lasting peace with justice and equity. When the territorial integrity of a State is being violated, the United Nations cannot remain passive and thereby condone such acts of aggression. At the moment the problem affecting the status of Jerusalem presents indeed a challenge to the prestige and dignity of the Security Council. Is the Council going to remain passive and merely watch Israel continue persistently to violate, in open defiance of the Council, the various resolutions adopted on Jerusalem?

119. Malaysia is dedicated to the fundamental principles of non-aggression, respect for the independence and territorial integrity of States, and support for United Nations actions. The Government and people of Malaysia abhor violence in any form and from any source; violence should not be used as an instrument to settle disputes. My delegation can only pray to God Almighty that the days of war and violence, death and misery, will come to an end soon, and that peace and sanity will return to the Middle East, the cradle of civilization, and love and hope for all mankind.

120. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Lebanon. I now invite him to take a seat at the Council table and I call on him to speak.

121. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, allow me first to join in the tributes paid to the past President of the Council, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay, and to voice my delegation's satisfaction that you are now presiding over the deliberations of the Council. Our satisfaction stems from the fact that a deep friendship has developed between Senegal and Lebanon through many years of human and cultural association.

122. I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to present the views of the Lebanese Government on the question of Jerusalem, which is before the Council.

123. Jerusalem is of particular importance and interest to Lebanon. The Christian and Moslem communities which compose the population of Lebanon have had, from time immemorial, deeply rooted spiritual, traditional and affectionate ties with the Holy City. Until the Israeli occupation in June 1967, their access to the religious shrines had never been interrupted and this constant association has been to them a source of pride and inspiration. The calculated and sustained Israeli plans for the de-Arabization and the Israelization of the Old City, containing the Moslem and Christian holy places, has aroused the gravest concern of the Government and people of Lebanon.

124. The Council has been convened to deal with the continuous illegal process of Israelization which is being carried out by Israel in defiance of the United Nations. My distinguished colleague, Mr. El-Farra of Jordan, has eloquently presented you with all the facts and justifiably requested the Council to take prompt and effective measures to redress a situation in Jerusalem bound to have serious consequences in the future.

125. Only today news dispatches in *The New York Times* bring to the attention of the Council and the world at large the news that Israel moved its national police headquarters yesterday from Tel Aviv to East Jerusalem in a bold move to solidify its annexation of the Jordanian sector of the Holy City. The police headquarters are to be housed in a handsome stone structure which, before the Israeli occupation, was being erected by Jordan as a hospital. *The New York Times* further reports that arrangements are being made to transfer the Ministry of Justice from downtown western Jerusalem to East Jerusalem. That is the kind of justice that Israel is applying in the occupied Arab city of Jerusalem. That is how Israel is complying with international law and United Nations resolutions.

126. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council, in 1967 and 1968, adopted, without dissent, resolutions requesting Israel to rescind all the decisions and measures it had taken with the aim of altering the status and character of the Old City of Jerusalem. But faithful to its heavy record of defiance of the United Nations, Israel has shown its disrespect for and contempt of the decision of this important body contained in resolution 252 (1968) of 21

May 1968. That is the central issue for the consideration of the Council. Mr. Tekoah has been attempting, in his interventions, to confuse that issue, to drown the fish. He has spoken of many things, including the innocent testimony of two gentlemen from Sierra Leone and Madagascar about what they saw in Old Jerusalem. His attempt reminds me of a few verses by an English poet of the last century, William Thackeray, who said:

“He scarce had said his catechism
When up he jumps: There is land I see,
There’s Jerusalem and Madagascar
And North and South Amerikey
There’s the British fleet a-riding at anchor,
With Admiral Napier, K.C.B.”

Such a vision of the world can be claimed nowadays only by the astronauts. The Israeli representative will do better and be better advised if he tells the Council, clearly and squarely, whether his Government intends to heed the resolutions of the United Nations.

127. We have been gratified, yesterday and today, to hear the statements of representatives in the Security Council—especially the representatives of the Big Four Powers—statements in which they have reaffirmed the positions of their respective Governments with regard to the illegal and invalid decision taken by Israel to annex the Old Arab City of Jerusalem and all the measures that have flowed from that decision. They have unequivocally stated that the Israeli actions prejudice and prejudice the final settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict according to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. Those statements may have the effect of partially allaying the fears and suspicions of the Arabs about the fate of East Jerusalem. But more is needed. Action should be taken to implement, promptly and effectively, Security Council resolution 252 (1968). The Council is duty bound to prevent all actions by Israel which constitute at the present stage, and will undoubtedly constitute in the future, added grave obstacles on the already too difficult road to peace.

128. If Israel sincerely wishes peace, it must desist from all acts that will hamper and undermine peaceful developments. It should come to its senses and understand that in the age of the United Nations and of the better-defined principles of international law and morality, the road to peace no longer can be travelled by way of force, military conquest and *Diktat*. Israel entered the Holy City by force of arms, and by force of arms it wants to stay there. By the weight of conquest Israel claims that the integration of the Old City of Jerusalem into the western part is final, irrevocable, irreversible and not negotiable. This harsh, stubborn and defiant Israeli attitude does not augur well for the future of peace in the Middle East. This attitude motivated the views expressed in an editorial in *The New York Times* on 1 July, from which I quote the following:

“But in ignoring the rights of long-time Arab residents of the city and in refusing to recognize that others have an attachment for Jerusalem that is equal to their own, the Israelis are sowing the seeds of perpetual conflict.”

The continued presence of Israel in the Old City of Jerusalem will never be conducive to peace; it will always

be a sore spot, an area for friction and disturbance. Jerusalem, of all the cities of the world, should be spared this ordeal.

129. It follows that the Security Council has a special responsibility to prevent the development of such a perpetual conflict. It can do so by taking measures in accordance with the Charter to bolster Council resolution 252 (1968), by making it effective and by deterring Israel from committing further violations of United Nations resolutions. The Governments and peoples of the Arab world are growing sceptical of resolutions adopted by the United Nations and never implemented. The United Nations can no longer afford to have its resolutions and decisions flouted by Israel. The United Nations and the Security Council, in particular, have the responsibility of restoring the confidence of the Arab peoples in the effectiveness and prevalence of international law. This Organization has been created to maintain legality and order in the world, to promote peace and security amongst nations, to protect the human rights of individuals. What is now being undertaken in Jerusalem by Israel is not only in direct violation of international law but is also a flagrant violation of the human rights of the Christian and Moslem Arabs of Jerusalem.

130. My friend and colleague, Mr. El Kony, representative of the United Arab Republic, vividly expounded yesterday, as others have done today, the violations by Israel of some provisions and principles of international law. I do not wish to be repetitious. But to us in Lebanon, a country which since the inception of the United Nations has continued to make positive contributions to the promotion of the principles of human rights, the violation of the human rights of the Arab peoples in the Israeli-occupied territories is of deep and saddening concern.

131. In violation of the fourth Geneva Convention,⁴ article 54, and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 17, Israel has confiscated Arab properties and land.

132. In violation of the fourth Geneva Convention, articles 53 and 33, Israel has destroyed Arab property and belongings, amongst which are a mosque and a religious tribunal.

133. In violation of the fourth Geneva Convention, article 49, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 9, Israel has forcibly deported, evicted and transferred Arab inhabitants from their homes.

134. The evidence about these systematic violations by Israel of the human rights of the indigenous population of the Arab city of Jerusalem has been substantial and the records of this Organization are replete with it. The International Conference on Human Rights which was held at Teheran in May 1968 strongly condemned these and other Israeli violations. However, the Israeli representative has the audacity to pretend before the Council that peaceful, normal and co-operative relations prevail between the Israeli occupiers and the Arab people of the Old City of

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973.

Jerusalem. He goes so far as to pretend that the Arabs have never had it so good. If the Israeli Government can really boast of such achievements as it claims, if it has nothing to hide and has a clear conscience, then Israel can readily declare its willingness to co-operate with the United Nations and implement its resolutions. It can then receive the special representative of the Secretary-General, in accordance with Security Council resolution 237 (1967). It can receive members of two committees, the one formed recently by the Economic and Social Council⁵ and the other to be formed in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII) of 19 December 1968, to visit the occupied territories and the Old City of Jerusalem, in order to investigate the practices of Israel with regard to the human rights of the Arab populations. The special representative of the Secretary-General and the two committees can then establish their reports and tell us here at the United Nations whether or not Israel has violated the human rights of the Arab peoples of the occupied territories and the Old City of Jerusalem. The Arab Governments have welcomed the creation of the two committees and are willing to extend all co-operation to them. They are confident that what they have been saying about the violation of human rights by Israel in the occupied territories represents the truth. Israel should not be afraid of letting the complete truth become known.

135. Mr. Tekoah tried to demonstrate to the Council the other day the interest of his Government in the development of the Old City of Jerusalem. He stated that a conference is being held at present in Jerusalem for that purpose and that it is being attended by various personalities who have distinguished themselves in various fields of art, science and architecture. We have great respect for these personalities, but their presence in Jerusalem should not be represented or construed as an act of approbation of the annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem by Israel or of its violation of the human rights of the Arab people. These personalities should not be drawn, and I believe they do not want to be drawn, into any political disputes. We do not believe that their intention in being in Jerusalem is to sanction or consecrate the claims of Israel to the Old City of Jerusalem.

136. Mr. Tekoah speaks of acts of violence to distract the attention of the Council from the main issue. Lebanon has complete justification to recall the wanton, treacherous and criminal Israeli attack on the International Airport of Beirut in December 1968, an attack for which Israel was strongly and unanimously condemned by the Council. Other aggressive attacks against the Arab countries and people continue unabated, thus endangering the precarious peace in the Middle East.

137. While the four-Power talks go on here at the United Nations and the bilateral talks are pursued in Washington, while the Security Council convenes every now and then to deal with various aggressive acts by Israel against the Arab States, while the occupation of the territories of three Arab countries continues, while the international community is dealing with the situation in the Middle East which is

⁵ See Economic and Social Council resolution 1423 (XLVI) of 6 June 1969.

fraught with so many explosive dangers—while all this is happening, Israel is forging ahead in consolidating its annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem. Some Israeli leaders are declaring their desire to transform the new facts of occupation in other parts of the occupied territories into established facts, and to follow the example of integration of the Old City of Jerusalem by integrating such areas as the Golan Heights, Nablus, Jericho, Sharm esh-Sheikh and other places. It follows that what is happening in Jerusalem is symptomatic of well-hidden and well-conceived Israeli plans for expansion and annexation; it follows therefore, as I have said before, that the Security Council, and particularly the Big Four, have the responsibility of preventing the perpetual conflict regarding Jerusalem from developing further. Governments have been in full agreement that the Holy City should be spared the horrors and ordeals of wars and hatred. The Security Council can and should act promptly to prevent the deterioration of the situation in the Old City of Jerusalem and consequently in the area.

138. To us in Lebanon, as well as to men everywhere, Jerusalem embodies all that is divine, sublime and spiritual; it is a city of love, harmony and understanding; it abhors hatred, animosity and strife. The destiny of Jerusalem was to be the holiest city for Judaism and Christianity and the second holiest city for Islam. Jews, Christians and Moslems have lived there in harmony, peace and understanding for centuries, and can do so again for a long time to come.

139. We in Lebanon have a deep attachment to our Christian and Moslem Holy Places in the Old City of Jerusalem. We share this attachment with that of all the Christians and Moslem peoples in the Arab World. We do not want to be estranged and detached from our Holy Places, from the Old City of Jerusalem. We want the Old City restored to the full splendour of its spirituality. We want to see that the Arab peoples, Christians and Moslems alike, share with the Christians, Moslems and Jews of the world over, the joy and exhilaration of visiting the sacred shrines of Jerusalem unhampered by strife brought about by an occupying Power. Barriers of hatred, suspicion and bitterness should not be erected or maintained. Israel must understand that it cannot arrogate to itself the sole right and power of dealing with the destiny of the old Holy City without at the same time preserving and reinforcing those barriers. Arab rights have to be fully restored and respected.

140. In conclusion, permit me to say that the Lebanese Government and people feel that peoples everywhere share their feelings and concern over the fate of Palestine and the old Holy City of Jerusalem. Because of Jerusalem, because of Palestine, President Charles Hélou of Lebanon said, not very long ago:

“Witness and victim of violence and inequity, our Arab Orient knows that it is not alone subject to jeopardy, and that in defending itself it is defending a morality and a justice that are indivisible. In this respect, it is not sufficient to say that every country could fear becoming one day the Palestine of someone else. It is necessary to say more and to recognize that, already and in the present conditions, every man, because of the Palestine drama, carries in himself a profaned sanctuary and a Holy Land in mourning.”

141. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Iraq. I now invite him to take a seat at the Council table, and I call on him to make a statement.

142. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq): Permit me, Mr. President, first to express to you and to the distinguished members of the Security Council the sincere thanks of my Government for your favourable response to my request to take part in the current discussions of the Council regarding the question of Jerusalem. The fate of Beit-al-Maqdis is so vital and crucial to the Iraqi people, as part of the Arab nation and the Moslem world, as to make it essential to acquaint the Council with the views of my Government and to convey to it the feelings of my people.

143. For, whereas other aspects of the Israeli aggression affect the sovereignty of three Arab countries and the condition of the inhabitants in the occupied territories, the Israeli aggression in Beit-al-Maqdis affects the future of a city unlike any other city in the whole world: a city held in sacred reverence by three major religions, but one that is about to fall prey irremediably to the political designs of Israel. Thus the profound sentiments of more than half of human kind are in danger of being utterly disregarded so that the stranglehold of the Israelis on that suffering city and its inhabitants may be perpetuated. The fate of Beit-al-Maqdis and of its people is symbolic of the future of a whole country and of a whole nation. Only when justice is done to that city can there be a glimmer of hope that justice will finally emerge victorious in Palestine.

144. What is before the Council now is not a complaint by Jordan, nor is it a complaint by the Arab countries or the Moslems or the Christians. It is an appeal by all humanity; and the Council, which is entrusted by the collective will of the Members of this Organization with the maintenance of international peace and security, is called upon to deliver Beit-al-Maqdis from the aggressor, to restore its dignity and sanctity and to protect its people.

145. The issue is very clear. On 5 June 1967, Israel embarked on a further step in the implementation of its expansionist plan, this time to absorb all of Palestine and occupy sizable areas of territory of the United Arab Republic and Syria. The next day the Security Council called for a cease-fire, but Israel went on waging its war of aggression for five more days until it fulfilled all of its immediate objectives. Less than three weeks later, on 27 June 1967, Israel took the first steps to perpetuate that situation brought about by conquest. On that day, Israel enacted legislation designed to annex the Old City of Jerusalem and all of its environs, with more land to be added at a later stage. Actually, Israel did not wait for the legislative formality to give effect to its plan of annexation. It had already dynamited and bulldozed 135 houses belonging to the Moslem Waqf in the Maghrabi Quarter adjacent to Al-Haram Ash-Sharif.

146. Systematic actions then ensued, all designed to finalize the annexation and absorption of the Old City into Israel. Where acts of intimidation and terror failed to remove the Arab inhabitants of the city, eviction by force was resorted to. The Arab Municipal Council was dissolved

and the Mayor of the city was banished, together with other religious, civic and political leaders. Full accounts of these and other illegal activities by Israeli occupation authorities were given by the Mayor of Beit-al-Maqdis when he addressed the Council on 3 May 1968, and can be found in the record of the 1421st meeting. What has taken place since then was partly reported by the Secretary-General in his report of 11 April 1969 [S/9149], and its significance was adequately highlighted by the representative of Jordan in his statement to the Council on 30 June 1969 [1482nd meeting].

147. Fully aware of the implications of all the illegal activities of the Israeli occupation authorities, and conscious of its duties, the General Assembly moved swiftly to deal with the situation. On 4 July 1967 it adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V), considering the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the city invalid and calling upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. When that resolution fell on deaf ears, the General Assembly, at its fifth emergency special session, adopted its second resolution on the city of Jerusalem [2254 (ES-V)]. The cynical arrogance with which Israel dismissed those resolutions ought to make the whole membership of this Organization ponder.

148. The Security Council, in its resolution 252 (1968), was no more successful in its attempt to make Israel heed world public opinion and respect the universal will of the international community. In that resolution the Council, reaffirming that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible, deplored the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolutions, considered all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem invalid and incapable of changing that status, and finally called upon Israel urgently to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action tending to change the status of Jerusalem.

149. The mere fact that the Council is seized once again of the matter after more than 13 months attests eloquently to Israel's arrogant obduracy and its intransigence. As for Israel's cynicism, the statement of the Israeli representative in the Council on 30 June 1969 provided more than sufficient evidence.

150. Impervious to the resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly, Israel went headlong into implementing its programme of total and final annexation of the City of Jerusalem and harassing its people into either forced submission or departure. The occupation authorities pursued their designs with a vengeance. The eviction of people and the demolition of houses and dwellings went on unabatedly. The most modern and up-to-date hospital in the Old City was converted into a police headquarters, undoubtedly to force the people to attend the hospitals in the Israeli sector and to picture that as "intermingling" of Arabs and Jews to the unsuspecting tourists, to whose testimony Israel attaches greater importance than to the testimony and reports of official representatives. The expropriation of land and property, especially that belonging to the Moslem religious endowments (Al-Waqf), have

continued relentlessly, resulting in the incorporation of 827 acres of East Jerusalem and its northern suburbs within the city's municipal boundaries.

151. In a futile attempt to justify all these and other actions manifestly designed to alter drastically the legal, civic and administrative structures of the Old City, the Israeli authorities forwarded the curt and inane explanation that they were meant to provide better municipal services. Undoubtedly encouraged by the inaction of the international community, and particularly the competent organs of the world Organization, Israel grew bolder in its coercive measures in the occupied territories, and in Beit-al-Maqdis in particular. Simultaneously, and emboldened by the protection it received from its imperialistic benefactors, Israel also became more contemptuous of world public opinion. The statements of its official spokesmen have become more derisive of the intelligence of its audience, as evidenced by the statement made by the Israeli representative to the Council at its 1482nd meeting. In that statement, he dismissed the recent Israeli legislation and the administrative actions based on it, and aimed at the radical transformation of the legal status of the Old City, as merely "licensing regulations". He demonstrated a surprising jealousy of the Council's time and efforts in an attempt to admonish it for involving itself with matters relating to the "issuance of licences and permits". He went on to extol the merits of the new regulation to the extent of boasting that it guaranteed "the rights of Arab absentee owners of property in Jerusalem". He conveniently failed to mention which part of Jerusalem he meant. The question is therefore put to him to answer here and now whether in this context the word "Jerusalem" includes the western sector and whether Arabs can now claim their properties in the Israeli sector of which they have been deprived by brutal force since 1948. Do the guarantees mean that Arab landowners can now claim their properties in western Jerusalem together with their accrued benefits and interests, or can they only, in their "intermingling" with the Israelis, see their properties from outside and bestow their blessings on the Jewish occupants?

152. The threadbare attempt by the Israeli representative to defend his Government's actions should never make us oblivious to the ridicule in which he holds the decisions of this Organization. In his defence of these actions he reduced them to simple acts of merely removing public latrines. And while he considered public conveniences important enough to mention them twice within the span of one minute, he did not deem it fit to refer even once to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding Jerusalem. While completely ignoring the legal aspect of the debate, and conveniently forgetting the relevant principles of international law and the Charter, he untiringly, though tediously, kept on extolling the material benefits which he claims the Israeli occupation has brought about. Now, according to him, we ought to observe that the people of Arab Jerusalem, though deprived of their modern hospital, schools and mosques, can share the joys of "Arab-Jewish song-and-dance ensembles". What does it really matter to be deprived of your sovereignty and your basic rights if you can join the mixed song-and-dance groups? And what business is it of yours, you guardians of world peace and security—the demolition of houses, the

eviction of tenants, the expropriation of land, the perpetuation of another fait accompli—now that the Arabs can sing and dance?

153. Last week, *The New York Times* published a report on Southern Rhodesia in the wake of the referendum on the so-called "constitution". The caption of one picture published with the report quoted a white man as saying: "Of course we let them"—meaning the African nationals—"attend the horse races; they love it". The condescension and patronizing air apparent from the white man's comment and the Israeli's song-and-dance report need no further elaboration. At a time when the whole world is striving to put an end to the "white man's burden" in Africa, we encounter the self-proclaimed "Zionist's burden" in Palestine.

154. One important fact, however, should be highlighted at this stage of our debate. This concerns the insinuations the representative of Israel injects into his statements, thus attempting in a roundabout way to present his allegations as facts. Take, for example, his frequent use of the words "Arab minority in Jerusalem". He often repeats them, conveniently ignoring that the increase in the number of the Jewish population in the city was not a result of the natural process of propagation, but rather a product of the systematic colonization policy of the whole country and the importation of foreign settlers. Be that as it may, he persists in using that expression, which is insidiously meant to convey that Arabs are no longer the inhabitants of East Jerusalem, but have become, by the simple decree of the occupation authorities, a minority in a "united" city. If indulging in such a practice makes him any happier, he is welcome to it; but let us hope that he does not believe we take his words at their face value. The practice of over-simplification is no novelty resorted to only recently by the Israeli representative. It has indeed become standard in the pronouncements of the Israelis. In the interview published by the *Sunday Times* of London on 15 June 1969, to which the representative of Syria referred yesterday, the Israeli Prime Minister, Golda Meir, attempted even to deny the existence of the Palestinians and Palestine altogether, just because there was no State named Palestine. In the same interview she was asked:

"Rightly or wrongly, the Arabs look upon Israel and the Israelis as Westernized intruders, bent upon aggrandizement in a Moslem Middle East. What can you say or do to show them that they are wrong?"

The over-simplified reply was:

"If this means that we have brought in a modern phase of thinking, we have. I came to Israel in 1921"—mind you, Israel and not Palestine, as if Israel and not Palestine were in existence in 1921—"One of the first sights that shocked me was an Arab ploughing with a very primitive plough, which was really a piece of wood with some nails below. . . . Now, if it means that we have destroyed this romantic picture by bringing in tractors and combines and threshing machines, this is true: we have."

155. With a little dabbling in the art of over-simplification, the whole question of the occupation by force of arms of

the entire territory of Palestine and the displacement of most of the Palestinians becomes a matter of replacing a wooden plough with a tractor. Unfortunately, she omitted to mention bulldozers. Similarly, the representative of Israel alleged before the Council yesterday

“that compensation was paid not only to tenants actually residing in a particular house, but also to the title-holders of empty structures” [1483rd meeting, para. 119].

Thus, by stressing an entirely irrelevant offshoot of the Israeli actions in the City, he attempted to distort the whole issue and confuse the entire question. He has to be reminded here and now that the question is not whether compensation was paid to this landowner or that tenant. The question is simply that of illegal legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem, to use the words of resolution 252 (1968).

156. Although I now caution against the art of over-simplification as practised by the Israelis, the course the Security Council should now take in dealing with the question of Jerusalem is very simple and obvious. The Security Council has its resolution 252 (1968), which Israel has consistently flouted in flagrant defiance of the Council and the General Assembly. This is deplored by the totality of the membership of the United Nations. Indeed, the four permanent members of the Security Council have pronounced themselves and they have all agreed that the Israeli legislation and actions regarding the status of Jerusalem have blatantly violated the provisions of the resolution. What is required now is that the Council exert its authority and take effective measures to put an end once and for all to Israel's defiance.

157. The representative of Jordan, in the eight points he enumerated at the conclusion of his statement before the Council on 30 June [1482nd meeting, para. 44], charted the suggested route for the immediate action. He was generous enough to reprieve Israel for two weeks. My delegation is prepared to go along with that. However, if at the end of that period Israel has failed to meet the requirements of the resolution, Article 41 of the Charter would provide the necessary measures that could be taken.

158. Although the legal status of Jerusalem is very well known and although we all agree that no change in that status should take place arbitrarily and through the use of force as a result of illegal occupation, the city spiritually belongs to all of us. Let us not now forsake our city in its hour of sorrow and need. If, by our inaction, we allow the occupation to be consolidated and the annexation to be perpetuated, each of us will have his own cross to carry on his back; and, unlike the original cross, which was that of martyrdom and redemption, ours will be heavy with guilt and remorse. Then it will be too late for any of us to cry in anguish: “O, Jerusalem! What have I done unto thee?”

159. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Iraq. I now invite the representative of Indonesia to take a seat at the Council table and I call on him to make his statement.

160. Mr. ABDULGANI (Indonesia): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate, because it enables me to express the view of my Government on this topic of grave consequence to all Members of the United Nations. Moreover, Indonesia has a strong and abiding interest in the problem of Jerusalem. I should like also to extend to you my best wishes on your assumption of the office of President for the current month.

161. Before beginning my remarks on Jerusalem, I should like to recall that this is the second time recently that Indonesia, as a non-member of the Council, has requested the right to participate in a Security Council debate. When we last participated, as also a member of the Council for Namibia, on 21 February 1968 [1393rd meeting], we were concerned at the continued defiance of South Africa for resolutions of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council. The subject of that debate affected the whole of southern Africa. My Government attaches the greatest importance to its commitments in the struggle for freedom from colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in that whole area, where tensions make it one of the most potentially explosive on the international scene.

162. Indonesia, in seeking again to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council, is motivated by the fact that here again is at stake the continued defiance of General Assembly resolutions and decisions of the Security Council by Israel. The Middle East is also an area where tensions have risen that are threatening to upset a precarious balance of power in that crucial area of the world.

163. My country is located in yet another area where the world is witnessing a battle between forces whereby some of the nuclear Powers are facing each other and where one of the technically, most highly developed nations—if not the foremost—and one of the least developed are involved. In that area of South-East Asia, the balance of power is still precarious in spite of commendable efforts at the conference table and the best intentions indicated by troop withdrawals and de-escalations. It is not Indonesia's intention to arrogate to itself the pretension of trying to tell the members of the Council how to solve this problem, but we feel obliged to share our concern about its seriousness, because there is an obvious interrelation and inter-connexion between increasing tension in the Middle East and the stabilization efforts in my country.

164. Allow me to limit my statement to the problem of Jerusalem, although we realize that it is part of the whole complex situation prevailing in the area. Let me explain in brief why Indonesia continues to have a vital interest in the status of Jerusalem. During the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly in 1967, we participated in the debate on the renewed crisis in the Middle East. At that time we supported resolution 2253 (ES-V), which called upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist from taking further action to change the status of Jerusalem. We also supported resolution 2254 (ES-V), which deplored the failure of Israel to implement the former resolution. Both resolutions were adopted overwhelmingly by the General Assembly, thereby reflecting the acute international concern over Jerusalem. Our par-

ticular concern is related to the fact that, although Jerusalem might seem geographically remote from Indonesia, it is not remote from our hearts and spiritual life. Jerusalem is as dear to the 100 million Indonesian Moslems as the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. For us, Jerusalem is the Holy City of the Mosque, Beit-al-Maqdis, which includes the first Qiblah and the third most sacred mosque of the Moslems. Similarly, it is sacred to us as the site of the ascension of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may he rest in peace. Each year during our Mi'radj festivals, we commemorate this sacred event, as it represents a spiritual source for our national strength in time of difficulties and hardships. In mosques, prayer houses and public buildings throughout Indonesia, in villages as well as in cities, the name of Jerusalem with the Holy Mosque, Beit-al-Maqdis, is chiselled and engraved in the minds and hearts of the millions of Indonesian Moslems during the Mi'radj commemorations. My Government has sent material contributions for the Holy Mosque. Our spiritual attachments to these holy cities has always been one of the sources of strength in our task of nation-building in our whole archipelago, in our fight against all the injustices of the colonial past, and in our struggle to survive as a nation against the pressures from extreme reactionary, conservative forces, as well as from adventurous forces of the extreme left.

165. It is, of course, self-evident that the relevant Secretary-General's report and other reports from Jerusalem, such as appeared in *The New York Times* of 1 July, regarding the annexation by requisition of Arab lands, the bulldozing of Arab homes and the evicting of scores of Arab families, are a source of great concern to us. Our people have demonstrated this concern in resolutions adopted by our Parliament and in cables to the Secretary-General. Also outside the Parliament our Moslem student movements and many other social and political organizations of all layers of our society share this concern.

166. These actions on the part of Israel are a clear violation of the established provisions of international law regarding the rights of an occupying Power, as was stated by the United States representative, Mr. Yost, yesterday. Furthermore, it constitutes total disregard for the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and military conquest, as set forth in previous resolutions. This principle is in our view so vital for maintaining peace that in yesterday's joint communiqué issued in Djakarta by the Indian Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, and our President, Suharto, this principle was specifically reaffirmed and emphasized. Both leaders expressed their hope for the early return of peace and stability in the Middle East on the basis of the full implementation of the Security Council resolutions. Fruits of aggression should not accrue to any State. It is self-evident that in the case of places of great religious significance this principle should apply with even greater strength.

167. In stating these things we would also like to clarify why the Moslem community in our part of the world came together recently in Kuala Lumpur, along with our Moslem brothers from other parts of Asia and Africa. The conference made a decision to condemn Israel for usurping the Arab territories and in particular the Holy Mosque of

Beit-al-Maqdis; this has already been mentioned by the representative of Malaysia.

168. Let me now turn to the constitutional obligations of all of us in the United Nations community. It is now more than two years since the General Assembly in its special session expressed itself on this matter and over a year since the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968) on 21 May 1968. Those decisions still have not been implemented and, as representatives from many countries have pointed out on numerous occasions, this repeated disregard by Israel for a resolution of the highest authority of the United Nations poses a serious threat to the very existence of our Organization. There has probably been no more persistent and difficult problem facing the United Nations in its nearly 25 years of existence than the failure by a few countries to carry out their pledged obligations to the Charter of the United Nations. I am referring specifically to Article 25, in which all Members agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the Charter. Continued defiance poses a great threat to both the word and the spirit of the Charter. The crisis of confidence in the United Nations will deepen.

169. Summarizing our point of view, I would state that our deep concern for the question of Jerusalem is twofold: first, the religious and spiritual attachment to Jerusalem by the people of Indonesia as the largest Moslem country in South-East Asia, based on the teaching of Islam—and Islam not only as a religion but also as a way of life and as a civilization; and second, the future of the United Nations. It is the earnest conviction of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia that only by a firm stand by the Council can further aggravation of the situation be halted, and further deepening of the crisis of confidence in the United Nations be averted.

170. Mr. CAÑADAS (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, permit me, first of all, to address your predecessor in the Presidency, the representative of Paraguay, to thank him for his conduct during the past month of June. There is no need to praise him now, since the representative of France already did so yesterday in masterly terms and with greater authority than I myself can claim. Therefore, I only wish to express whole-heartedly the gratitude of my delegation for the efforts, the gentlemanly behaviour, the constant friendship and the spirit of co-operation which Ambassador Solano López, the representative of a sister nation, has always shown. We wish you, in your difficult post, Mr. President, a tenure full of success and satisfaction such as may be expected from so distinguished a diplomat who has acquired the highest prestige in this Organization.

171. Turning to the item on our agenda, I wish to say that I shall try to be very brief, since it is very late. Compared with the complex nature of the Middle East problem as a whole, the specific case before us today is comparatively simple, at least from a purely formal standpoint.

172. The city of Jerusalem, which was subject to a prior legal status, is the victim of military occupation by a State Member of this Organization; and that occupation is in no way justified. Furthermore, it is contrary to a number of

resolutions adopted by this Organization. Nevertheless, on the basis of the fact of that occupation itself, the occupying State is enacting a series of measures whose consequences would tend to change the legal status of the city and consolidate a *de facto* situation which cannot be recognized in law.

173. No explanation or justification which may be claimed for these measures can stand up even to the most cursory analysis. Neither the opinion of an alleged majority of the inhabitants, nor the need for some town-planning measures, nor the hypothetical benefits of a unity imposed by force nor, of course, considerations of good administrative order—which already existed previously—can legitimize an entire series of measures which gravely affect Jordan, which affect the inhabitants who are in no way responsible for what happens in the city, which offend the religious sentiments of communities comprising many hundreds of millions of human beings, which affect the spirit and even the physical appearance of a group of monuments which has been miraculously preserved until now, and also affect the rights and interests of third parties, and the very legal structure of this Organization upon which rests the safeguarding and preservation of peace.

174. As my delegation has stated on previous occasions: "What Spain ardently desires is that a situation maintained exclusively by armed force should be terminated, that peace should be restored and that certain countries should receive justice".

175. However, I realize that this general view of the problem is not easy, nor is it the one which specifically concerns us at this moment. But it may be well to keep this general situation in mind, as a background to our discussions, so as not to forget that we are dealing with an atmosphere in which, in addition to the original injustice of dispossessing an indigenous people of its lands and property and replacing it with immigrant settlers, there is now also the continued military occupation of certain territories, and the plans for annexation which are clear from the measures adopted by Israel.

176. The authority of this Organization is at stake in Jerusalem and, consequently, so is the future of peace. My delegation cannot fail to mention the growing concern with which it observes the non-compliance with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Council. The course matters have taken is certainly a dangerous one, and therefore my delegation considers that the time has now come to make a determined effort to change this trend.

177. Regarding the specific request summarized in eight points by the representative of Jordan [1482nd meeting, para. 44], my delegation does not conceal the sympathy with which it views certain requests which—since they proceed directly from resolution 252 (1968) adopted by the Council, as well as others adopted by the General Assembly—seem on the whole appropriate and reasonable. However, because of their profound importance in our opinion, I wish to stress in particular the following ideas which are directly connected with the subject we are examining, but which are also of much broader general significance.

178. My delegation considers that, first of all, it is urgent that the Council pronounce itself as categorically as possible regarding the respect due the resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

179. Secondly, in order to prevent any future misunderstanding, it seems necessary for the Council to condemn unequivocally the entire *fait accompli* policy adopted by Israel. It is intolerable that this kind of policy should serve as a basis for continually consolidating positions and creating new situations which may be used later as a pretext for refusing to comply with the resolutions adopted.

180. Thirdly, it is imperative that we firmly declare that the use of force cannot justify any annexation of territory, nor legitimize any expansionist aspirations.

181. Respect for accepted norms and fulfilment of obligations are the only way civilized society has found to overcome the law of the strongest. In Jerusalem, the cradle of spiritual values shared by many millions of human beings, that respect is even more important and urgent.

182. The gravity of the situation, the tensions arising from it, and the unforeseen complications which may arise at any moment make it urgent for us to know once and for all whether Israel is or is not willing to fulfil its obligations so that, in the light of that knowledge, the Council may act accordingly. My delegation considers that the time has come to adopt effective decisions on this question, since it is impossible to go on waiting indefinitely, without any fixed time-limit, for some hypothetical courses of action which might lead to a general solution. There can also be a limit to the patience we display in the face of non-compliance with the resolutions adopted here, and the lack of regard which this implies toward a large majority of Member States of this Organization.

183. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Spain for the kind words he has addressed to me.

184. Mr. MORALES-SUAREZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, it is a source of the greatest satisfaction to my delegation that a person of your outstanding qualities is presiding over the work of the Council. You succeed Ambassador Solano López, to whom I wish to express my warmest congratulations on the exemplary skill with which he has carried out his delicate mission.

185. The general position of my delegation regarding the problems of the Middle East was set forth by Mr. Turbay Ayala on 27 June 1967 during the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly [1538th meeting]. The views expressed at that time retain all their validity so far as we are concerned and therefore remain unchanged. Moreover, they constitute a single whole from which it is impossible, in our opinion, to omit any element if we wish to achieve a lasting and just solution. But in connexion with the case now before the Council, the Council itself has set the limits to which its action must be confined. In adopting the agenda 1 July, the Security Council specifically and unanimously cited the letter from the representative of

Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council; this letter referred to the violation of resolution 252 (1968) adopted by the Security Council on 21 May 1968.

186. In accordance with the legal principles which traditionally govern its conduct, my delegation fully endorses the above-mentioned resolution, regards any act or procedure contrary to it as inadmissible, and considers the measures taken in violation of its provisions to be illegal and arbitrary. Therefore, the change in the legal status of Jerusalem by a unilateral initiative, whatever its origin, cannot be countenanced in any form whatever by the delegation of Colombia.

187. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he has addressed to me.

188. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Before expressing the views of my delegation regarding the matter before us, permit me, Mr. President, to express my sincerest gratitude to those representatives who, in the course of the afternoon, have been kind enough to refer to me with the cordiality typical of friends.

189. Once again, the Security Council is examining the problems concerning Jerusalem. Therefore, once again, my delegation considers it its duty to reiterate its points of view since we believe that, although they may be well known, the present debate requires their repetition.

190. The position of my delegation is based entirely on questions of principle, and is therefore unchanging. Resolution 181 (II), adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November 1947, established a well-defined special international régime for the city of Jerusalem, and inasmuch as that resolution or relevant parts of it—and the resolutions following upon it—have not been revoked or changed, they continue to have full legal validity.

191. In section A, entitled "Special régime", of Part III of resolution 181 (II) it is stated that:

"The City of Jerusalem shall be established as a *corpus separatum* under a special international régime and shall be administered by the United Nations."

Other provisions of the same resolution establish the boundaries of Jerusalem, the organ which is to be competent to act as the Administrative Authority, the duration of the special international régime, and the date after which it may be modified if necessary, and a number of other general and special conditions of the said international régime.

192. These intentions of the United Nations, whose underlying reasons are known to everybody, have been reiterated on several occasions. In mentioning this, I refer particularly to paragraphs 7 and 8 of General Assembly resolution 194 (II) of 11 December 1948, and to paragraph 1 of resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949 adopted at the fourth regular session of the General Assembly.

193. I shall now quote the following parts of resolution 303 (IV):

"The General Assembly,

"...

"1. *Decides*

"In relation to Jerusalem,

"*Believing* that the principles underlying its previous resolutions concerning this matter, and in particular its resolution of 29 November 1947, represent a just and equitable settlement of the question,

"1. To restate, therefore, its intention that Jerusalem should be placed under a permanent international régime, which should envisage appropriate guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places, both within and outside Jerusalem. . . ."

This resolution also specifically confirmed, *inter alia*, the following provisions: the establishment of Jerusalem as a *corpus separatum* under a special international régime; the form of its administration; the organ designated to discharge the responsibilities of the Administering Authority, and the territorial jurisdiction of Jerusalem. Paragraph II of this same resolution called upon the States concerned to make formal undertakings, at an early date and in the light of their obligations as Members of the United Nations, that they would approach these matters with goodwill and be guided by the terms of the aforesaid resolution.

194. In 1968, when the Security Council considered the situation in Jerusalem, I said in the course of the statement I made on 21 May 1968 [*14226th meeting*] that in my delegation's view, despite the *de facto* situation, those provisions of the General Assembly still retained full legal validity. I said at that time that we do not recognize as valid any unilateral action tending to change the legal status of Jerusalem. I repeat now that so far as my delegation is concerned, any act intended to preserve the special international régime of Jerusalem decided upon by the General Assembly involves an obligation, and as Members of the international Organization our conduct will be dictated by that obligation.

195. True to this concept, and convinced that the General Assembly is the only authority which can reconsider or change such aims, if it so desires, we, together with the other States of Latin America, included a special paragraph in the draft resolution we submitted jointly to the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly in 1967.⁶ The fact that this draft resolution failed to win adoption by the Assembly in no way changes the basic concept which led us to co-sponsor the aforesaid draft and paragraph. These same reasons of principle dictated our affirmative vote for resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), which were adopted by the General Assembly at its special session by the overwhelming majority of the

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

Member States of the United Nations, as well as our vote for Security Council resolution 252 (1968).

196. Likewise, and for the same reasons, we consider that all and any unilateral actions whatever tending to change the international status of Jerusalem are unacceptable. A contrary view would imply a sort of recognition or legitimization of the acquisition of territory achieved through the use of force. And, in view of our own political, philosophical and legal traditions, this is an unacceptable view.

197. In the light of the new legislative and administrative measures and other actions taken by the Government of Israel, which we deplore and which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem, and recalling resolution 252 (1968) of the Security Council and the failure to comply with it, we believe that such actions are not legally binding either upon ourselves or upon the United Nations, and therefore have no legal validity.

198. So far, I have referred to matters of principle. However, it should not be forgotten that Jerusalem, although dealt with separately, is an intrinsic part of the vast and complex problem of peace and security in the Middle East. What happens in Jerusalem will necessarily affect other aspects of the general problem of the area, and there is no doubt that the actions which have given rise to our debate are affecting these aspects negatively. These actions are occurring at a time when, in addition to the persistent efforts of the Secretary-General and his special representative to obtain full implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, efforts are also being exerted by four permanent members of the Council, who are holding a series of meetings which have already been going on for over two months, in their desire to contribute by their efforts and the undeniable power of their influence to the just, equitable, and consequently lasting settlement of these problems of peace and security in the Middle East. We know that these talks have now entered a period of recess; but even though we are aware of this circumstance, we feel it is our duty to appeal, first to the parties concerned and then to those four permanent members, to exert even greater efforts in the search for a just peace, and intensify still more earnestly the exploration of all paths which may eventually lead to the settlement of the problems I mention. The means are within their power: if the will exists, the difficulties, although we know they are immense, can be overcome. This is our fervent hope, linked as we are by close ties of friendship with all the States of the Middle East.

199. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table, and to make his statement.

200. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Allow me, Mr. President, to associate myself with all those who have paid high tribute to you and to your country, Senegal, with which my country, Syria, has the strongest ties of friendship and culture. It is indeed enough to mention the name of the illustrious President of your country to be reminded of the high level of culture and of achievement in intellectual

endeavours that your great country has reached. May I also associate myself with all those who paid a tribute to the previous President of the Security Council, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay, with whose country mine is also linked with the strongest ties of friendship.

201. It might seem unnecessary to speak further on the issue before us. But the Security Council is faced with a most explosive situation, the dangers of which can hardly be over-estimated. Patience and historical insight are therefore an obligation on world statesmen. For four days now the Security Council has been debating the Jordanian complaint on the actual annexation of Arab Jerusalem. Much has been said and much will be said about Israel's disregard of two solemn General Assembly resolutions and of resolution 252 (1968) of the Security Council. The two reports of the Secretary-General, namely the one dated 12 September 1967 [S/8146], and the other dated 11 April 1969 [S/9149], are historical records which preserve the truth about the Israelis and their actions and intentions, for generations to come.

202. Avoiding repetition of what has been said, amplified and expanded by so many representatives, let us see now, within the historical perspective looking towards the future which we are called upon to take into consideration, what are the patterns with which we are going to be faced, and the laws of Israeli behaviour. For, undoubtedly, 20 years of continuous tragic history in our part of the world must necessarily lead us to draw some conclusions.

203. With regard to Jerusalem, it is crystal-clear that Israel has thrown all resolutions concerning the Holy City into the wastebasket and has virtually slapped the United Nations in the face. Is this a new departure? No. But from this the first pattern and law of behaviour may be formulated as follows: that whenever the General Assembly or the Security Council is seized of the Palestine question or any of its derivative issues, Israel takes the law into its own hands. While we are debating the Jordanian complaint—and many speakers have already referred to this at the current meeting—there have appeared on the front pages of the newspapers this very day reports about Israel's carrying-out of the annexation and occupation, its clearing-out of Arabs from the Holy City, and its complete domination of Jerusalem. This pattern and practice can be substantiated in every period of recent Palestinian and Arab history. The most recent case concerns the morning of 5 June 1967. The Security Council was seized of another facet of the Palestine question. It was debating some of the most intricate and complicated problems of international law, seeking to solve an international dispute by peaceful means; and once again, in the very midst of that peaceful process, the search for a peaceful answer, Israel's military establishment struck.

204. The Security Council was, and is now, employing the civilized rules of examining the law. It has not been employing jet bombers striking out of the dawn to bomb the territories of three neighbouring States in a typical *Blitzkrieg*. I would not have dwelt on the developments that ensued had it not been for the absolute necessity for my country, Syria, to set the record straight. This is all the more necessary since the representative of Jordan, Mr. El-

Farra, quoted, at the 1482nd meeting, that interpretation of the cease-fire as stated in the Council by the representative of Nigeria on 11/12 June 1967 [1357th meeting].

205. In what circumstances was that interpretation made? Allow me to pick up one of the threads where I left off yesterday—specifically, Mr. Yigal Allon declaring on 2 June 1967: “we are not forgetting the Jordanian and Syrian fronts either”. Indeed, the Israeli military might did not forget either the Jordanian front, including Jerusalem, or, later, the Syrian front, whose turn in the Israeli master plan came on 9 June 1967.

206. Now I wish to remind this lofty body of some very pertinent facts relating to the period between 9 June and 12 June 1967, to show who put himself outside the law of nations, something about which Mr. Tekoah, in his usual manner, was lecturing us yesterday.

207. The facts are as follows: Syria accepted the cease-fire resolution of the Security Council at 1 a.m., New York time, on 9 June 1967, and the telegram addressed by the Foreign Minister of Syria to the Secretary-General contained that acceptance dated 9 June 1967 [S/7958].⁷ At 6 o'clock on the morning of 9 June 1967—and I am sure the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, remembers this very well—I requested a very urgent meeting of the Security Council to report on the Israeli invasion of Syria. The meeting could not start before 12.30 p.m. of that day. Why could it not start? That is a very interesting question for the student of history to investigate in future. But those six and one-half hours were crucial, in modern warfare, when napalm and fragmentation bombs were being poured over Syrian territory.

208. The Council met at 12.30 p.m. on 9 June [1352nd meeting], and the President of the Council proposed the urgent adoption of a draft resolution demanding that hostilities cease forthwith; the following is the text of that resolution [235 (1967)]:

“The Security Council,

“Recalling its resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June and 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967,

“Noting that the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance of the Council’s demand for a cease-fire,

“Noting the statements made by the representatives of Syria and Israel,

“1. Confirms its previous resolutions about immediate cease-fire and cessation of military action;

“2. Demands that hostilities should cease forthwith;

“3. Requests the Secretary-General to make immediate contacts with the Governments of Israel and Syria to arrange immediate compliance with the above-mentioned

resolutions, and to report to the Security Council not later than two hours from now.”

That resolution was adopted unanimously; all the members of the Security Council voted for it.

209. The Council reconvened at 7.15 p.m. of the same day [1353rd meeting], and the report read by the Secretary-General, cabled to him by General Odd Bull from the scene of the battle, confirmed that Israel, with all its military might, was penetrating deep into Syria. The Security Council was in almost continuous session from the morning of 9 June up till 12 June, during which time one report after another from General Odd Bull confirmed that the invasion of Syria was proceeding in the most outrageous manner, not sparing the civilian population, using napalm and fragmentation bombs.

210. On 10 June 1967, a second cease-fire was arranged. I quote the words of General Odd Bull himself: “I propose a cease-fire, together with no further movement of troops, to be effective at 1306 hours GMT, 10 June”.

211. On the night of 11/12 June 1967, the Security Council met again and adopted unanimously, at 2.20 a.m., a second resolution [236 (1967)] concerning Syria, the text of which is as follows:

“The Security Council,

“Taking note of the oral reports of the Secretary-General on the situation between Israel and Syria, made at the 1354th, 1355th, 1356th and 1357th meetings and the supplemental information supplied in documents S/7930 and Add.1-3,⁸

“1. Condemns any and all violations of the cease-fire;

“2. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his investigations and to report to the Council as soon as possible;

“3. Affirms that its demand for a cease-fire and discontinuance of all military activities includes a prohibition of any forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire;

“4. Calls for the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1630 hours GMT on 10 June 1967;

“5. Calls for full co-operation with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the observers in implementing the cease-fire, including freedom of movement and adequate communications facilities.”

That resolution, as I said, was adopted unanimously by the Security Council; it is clear and needs no comment, except emphasis of its paragraph 4, which calls for the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops which may

⁷ Incorporated in the record of the 1352nd meeting of the Council, para. 2.

⁸ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967*.

have moved forward subsequent to 1630 hours GMT on 10 June. The fact is that, even after the adoption of that resolution, the Israeli army, as can be seen from the subsequent records of the Security Council, did not abide by that resolution, and continued its conquest.

212. Of particular importance are two statements made prior to the adoption of resolution 236 (1967). I have already alluded to one of them—that cited at the 1482nd meeting by Mr. El-Farra—namely, the statement of the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Iyalla, who said the following:

“Normally, having arranged a cease-fire and the cease-fire having been accepted by the parties concerned, the Council should now proceed to the more important questions regarding the re-establishment of peace in the area, beginning principally with the withdrawal of forces to the positions they occupied before the hostilities broke out. This is clear. If, however, this is to be prevented by an endless succession of incidents generating an equally endless succession of meetings of the Security Council at all hours of the day and night, then we would never get to the substantial issues.

“A cease-fire, as we understand it, must mean that the guns must be silenced and that the troop movements must be halted wherever they are. Any attempt to gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation must therefore be deplored.

“I have one last point. In the course of the debate this evening, a new phrase has gradually come into circulation, that is the phrase ‘cease-fire line’. Lest it be accepted merely by default, let me say, for my delegation at least, that we do not understand that there is a cease-fire line. There are the armistice lines. There is the cease-fire order which means that troops should stay where they are and that any movement, north, south, east or west, except such movement as to return from the scene of battle to one’s own home ground, is a violation of the cease fire.” [1357th meeting, paras. 175-177.]

Needless to say, I supported that interpretation; but even more important are the words contained in the statement made at that time by the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, who said the following:

“I have only one point which I wish to make, very shortly. I wish to express my gratitude to the representative of Nigeria for raising an important point. I think that when I was speaking earlier I referred to the cease-fire line. If I did so, I did so inadvertently. I entirely agree with the important point which he has put to us. It is well, I think, to refer back to the actual words of the agreement reached by General Bull. I refer to the record of yesterday’s meeting; the actual words of General Bull were: ‘(1). I proposed a cease-fire together with no further movement of troops to be effective at 1630 GMT 10 June’ [1356th meeting, para. 25]. That is the proposal which he made to both parties, and it was accepted by both parties.

“I am very glad that I can confirm that, and if previously I used the word ‘cease-fire line’, I was mistaken.” [1357th meeting, paras. 204 and 205.]

213. What do we conclude from the preceding? First, that Israel attacked Syria after the acceptance by Syria on 9 June 1967 of the cease-fire resolution; and that, in spite of two cease-fire resolutions adopted unanimously by the Security Council with reference to Syria and a cease-fire under the auspices of General Bull, Israel continued its invasion of Syrian territory and completely disregarded those two decisions unanimously adopted by the Security Council. Within the context of the jurisdiction of the United Nations, those resolutions are the ones to apply to Syria. They were disregarded by Israel. If anyone has put himself outside the pale of the law of nations, it is Mr. Tekoah and his authorities, who were lecturing us yesterday about respect for international law.

214. Secondly, the most important pattern which has repeated itself throughout the past 20 years is the strategy to eliminate Arabs and to strike at them in the most barbaric manner. Thus the fight against the British, in the words of the Zionist terrorist leaders themselves, was only one stage in this master plan to isolate the Arabs, part and parcel of which, let us remember, was the conquest of Jerusalem. With this goes the unbelievable refusal to recognize that there are Arabs of Palestine or that Arabs have ever existed in Palestine—as we heard from the quotation from Mrs. Meir yesterday.

215. With reference to the statement I made yesterday regarding the respective percentages of Arab and Jewish ownership of land in the sub-district of Jerusalem [1483rd meeting, para. 129], I should like to add that, in 1947, the official statistics of the Mandatory Government of Palestine which were submitted to the United Nations showed that the lands in the Jerusalem sub-district alone which belonged to the Jews amounted to 33,401 dunams, 2 per cent of the total area of 1,570,785 dunams, while the lands owned by the Arabs amounted to 84 per cent, that is, 1,326,571 dunams.

216. Mr. Tekoah, in giving population statistics for Jerusalem at the 1483rd meeting, quoted the President of the Institute of Holy Land Studies as saying: “It is also erroneous to say ‘Jerusalem has been overwhelmingly Arab . . .’”. He then proceeded to divide his statistics into three categories—Jews, Moslems and Christians—as though Christians could not be Arabs, nor Arabs Christians. It so happens that I am a Christian and I am an Arab. Among the total population of Arab Palestine that has been evicted, there are at least 400,000 Arab Christians, constituting the oldest Christian community in the whole world, that have been dislodged. There are similar Christian communities in the Arab countries, including my own. Therefore I completely concur with the brilliant rebuttal that was made today by the representative of Morocco to the publicity stunt of Mr. Tekoah in his statement at the 1482nd meeting in which he referred to meetings of great personalities to plan for the urbanization of the Holy City.

217. While the problem is primarily and basically a political one, a problem of expansion, as we see it, I feel

duty bound to express here the veneration, respect and holiness with which our people, our Arab people, Moslems and Christians alike, look towards the Holy City of Jerusalem. The road to the Calvary is always present in our minds. The real Jerusalem is the new Jerusalem as taught by Christ and as expounded by Saint Paul in his Epistles to the Hebrews. However, I can find no more eloquent and tragic words about this tragic situation than the words of a great French thinker, Pascal, who, speaking about the sufferings of Christ remembering humanity, said:

[The speaker continued in French.]

“In my anguish I thought of thee and I shed tears . . .

Must I always pay with blood for my humanity?”

[The speaker resumed in English.]

218. The third pattern concerns the place of Jerusalem, which we are discussing today in this onslaught in our part of the world which resulted in the complete conquest of the Holy City. The massacre of Deir Yassin on 9 April 1948, when 250 persons were butchered in cold blood by the Irgun Zvai Leumi, under the command of Menachem Begin, now a member of the Israeli Cabinet, and the Stern Gang, as it called itself, was actually the first step towards the conquest of Jerusalem in 1948, prior to the establishment of the State of Israel. The Haganah, being the official military body of the Jewish Agency, was forced to disown this massacre as an operation of “no military value” performed by “dissident groups”. Yet according to Menachem Begin’s story of the Irgun, entitled *The Revolt*, the Irgun commander had received a letter from the Haganah regional commander stating the following: “I learn that you plan an attack on Deir Yassin. I wish to point out that the capture of Deir Yassin and holding it is one stage in our general plan. . . . Furthermore, if foreign forces enter the place this will upset the plan for establishing an airfield.” The airfield, says Begin, was established at Deir Yassin, and he states categorically, “Deir Yassin was captured with the knowledge of the Haganah and with the approval of its Commander.”⁹

219. What we are witnessing today, as has been related so accurately by the representative of Jordan, is the systematic implementation of Zionist designs on the Holy City. With it all goes the undeniable fact that dozens of military operations by the Zionist terrorists, according to their own sources, were carried out outside the area given to them under the partition plan of 1947. The continuation of the complete Israelization of Jerusalem, as we are sitting here and discussing ways and means to lessen an inflammatory international situation, proves categorically this third pattern and behavioural law for the conquest of Jerusalem.

220. Fourthly, before even contemplating a solution, Israel posits its terms for *Diktat*. Let us take the recent crisis. The Foreign Minister, Mr. Abba Eban, according to *The New York Times* of 19 June 1967, suggested that Israel would act again, as it had in the past, in contempt of the decisions of this international body. Said Mr. Eban, the

eloquent “peace-maker” of this “peace-loving, law-abiding State”: “If the General Assembly were to vote 121 to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the armistice lines tomorrow, Israel would refuse to comply with that decision.”

221. Well, what party is guilty, out of its own mouth, standing before this forum? What party spits in the face of international law and order? What party consigns the Charter of this Organization to the bottom of its totem pole of values and loyalty?

222. I spoke yesterday of the ordeal of the Arabs of Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, as reported by Archbishop Raya, a Catholic Archbishop from Jerusalem, in an address to the Prime Minister. But the story is not new; for if we go back to the records of the United Nations we will find that on 31 July 1952 spokesmen for the non-Jewish inhabitants of the Israeli-occupied sector of Jerusalem protested to the United Nations against being forced to become Israeli citizens. Signing the letter were lay leaders of the Protestant, Greek Orthodox, Catholic, Armenian and Moslem communities in the Israeli-held area. In their letter these representatives complained of discrimination and injustice which they declared had deprived their communities in the Israeli section of Jerusalem and in other parts of the country of basic human rights.

223. But the occupation of Jerusalem goes beyond those limits. As Professor Al-Khalidi of Iraq pointed out during the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, at its 1553rd meeting on 14 July 1967, the main purpose of the Israeli strategy of occupying Jerusalem is a twofold. First there is the economic purpose. Jerusalem is a tourist attraction, to put it baldly. Secondly, the one who dominates Jerusalem holds the strategic key to the west bank of the Jordan. It isolates the southern half of the west bank from the northern half. In short, it dominates the approaches to Jordan. Of course this cannot be said by the representative of Israel because we have to bear in mind always that we are oscillating between Machiavellism and Messianism, the latter certainly being a disguise for the former.

224. Fifthly, Israel claims, as it has repeated many times, that the Arabs are benefiting from Israeli technical know-how and superior scientific knowledge. But how does that tally with the systematic destruction of every aspect of Arab progress and development? I will not repeat either what was said yesterday or what has been said today, but surely among the basic causes of the aggressive war of 5 June 1967, planned by Israel, was the economic cause—namely, that whereas the Arab countries were making strides in economic, educational, scientific, agricultural and financial development, Israel was suffering a great economic crisis, with at least 100,000 persons unemployed. How can their claims to peace be tallied with the fact that every day they were destroying, as they still are destroying, the bridges and the canals and burning the fields and killing the labourers, the farmers, the workers, with napalm bombs? Is not this indeed the mockery of mockeries?

225. The point we have to remember is this: the acts perpetrated in Arab Jerusalem today include the eviction of Arab civilians from all occupied areas and the tyrannical

⁹ New York, Henry Schuman, 1951, p. 163.

domination over the Arab minority in Palestine, all of which, according to the latest legislation of the United Nations, constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity that cannot be forgotten and surely not easily forgiven. Therefore, within the proceedings of the United Nations itself, we find that the General Assembly, at its twenty-third session, adopted resolution 2391 (XXIII) containing the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, sub-paragraph (b), article I, of which reads:

“Crimes against humanity whether committed in time of war or in time of peace as they are defined in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, Nürnberg, of 8 August 1945 and confirmed by resolutions 3 (I) of 13 February 1946 and 95 (I) of 11 December 1946 of the General Assembly of the United Nations, eviction by armed attack or occupation and inhuman acts resulting from the policy of *apartheid*, and the crime of genocide as defined in the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, even if such acts do not constitute a violation of the domestic law of the country in which they were committed.”

226. Israel, no matter under what guises it tries to escape or hide its crimes, cannot deceive all the people all the time. And it will be brought to the Court of justice one day—I am sure of it. The Zionist disguised as a Jew, who is really not a Jew, must suffer from a mental block or have lost the page from his copy of the Holy Scripture on which he could read the explicit words of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapter V, Verse 8:

“Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth! ”

227. To translate these high ideas into the tragic realities with which the Israelis are faced now, let me quote from an open letter addressed by a great Israeli educator, Professor Ya'cov Talmon, to the Minister of Information, Yisrael Galili. It was published in the journal *Ma'arif* on 6 May 1969. He said the following to the Minister:

“Don't forget, Your Excellency, that the Jewish national home and the establishment of the State of Israel were the result of an agreement between the great Powers imposed upon the Arabs. When, therefore, you state that you do not recognize the Arabs of Palestine as a moral or legal entity in Palestine with specific national and popular characteristics, you are in fact saying that they are 'natives', with no identity of their own. In other words, Your Excellency, they have no rights as a community. Why should you, therefore, wonder when the Arabs or others describe you as colonizers and claim that they cannot reach an agreement with you, because you simply do not recognize the principle of mutual respect, but look only toward expansion. Words are more painful than physical pain, and they are long remembered, even after the human body has been cured of its pain. And I ask you, in your capacity as Minister of Information, what shall I answer the thinkers and educated people of other nations, when they ask me: why should not the Arab join the ranks of the freedom fighters, when he

hears the words of Galili? You deprive him of his right to national existence and self-determination. When the British attempted to do the same with you, didn't the Haganah, the Irgun and the Stern Group resort to terror and violence? Yes, Mr. Minister, I ask you most sincerely: what do you expect my answer to be? And I assure you most genuinely that I did not fabricate these questions, nor did I invent them. The duty of the historian impels him to see all aspects of the problem, and not to be a liar or a propagandist.”

228. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Syria for the kind words he has addressed to me and to the Head of State and the people of Senegal, a country which for many years has maintained close relations of co-operation with Syria. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

229. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is now the third meeting of the Security Council dealing with the item on our agenda and, with each one, Arab intransigence, Arab determination to persist in hostility and aggression against Israel are revealed in ever greater ferociousness and malevolence. If Jordan's exercise in unbridled hatred and belligerence that recognizes no limits was intended to convince everyone that the Government of Jordan and other Arab Governments think and plan and act not for peace with Israel but for continued warfare, military and political, it has indeed thus convinced the world. This has not been a search for understanding, not a rational examination of issues, but a macabre orgy of enmity and abuse. In its facts have lost meaning; values and principles become aborted and unbridled fanaticism the rallying cry.

230. Yesterday, and again today, we witnessed the Middle East arch criminal, Egypt, invoke law. We were treated to the spectacle of Algeria, which has repudiated the Security Council resolutions on cease-fire and peace, taking the floor as a member of the Security Council. We heard Syria, which has rejected the United Nations peace efforts; Syria, which continues to conduct warfare against Israel, contrary to its international obligations under the Charter, and has today repudiated even the concept of the cease-fire line under which it affixed its signature in 1967; Syria, which oppresses the Jews and other minorities without mercy or shame—we heard Syria give advice on the situation of the Arab minority in Jerusalem.

231. Today, this chorus was joined also by Morocco. I would like to say to the representative of Morocco that I respect his feelings and his pride as an Arab and as a Moslem, and the Government and people of Israel hold in high reverence the values of the Moslem faith and will honour the interests of Islam in the Holy Places. This can and would be better realized in conditions of peace and mutual respect and understanding. Israel has been waiting for more than 20 years to detect a similar attitude on the part of the Arab States for the interests of Judaism, of the Jewish people and of Israel as a nation. However, the representative of Morocco has also come before the Security Council to distort history, to deliver himself of anti-Jewish epithets and personal aspersions, and to tell us that we Jews have no right to live in liberty in our own homeland.

232. Where should we then live? In Morocco, where Jews have lived for centuries in misery and persecution? Is it this that gives the representative of Morocco the right to appear here in the garb of mentor and counsellor on law and human rights?

233. For the record, the time has come to put an end to the Arab representatives' using Jewish suffering as a plaything in debating contests. True, there have been periods of enlightened liberalism in the treatment of Jews by the Arab world, as indeed there have been such periods in Europe as well, but the general picture is one of dark, grim discrimination and sorrow. This is, of course, one of the main reasons why so many Jews fled to Israel from all the Arab States and why Israel has absorbed as many Jewish refugees from Arab lands as there are Arab refugees from Palestine. Nor can we forget that today the Arab Governments are the only ones in the world which still print and distribute the old Tsarist fabrication *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, still publish *Mein Kampf*, still employ Nazi experts in propaganda, in the production of arms, in the training of saboteurs to continue Hitler's murder of Jews, still educate their children on text books containing direct anti-Jewish abuse, still discriminate against Jews by legislation and still keep innocent Jews in concentration camps and prisons.

234. Iraq too has found it appropriate to appear before this Council—Iraq which till now has not accepted the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council adopted two years ago, Iraq which continues to wage war against Israel daily from Jordanian territory, Iraq which hangs innocent Jews in public squares of its capital, Iraq which pursues a war of extermination and genocide against the Kurdish people. This is the State that has the audacity to speak of justice, of human rights, of spiritual values.

235. The absurdity of the situation in which such States lodge complaints before the Security Council, make claims and offer advice to others, is surpassed only by the absurdity of the arguments that they have put forward. The Jewish people's national liberation movement—Zionism, as old as Rome's conquest of Judea, an inspiration to nations of Africa and Asia in their struggle against foreign imperialism—is blasphemed as colonialism. Jews who for centuries have experienced Europe's discrimination against Asians and Orientals are now told that they are foreigners to Asia and not even Jews at all. Israel's struggle since 1948 against Arab aggression is blackened, simply because Israel has been successful in defending its independence and sovereignty. And now Jerusalem, integral and united for centuries and divided only for nineteen years by an invasion contrary to the United Nations Charter, Jerusalem, holy and venerated by all, is turned in this debate into a mere weapon of Arab malice and animosity towards Israel. When Israel proves that its Administration has brought welfare, prosperity and higher standards of life to the Arab minority, it is accused by the Arab delegations of colonialist methods. When Israel explains that it has been compelled to take security measures to protect life against Arab terror warfare, it is told that it injures the interests of the Arab inhabitants. When Israel demonstrates that regulations on licensing permits, regulations which served as the main pretext of Jordan's complaint to the Security Council, are

aimed at facilitating Arab business and protecting Arab interests, the Arab representatives, as we heard today and yesterday, suddenly claim that this is not the problem.

236. Where will this vicious circle of blind passion and rancour lead us? Has not the time come to stop and ask ourselves how this frenzy of lust and fanaticism appears in the eyes of the world and what history will have to say about it and about its participants? Is it not time to look at Jerusalem with love, not with hate? Is it not time to see in it what it is—a bridge to understanding between Jew and Arab, not an instrument of further conflict and warfare?

237. Today, united Jerusalem is happier, more prosperous, more true to itself, its character and destiny, than during centuries of rule by successive conquerors or the years of amputation and bisection that ended in 1967. For the first time, all universal religious interests, Islam, Christianity and Judaism alike, are accorded recognition and respect. All holy places are protected by law and administered by the religious communities themselves. To all holy sites access is free. Those who are motivated by truly religious considerations, not by lust and hatred, cannot but be aware and impressed by this situation. Only a few days ago, on 24 June, the well known American evangelist and Editor-in-Chief of *The Trumpet Call* declared to the press after a visit to Israel: "There has been a tremendous improvement in the maintenance of Christian holy sites since they came under Israeli control". But at today's meeting we again heard Arab representatives arrogate to themselves the right to speak on behalf of Christianity. The one who surpassed all in this arrogance was the representative of Morocco who rejected the right of such Christian leaders as the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Patriarch of the Church of Ethiopia, Catholic and Protestant theologians and the Latin Custos of the Holy Land, whom I quoted at previous meetings to speak on behalf of Christianity and express satisfaction with the conditions of their communities and holy places in Jerusalem. This in fact has been the pattern followed by the Arab representatives throughout this debate: deny Christian leaders the right to speak of Christian religious interests; deny Israel the right to speak on behalf of Jerusalem's majority, of Jerusalem's interests and of Jerusalem's peace; trample everyone and everything for the sake of continued enmity, belligerence and bloodshed.

238. As for the interests of Islam, the following statement was made, for instance, on 3 June 1969 by the Secretary of General Services of the Philippines, Mr. Salah Ututalum, the leader of the 3 million Philippine Moslems, following a meeting of the Moslem Sharaf Court in Jerusalem. He said: "I received the impression that Moslems here are well off. The Israel authorities are fair towards all religions. On the whole, I was pleased to witness realities which are different from what I was told back home." When religion is not debased and abused as a political weapon then the situation in Jerusalem, even in the eyes of Moslem leaders, appears quite different from what the Arab representatives have tried to paint here.

239. If allegations were voiced again today that restoration or excavation projects in Jerusalem have affected any mosque, or for that matter any religious court, they are as

unfounded as other accusations made only to distort reality and foster misunderstanding. Professor H. J. Reinink, the Special Representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) entrusted with reporting on compliance with The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict¹⁰ was quoted in the Director-General's report of May 1969 to the seventy-eighth session of the Executive Board of UNESCO as follows: "I satisfied myself on the spot that the excavations being carried out by Professor Mazar near the South Wall do not threaten the Mosque Quarter of Jerusalem, which is unique in the world." The Mosque Quarter referred to is the Haram Ash-Sharif, about which we have been hearing in the course of this debate continuous allegations and accusations.

240. Aref al-Aref, a well-known Arab authority on the history of Moslem Jerusalem, states in his book *The History of Jerusalem*, published in 1961, that 27 mosques existed in the city in October 1947. According to Mr. Aref, 10 of the mosques were at the time closed and abandoned—10 out of 27. Not a single one is mentioned as being situated among the Moghrabi houses or among the other buildings affected by the various slum-clearing, restoration and excavation work that has been carried out in Jerusalem since 1967. Incidentally, according to Aref al-Aref, in 1947, on the eve of Israel's independence, in addition to the 27 mosques there were in Jerusalem 150 Christian churches and about 300 synagogues.

241. Jerusalem, however, is not only a centre of religion; it is also a living city, with a population of 200,000 Jews, 60,000 Arabs and 5,000 persons of other nationalities whose political rights to the unity of their metropolis cannot be sacrificed on the altar of belligerency. Jerusalem is also a city with a history; and, as I indicated yesterday, throughout its age-long existence it has been the capital of one nation only—the Jewish people. Only the history of the Jewish people is irrevocably bound with Jerusalem. This is the city where Jewish sovereignty and freedom were shattered by the cohorts of imperial Rome, and this is the city in which Jewish statehood and liberty were reborn. It is with Jerusalem's name on their lips that our ancestors were carried off to bondage 2,000 years ago. It was with the dream of Jerusalem Restored that the Jewish people trod across centuries of persecution and suffering. It was for our faith in Jerusalem, for our loyalty to Jerusalem, that we died in the flames of the Spanish Inquisition, in the Tsarist pogroms, in the Nazi gas-chambers. No one will deny us today the right to live for Jerusalem, to work and create in Jerusalem.

242. Jerusalem's history does not begin with last year's Security Council resolution. Jerusalem's history, Jerusalem's reality, Jerusalem's destiny cannot be erased by votes. However, if one does wish to approach this question from the legal point of view, why not start at the beginning? At the beginning there was Jordan's invasion of 1948, in defiance of United Nations resolutions; there was Jordan's illegal bisection of the city; there was Jordan's barbaric destruction of the Jewish Quarter, of Jewish houses of worship, of ancient Jewish cemeteries. At the beginning

there was Jordan's repudiation of its international obligations and the barring of free access to the holy places. If we are to consider Jerusalem in the light of United Nations jurisprudence, who is it that will allow the aggressor of 20 years to determine, at his convenience, the legal point of departure?

243. Jerusalem is one entity today because this is the natural state of the city. Israel is there because Israel exists and because Israel is sovereign, and Jerusalem is Israel's eternal capital. We fully realize, however, our international responsibility. We shall ensure the universal religious interests in Jerusalem with utmost respect and consideration. We shall make certain that all its inhabitants, Jewish and Arab alike, are protected in their rights, their property, their lives. We trust that Jerusalem will be a source of happiness, inspiration and light to all. We hope that eventually the attempts now being made by the Arab Governments to hamper our work will end, for they will realize that these designs on Jerusalem's integrity and life cannot succeed and they will understand that Israel's endeavours are indeed for the good of all.

244. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

245. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): It seems to me that the Security Council is now facing not only the question raised by Jordan, but a more serious case. The case is before you, and you have here a sample of Zionism and of Hitlerite statements, a sample of the problems we in the Arab world are faced with. Mr. Tekoah tells you: "This is nothing but a chorus: either I have it my way or every thing is wrong and illegal". What remains for Mr. Tekoah to do is to dance to that chorus.

246. This is not the first time Mr. Tekoah has spoken about this body. At the 1462nd meeting, on 31 December 1968, referring to the resolution the Council adopted concerning the airport in Beirut, Mr. Tekoah, with all the audacity on earth, made the following statement: "The resolution reflects the moral, political and juridical bankruptcy of the Security Council in respect of the Middle East situation."

247. It is not only Mr. Tekoah who has attacked the Council as well as great religious leaders. If we turn to what happened after the Council's decision on the question of the attack on the Lebanese airport by the Israelis, it will be seen that the reaction of all Zionist circles, whether in Europe, the United States, Israel or everywhere else, was a wild one. Mrs. Meir said in the Knesset—I am quoting from the *Jerusalem Post* of 1 June 1969: "I am beginning to feel very sorry for this family of nations that sits there and discusses our actions. It would be much more justified if the Knesset were to debate the United Nations and the Security Council." In other words, Mrs. Meir would like to be the judge of the whole world, including the Security Council. And she is the Prime Minister of Israel.

248. Yigal Allon, the Deputy Prime Minister, said: "The United Nations Security Council has turned into an 'insecurity council' encouraging terrorist activity . . ." That appeared in *The Jerusalem Post* of 6 January 1969.

¹⁰ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 249 (1956), No. 3511.

249. In a debate in the Knesset, the body which Mrs. Meir wanted to debate the Security Council and the United Nations, all speakers denounced the reaction of the whole world as "hypocritical", with several of them having the nerve, the audacity, to attack His Holiness the Pope. I am referring to an article appearing in the *Jewish Monitor* of 3 January 1969. Israel Galilee, another minister without portfolio, indicated also that they have no intention of coming to the Council; they are powerful enough; they have the might; they have the destructive weapons; they have the napalm. He said they would not come to the Council, according to Galilee, because of the Council's "bias and impotence".

250. Going further, we see Zionist forums elsewhere also attacking the Security Council, the United Nations and the world community; everybody is wrong but the Israelis. I cite here the Governing Council of the World Jewish Congress, meeting in Rome, which expressed dismay at Security Council resolution 262 (1968) condemning Israel for its aggression against Lebanon. Going even further, we find that leaders of the three major branches of American Judaism, Zionist organizations, asserted that His Holiness and other world figures had applied a double standard. Everybody is wrong: religious leaders, secular leaders, United Nations Members—everybody is wrong but Israel; everybody is out of step but Mr. Tekoah. What did those leaders say? They made an accusation, consisting of a 750-word statement issued by Rabbi Jacob Rudin, President of the Synagogue Council of America. The statement read in part, as follows:

"We resent very deeply the application of a double standard by world political and religious leaders in their dealings with Israel and with the Arab countries. We submit that it is this dishonest duality which raises the fundamental moral issue in the situation. This one-sidedness does not speak of justice or morality but of the self-serving interests of men and nations."

251. I have many other statements I could quote on this specific phase of Zionist behaviour, but I will conclude by quoting this statement of a member of the Knesset, Schmuel Tamir, from *The Jerusalem Post* of 6 January 1969: "The enlightened world, in its hysteria over destroyed aircraft, is more than anti-Israeli; it is anti-Jewish." When the Council unanimously condemns Israel, the Council becomes anti-Jewish. Then they sing the tune of anti-Semitism; then they complain as the oppressed, the little, the innocent, accusing us of being the aggressors, the invaders, the occupiers. Sometimes people forget to look at the map and see that this very movement, this very State, the "little", the "oppressed", is the oppressor, the occupier, the invader, the one who is now occupying all of Sinai, who is now occupying all of Gaza, all of the west bank, all of Jerusalem, all of the Golan Heights. Listen to this distortion that Israel is the lamb and that the whole Council is against little Israel.

252. The Council, I said, has before it not only the case of Jerusalem but this very case right here, and it needs examination. Maybe the first President of Israel can give us an enlightened answer. On his death-bed he said something

very enlightening. This is the statement of Mr. Chaim Weizmann:

"We are a small people but a great people, an ugly and yet a beautiful people; a creative and a destructive people, a people in whom genius and folly are equally co-mingled. We are an impetuous people who have time and again repudiated and wrecked what our ancestors built. For God's sake, let us not allow the breach in the wall to swallow us."

Those were the words of the first President of Israel on his death-bed.

253. I think what is needed to cure this sickness of Zionism is a change of heart and mind and behaviour. We have to look at the good face of life, at the beauty of it, at the human aspect of people, at the fact that we are living in a world of togetherness. They should not feel that they are the chosen ones and that the whole world is made up of second-class people. This idea of "we, the race", "we, the Zionists", "we, the pure", should be eliminated. This is destruction; this is not living and letting others live; this is dictated by folly and by the ugliness that Weizmann spoke about.

254. So much for the Hitlerite statements we have just heard. I have many points still to discuss. I know the hour is late. This afternoon I requested that certain pictures, showing the high buildings, scores of them, built on Arab lands in the Holy City of Jerusalem, be distributed so that the members could see whether this was simply a minor administrative action taken by Israel or completely contemptuous behaviour with the intention of displacing more Arabs, taking their lands, confiscating their property, evicting more of them, bulldozing more of their houses. I hope these pictures will be before the Council tomorrow.

255. The other point I wish to raise is this. I wonder whether I could ask for the floor tomorrow to raise the other points I wish to raise and to answer the main distortions, falsifications and falsehoods which Mr. Tekoah had the audacity to present to this important body.

256. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of the United States wishes to speak on a point of order.

257. Mr. YOST (United States of America): In view of the fact that the representative of Jordan has expressed a preference for completing his statement tomorrow and in view of the lateness of the hour, I should like to move formally, under rule 33, that the Council adjourn until tomorrow at the hour which, I believe, has been agreed by informal consultation: 4 p.m.

258. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure reads as follows:

"The following motions shall have precedence in the order named over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the subject before the meeting:

"1. To suspend the meeting;

"2. To adjourn the meeting;

"3. To adjourn the meeting to a certain day or hour;

"4. To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or to a rapporteur;

"5. To postpone the discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely; or

"6. To introduce an amendment.

"Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate."

259. I assume that the reference in this case is to paragraph 3 of rule 33. If there are no objections, the Council will adjourn until 4 p.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 8.55 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. Приводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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