



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1509th MEETING: 11 SEPTEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1509)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 28 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen (S/9421 and Add.1 and 2)	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.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 11 September 1969, at 3 p.m.

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

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/1509)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 28 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen (S/9421 and Add.1 and 2).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 28 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen (S/9421 and Add.1 and 2)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with the Council's previous decisions, and with the consent of the members, I now propose to invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic and Indonesia to take places at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion of the question before the Council without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), Mr. A. El-Erian (United Arab Republic) and Mr. H. R. Abdulgani (Indonesia) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its last

meeting, the representatives of India and Somalia are also invited to participate in the debate on this item. I invite them to take the places reserved for them at the sides of the Council chamber since, as was already pointed out yesterday, there are unfortunately too few seats at the Council table to accommodate them there.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. Sen (India) and Mr. A. A. Farah (Somalia) took the places reserved for them.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In a letter addressed today to the President of the Security Council [S/9441], the representative of Jordan requests permission to participate in the debate on the item before us. If there is no objection, I propose to invite the representative of Jordan to participate in the debate on this item without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan) took the place reserved for him.

4. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Somalia, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

5. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation would have intervened yesterday to reply to the observations of the representative of Israel on my statement, but could not do so because of a procedural misunderstanding on the part of the Conference Services.

6. At the 1508th meeting, the representative of Israel referred to statements made by Sheikh Hilmi Al-Muhtasib, the leader of the Supreme Moslem Council, the body responsible for religious affairs and institutions in Jerusalem. The representative of Israel said he had already reported the principal points of the Sheikh's statements in his intervention before the Council the previous day. Let us examine what the Israeli representative chose to cite from the statements of the Sheikh and what he chose to omit.

7. The Israeli representative selected from the many points raised in the Sheikh's statements the fact that the Sheikh had declared that the fire at the Mosque had been caused by arson, and that a young man, whose nationality was not Palestinian, had been seen leaving the Mosque just before the fire broke out. The second point was that the Committee of which Sheikh Hilmi is the Chairman had

announced the creation of a special fund for repair work, and that repairs would require several weeks at the most. Before going over those points in the Sheikh's statements which the Israeli representative failed to mention, let me repeat what I said in the Council.

8. I said that since the Israeli representative had found it convenient to cite from the statements of that distinguished religious leader, and since the Israeli delegation attached such importance and credibility to the statements of that eminent religious leader, we could perhaps compare and study some of the points that were contained in those statements. I shall now take some of the points which the Israeli representative considered it prudent to omit and contrast them with the information which the Israeli representative has given to the Council.

9. On the question of the fire, the Israeli representative claimed that it had been relatively small and that it had been extinguished within an hour. The statement of the Sheikh speaks about the ineffectiveness and slowness of the Israeli firemen in extinguishing the fire, and of the Israeli police preventing the population from helping in quelling the fire.

10. According to the statement of 30 August issued by the same distinguished religious leader, the municipality did not discharge its duties adequately or effectively in extinguishing the fire. According to the Sheikh, the fire was finally extinguished by Arab firemen brought all the way from Ramallah and Al Khalil.

11. With respect to the question of excavations, in my statement yesterday I said that when excavations, whether for archaeological or religious purposes, are undertaken at the expense of desecrating the holy shrine of another faith, a situation of ominous proportions is created.

12. The representative of Israel stated that no archaeological excavations whatsoever had taken place in the Mosque compound and that the only excavations in the vicinity were works proceeding to the south of the area in accordance with projects basically approved by the Jordanian authorities and commenced before 1967. No doubt the representative of Jordan will be in a position to speak on that particular aspect. The duty of my delegation is to bring to the attention of the Council the views and feelings of the Moslem community in the Holy City as represented by the Supreme Moslem Council.

13. In his two statements on 21 and 30 August, Sheikh Hilmi, the Council's President, declared to the press that the Israeli authorities were violating international law by permitting excavations beside the Al Aqsa Mosque and in Moslem properties. Furthermore that same Moslem Council demanded the cessation of all excavations around the precinct of the Al Haram Ash Sharif and demanded permission for members of the Arab Committee of Architects to investigate the excavations being carried out beneath the Silsileh Gate. Yesterday the Israeli representative denied this.

14. The *Christian Science Monitor* of 25 August 1969 has this to say:

"Controversy over the supposed existence of the Jewish Temple of Solomon under the two mosques of Al Aqsa

and the Dome of the Rock has recently been heavy inside Israel.

"This controversy, which has extended to Christian circles, began in September 1967, when the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs started archaeological excavations of a trench at the northern end of the Wailing Wall.

"In January 1968, the Ministry said it was carrying out further digging in the cellar of the Mahkama or Moslem religious tribunal building, just north of the Wailing Wall. Moslem religious authorities have repeatedly protested these excavations and the Israeli seizure and destruction of houses and other Moslem premises nearby."

15. References to those excavations proceeding under the southern wall are contained in the following extract from *The Jerusalem Post* of 7 June 1968. Further mention of those excavations are also contained in reports published in *The New York Times* of 11 July and 15 August 1968. I shall just read one brief passage to show exactly the kind of tension which is being created in the area as a result of those excavations, tension which cannot be ignored at the peril of peace. The report on excavations under the southern wall carried out by Professor Mazar reads:

"The main entrance to the temple, according to Josephus, was through a double gate in the centre of the southern wall. Professor Mazar hopes to expose this gate as well, but if he does, he is likely to encounter resistance from the Moslem religious authorities in Jerusalem. They have already made a protest to the United Nations over his work at the western edge of the southern wall charging that it is Moslem property.

"The double gate is an even more sensitive issue, however, since it is beneath the silver-domed Al Aqsa Mosque, which is one of the most sacred mosques in Islam."

16. What measures, one may ask, did the Israeli Government take to stop such excavations and allow the Arab Committee of Architects to investigate them? If these and other questions remain unanswered, then the responsibility of the Israeli Government is clear.

17. Mr. Tekoah also spoke of the desecration of the Holy Places and referred to the desecration of the Western Wall or the Wailing Wall. Mr. Tekoah seems to forget that the Western Wall is part of the Al Haram Ash Sharif and cannot therefore be desecrated by Moslems. It is the property of the Moslem Waqf. The Jewish community in Palestine did not claim any proprietorship to the wall or even to the pavement in front of it. This was very well documented in December 1930 in the report entitled "Report of the Commission appointed by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, with the approval of the Council of the League of Nations, to determine the rights and claims of Moslems and Jews in connexion with the Western or Wailing Wall at Jerusalem".¹

¹ London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1931. [The report of the Commission was circulated in English only under the symbol S/8427/Add.1 dated 23 February 1968.]

But now in 1969 Israel claims, by mere force, I submit, the ownership of the wall, the plaza around it and other places.

18. With respect to the question of the Al Haram Ash Sharif, the Israeli representative has claimed that all Moslem Holy Places, including the Al Aqsa Mosque, have, since 1967, been controlled, administered and guarded by the Waqf. Let us contrast that statement with what the Supreme Moslem Council in Jerusalem had to say on the matter last month.

19. The Council considered the whole area of the Al Haram Ash Sharif a closed precinct for everyone except Moslems at the times of prayers, only until further notice. Have the Israeli occupying forces complied with that request by the only legitimate body in Jerusalem? The Supreme Moslem Council has demanded the closure of the Maghrabi Gate and the delivery of its key to the Waqf Committee immediately. My delegation has the following questions in this respect: (1) Why, to begin with, did the Israeli authorities confiscate the key to one of the gates of the Al Aqsa Mosque? (2) By what legal right or moral code did the Israeli occupying authorities justify that confiscation? (3) In what "spirit", to use the word of the Israeli representative, did the Israelis retain the key and for what purposes?

20. With respect to the desecration of Holy Places, in my statement yesterday I pointed out that Moslem holy shrines in Jerusalem were the concern not only of the Moslem inhabitants of that city, but of Moslem people throughout the world. This, in fact, is one of the main reasons why my delegation has been participating in the Council's debate. The Israeli representative has attempted to convince the Council that his Government has taken all the necessary precautions to see that the Holy Shrines are protected from offensive or sacrilegious acts. Yet the Supreme Moslem Council of Jerusalem protested, in the press statement released by Sheikh Hilmi on 21 August, that the Israeli authorities have "desecrated our Holy Places many times most recently when a group of Israeli youths had led what was called a military parade inside the mosque zone".

21. In my statement yesterday I said that the question of Al Aqsa was one which concerned Moslems throughout the world. The questions that I have directed to the representative of Israel require answers because the actions and attitudes adopted by the Israeli occupation authorities concerning Moslem shrines and the Moslem inhabitants of the occupied territories continue to cause grave concern to Moslems everywhere. The statements which the Israeli authorities have made with regard to the Al Aqsa fire and to the aims and objectives of Israel vis-à-vis the Mosque conflict with what has been reported in the international press and with the statements made by that distinguished body most intimately concerned with the protection and preservation of Moslem shrines in the Holy City—the Supreme Moslem Council of Jerusalem. There are grave doubts in the minds of all Moslems, and only an impartial investigation as suggested by the Supreme Moslem Council will remove those doubts.

22. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I invite the representative of Jordan to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

23. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Mr. President, despite the solemnity of this occasion it is a pleasure to see you in the Chair, to which we are sure you will bring your wisdom and sound judgement. The friendly relations that happily exist between Jordan and your great country, the Soviet Union, cannot but grow firmer and stronger.

24. It is also a pleasant duty to pay a special tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Piniés, the Permanent Representative of Spain.

25. Just before I came to this Council, I received a cable. I thought it contained instructions from my Government but I discovered that the contents were different. The cable is signed by "The Jewish Defence League"; it contains the following words:

"Hold you directly responsible for any anti-Jewish terror acts. In the event of such acts, consider you legitimate target for deserved punishment."

26. The same Jewish Defence League has appeared on television in New York. The group appeared in uniform with their leader on 4 September. It is surprising to receive threats by telegram, a communication medium. Previously we have received letters from a group called the "Minutemen". Telephone calls are received in our offices, and my office in particular, every morning and every afternoon.

27. If I refer to this abnormal situation facing members of the United Nations here, it is not only to remind the Council of the life we are living here, not only to mention the atmosphere in which we are living, but also to remind every single person around this table of our people within the occupied areas; of the captives of the Israelis, whether in Gaza or in the West Bank or in the Golan heights or in Sinai.

28. At a time when Jordan has been deeply concerned and worried about the ever-increasing dangers in our area resulting from the Israeli occupation and Israel's continued refusal to comply with the Security Council's resolutions on Jerusalem, the Israelis have revealed more of their motives and aggressive designs. Time and again we have spoken of Israeli expansion. We have explained the steps taken by Israel to bring about the complete annexation of Jerusalem and thus change the face and character of the Holy City.

29. Today, my delegation joins the 24 other members, representing 750 million adherents of the Moslem faith, which requested a meeting to consider another, more serious tragedy, namely, that of the Al Aqsa Mosque, and the fire which severely destroyed that historic Holy Place on the morning of 21 August 1969.

30. I, myself, was in the Middle East area. I was in Jordan when that horrible arson was committed. I have witnessed the horror and dismay of the Arab peoples, Christians and Moslems alike. I have also read the communiqué of the

President of the Supreme Moslem Council in Jerusalem concerning the circumstances of that criminal act. The President, Sheikh Al-Muhtasib, has rejected previous Israeli allegations that the fire was caused by an electrical short-circuit.

31. The Israelis attempted to decry the gravity of the matter at the time, when they not only delayed in reaching the burning Mosque but prevented local inhabitants from helping to put out the fire. They later imposed a curfew on the Old City of Jerusalem, so that no one could either help or witness the extent of Israeli efficiency, or rather inefficiency, in extinguishing the fire.

32. The Israeli authorities introduced more than one explanation for the start of the fire and at last charged an Australian with the arson. According to news that originated from Israeli sources, the Australian suspect is a friend of Israel who was brought by the Jewish Agency to work for Israel. The Jewish Agency arranged for this Australian to work in a Kibbutz for some months, so that he could learn the Hebrew language and acquire more of the Zionist teachings. The report published in *The Jerusalem Post*—an Israeli semi-official newspaper—of 25 August 1969 concerning the life of this Australian in the Kibbutz and his dreams of building Solomon's Temple casts doubts on the case and adds to the fears and worries of the Moslems about their holy shrines; it also throws light on who is the criminal and who is the accomplice.

33. We have not forgotten statements in the early days of the 5 June 1967 Israeli occupation about the future of Jerusalem, nor have we forgotten the report of Menahem Borsh, which was published in *Yadihote Ahronote* of 18 August 1969, only three days before the burning of the Mosque, emphasizing that the Temple would be built anew in the same spot that "strangers tried to seize". The desecration of this holy Mosque by a group of the Bitar members only three days before the arson is a living example of Israeli motives and designs.

34. What happened on 21 August 1969 was not only a premeditated burning of a sacred monument but also an open defiance of our people's feelings and heritage and a cause of deep concern to all peace-loving States. As a result of that criminal act, tension has been escalated in our area, outrage has reached its peak, and there is a situation seriously endangering international peace and security. As I shall now show, the responsibility for the act of arson lies squarely with the Israeli occupiers, who are intoxicated by their military victory and are adamantly proceeding with their illegal plans of expansion, in complete disregard of the will of the international community.

35. Let us see what did and what did not happen on Thursday, 21 August 1969. In the early hours of that morning fire broke out in the Al Aqsa Mosque. Moslems praying in the Mosque and others rushed to the scene to remove some of the valuables in the Mosque and extinguish the fire. The Jordanian fire brigade in Jerusalem was called. Moslem religious leaders as well as Jordanian officials within the Israeli-occupied area came to the scene.

36. To the outside world news of the fire came in Arabic from Radio Israel at 8.30 a.m., that is, one hour and ten

minutes after the fire started. The broadcast carried the news of the arson; it did not give any reason for the fire and did not say whether it was extinguished. Meanwhile, Jordanian fire brigades from Ramallah, and even those from Al Khalil (Hebron) and Nablus, were sent to the scene—and we all know it takes an ordinary car more than one hour to reach Jerusalem from those two cities. With the help of those brigades and the co-operation of the local population, the fire was at last extinguished and contained. According to *Reuters*, it took the fire brigades over five hours to extinguish the fire; this, to a certain extent, was substantiated by Israeli authorities. As stated at a press conference held that same day by Teddy Kollek, the illegally appointed Mayor, and according to Radio Israel, it took them until 10.30 a.m. to extinguish the fire. We think Mr. Tekoah should have exchanged notes with his authorities, with Radio Israel and Mr. Kollek, before coming here to say that it took about one hour. We find it took them until 10.30 to extinguish the fire. Certainly Mr. Tekoah seems to disagree with the Israeli eye-witnesses who admitted that there was delay and tried to find justification for that delay. There was no doubt among the inhabitants and eye-witnesses that the arrival of the Israeli fire brigades, in short reach of the scene, was delayed and their job was unsatisfactory.

37. That same afternoon the commander of the fire brigades told the journalists that the pumping of water was working swiftly and in an orderly manner at the beginning but that eight minutes later something happened—the pumping of the water was interrupted and could not work as before. This is something for every member to ponder. The commander of the fire brigades reported that it had not been indicated whether that was due to a technical mishap or to a premeditated act. It must be remembered, however, that after the Israeli occupation the water system in the city was connected to the western part so that the Israelis would be in full control of the water system. This, among other things, elicited sharp criticism and apprehension from Arab Mayor Rouhi El-Khatib and the former President of the Moslem Council, Abdul Hamid Es-Sayeh, both of whom were expelled from Jerusalem to the East Bank of Jordan.

38. What explanations did the Israelis give for the fire? The first version came from Abraham Libermann, the commander of the Israeli brigade, who thought that the fire was caused by "a spark from a welding machine". That was the first allegation, the first attempt. Later, having discovered the unfeasibility of such an explanation, Israeli officials and Radio Israel unequivocally declared that the fire had broken out because of an electrical contact. That is picture number two. The Government of Israel endorsed and adhered to that second version and took it, as appeared then, as the final version. As some of the truth began to unfold, and as the Supreme Moslem Council, with the help of individual eye-witnesses who were present in the Mosque, began to pronounce their observations and findings to the world, the Israeli Government had to abandon its second version of the cause of the fire and pass to the third.

39. Israel by then had no choice but to assume a different role altogether. It appeared under the guise of protector of the Holy Places. Therefore, a certain Dennis Rohan had to

be quickly arrested and negligence had to be imputed, not to Israel, but to the Moslem guards in the holy Mosque.

40. That is what appears to have taken place, or, to be more precise, that is the little we know of what had taken place. What did not take place, however, confronts us with serious questions, the answers to which may shed more light on this act of arson. After all, by raising certain pertinent questions one may reach the right conclusions. This is more so, since many of those questions are left unanswered by the Israeli Government, by Mr. Tekoah, and by other Israel officials.

41. Question number one: why did the Israeli officials and Radio Israel, before any on-the-spot investigation was carried out and immediately after the fire broke out, attribute the act of arson to an electrical contact?

42. Question number two: where were the Israeli fire brigades when the fire continued to spread, while the Jordanian fire brigades, which had come a long way, were at the scene? Were the Israeli fire brigades of Jerusalem deliberately delayed, or notified too late?

43. Question number three: why was the pumped water suddenly interrupted? Was that a coincidence, or a prearranged and premeditated act by the authority controlling the water units?

44. Question number four: why does Israel insist on keeping the key to one of the main gateways of Al Aqsa; and what part did that key play in the events? What was the role of that key—in the hands of the Israelis—the key to one of the main gateways to the holy Al Aqsa? An honest answer—if we get an honest answer from the Israelis—may be the key to the whole problem.

45. Question number five: when and why did Israel abandon its first and second versions of the events and instead put on the cloak of protector of the Holy Places?

46. And my last question: who is Dennis Rohan; and was he acting on his own initiative?

47. It is not a secret that the Israeli Government, as well as different Zionist organizations and bodies, have been changing the character and status of Jerusalem, against the wishes and will of its people, in open defiance of the United Nations and in clear disregard of the two decisions [resolutions 252 (1968) and 267 (1969)] unanimously adopted by this most important body. Time and again, my delegation has warned against such plans, and time and again the Security Council, as well as the General Assembly, has taken a firm stand against such Israeli measures. However, Israel, undeterred, goes on with its plans.

48. The Aqsa event cannot and should not be viewed by itself or as an isolated act. The Al Mosque is a part of the Old City that has been the subject of demolition and bulldozing, and its inhabitants forcibly evicted, to make room for a plaza where Israelis could pray. According to an interview with his foster-parent—an Israeli in Kibbutz Mishmar Hasharon—published in *The Jerusalem Post* of Monday, 25 August 1969, four days after that act, Dennis

Rohan thought, after spending some months in the kibbutz, that the demolition and bulldozing were not enough and that the plaza was not the right place. After spending that long period there, Dennis Rohan conveyed, according to his foster-parent, these views: he was led to believe that the Temple must be built; and for it to be built, Al Aqsa Mosque must disappear, as did the Maghrabi Quarter.

49. The question arises: was Rohan strange or eccentric? It depends. If we are to judge his thinking within the context of Zionist teachings and indoctrinations that draw on fanciful biblical interpretations—and he lived in the kibbutz for over two and a half months—then Rohan is as normal as any other Zionist in Israel. For, have not the Zionists and the Zionist movement exploited religion for political and secular goals? Was not the creation of the State of Israel in Palestine and the very idea of a Jewish State there based on religious and Messianic interpretations? Have they not continued to foster such religious fanaticism, be it in Al Khalil (Hebron), and to promote the creation of new Israeli settlements on our lands or in other parts of the occupied territories, especially in Jerusalem? Al Aqsa is only a part—though a very venerated part—of Jerusalem; and Jerusalem is only a part of the occupied territories.

50. Was Rohan, after all, acting on his own initiative? Was he not brought to Israel and sponsored by the Jewish Agency? Where did he get all the money which he offered to the guards of Al Aqsa on the morning of the fire and which the guards declined to take? According to *The Times* of London, of 12 September 1969: "On Rohan's way out he offered each £110 sterling but they declined, Mr. Hilwani said." The Sheikh, thinking there must be something wrong, then entered into the Mosque and rushed out crying: "They have burnt the pulpit". According to the same semi-official Israeli newspaper, *The Jerusalem Post* of 25 August 1969, Rohan's foster-parents in the kibbutz said: "He never appeared to be short of money to us."

51. It is not only what happened to the Al Aqsa Mosque and what has been going on in Jerusalem that arouse the fears and apprehension of 750 million Moslems and other peace-loving peoples in the world, but what the future holds for Jerusalem and other areas under Israeli occupation. Only one conclusion can be reached: the only insurance for the safety and integrity of the Holy Places, as well as for other places, is Israeli withdrawal.

52. I now come to what I consider the most serious aspect of Mr. Tekoah's statement. Mr. Tekoah told us that the criminal had been arrested, that a tribunal had been constituted, that Rohan would soon be tried and if convicted would be punished in accordance with the law. But the question arises, which law is he referring to? It is the same Israeli law which you around this table, all of you, without exception, have declared invalid. The law on which the charges are based and the law creating the so-called investigations committee are laws which this important body has repeatedly declared invalid. The Supreme Moslem Council in Jerusalem has also rejected such laws and committees. They are the laws you called upon Israel to rescind. In the words of the Security Council: "in the event of a negative response or no response . . . the Security

Council shall reconvene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter" [resolution 267 (1969), para. 7].

53. Was there any Israeli response? Yes, there was. Mr. Tekoah appeared before you, abandoning his usual aggressive style, to say in a soft voice, with respect, for a change: "we are applying the laws you rescinded in order to assess the situation in Jerusalem and we ask the Council to note this, endorse it and accept this fait accompli".

54. The Israeli representative should not be permitted to create this confusion. He is telling you: "Everything is taken care of; there is now a court, a commission and a fair trial." But once more I beg you to ponder one thing: which laws is he referring to? Not the laws a military occupier under the Geneva Convention is requested to enforce. Definitely not the laws of Jordan. I must re-emphasize here that the Israelis are invoking the very same laws you declared null and void, the very same regulations and laws you rescinded. Israel said openly that the charge sheet now being prepared against Rohan is based on sections 317 to 322 of the Criminal Law Ordinance. The Israelis further stressed that the Commission of Inquiry investigating the cause of the fire at Al Aqsa was the first commission to have been established under the 30 December 1968 Inquiry Commission Law. Both are Israeli, both were declared invalid by the Security Council, both are illegal and now Israel comes in this sneaky way, through the window, to have the Security Council validate what the Council has expressly declared to be invalid.

55. With all due respect, I suggest that Mr. Tekoah is putting forth his argument in a very misleading way. I would say that it is a malicious way, because while he knows that these laws were declared illegal he tries, through the back door, to have the Council validate them.

56. All of the foregoing evidence, together with Israeli behaviour, throws much light on the question. This emphasizes the need for firm action to put an end to the tragic situation in Jerusalem. Palliative measures will not remedy the situation. They will not put an end to the bitter feelings aroused in the Moslem world and, indeed, all over the world.

57. Mr. President, you and the members of the Council have heard Mr. Tekoah speak about how the Jews and Arabs strove side by side to overcome and extinguish the fire and about the spirit of co-operation among them. But I have already shown what part the Israelis played in extinguishing the fire and the kind of co-operation they rendered. Be that as it may, honest and genuine co-operation is based on things which Mr. Tekoah has failed to see.

58. Why should not peace and justice be the basis for co-operation? Why should not the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly be the foundations for such co-operation? Israel should not expect the United Nations to endorse crime as a legitimate means of co-operation between Arab and Israeli. Otherwise more crimes will be committed by Israel. Bloodshed will not open the way to peace in the land of peace. The Israelis are in a position to

choose between love and hatred. Mr. Tekoah is grossly mistaken in feeling that arson and destruction bring co-operation. To burn Al Aqsa is to burn the heart of every Moslem. This brings neither love nor co-operation. This will encourage more Israeli defiance and the Israelis will be tempted to continue on the road of tension, aggression and bloodshed.

59. We offer our full co-operation to implement all Security Council resolutions, all General Assembly resolutions and all United Nations resolutions. Let Israel show the same desire by deeds, not words. That would bring genuine peace.

60. This is the first time that I have spoken from this side of the Council table. Mr. Tekoah is not sitting far from here. He is near, but he does not hear.

61. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Jordan for the kind words he has addressed to me.

62. In connexion with the reference made by the representative of Jordan in his statement today to terrorist threats against the representatives of Member States of the United Nations, I consider it necessary, in my capacity as President of the Security Council, to state that the question raised by the representative of Jordan affects the common interests of all Member States.

63. I consider it necessary to draw the attention of the Secretary-General to this matter and to ask him to study it together with the representative of the United States so that the necessary measures can be taken.

64. In conclusion, in view of the name of the next speaker on my list, if the representative of Jordan considers it advisable to remain at the Council table, he may do so.

65. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel. I now call on him.

66. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I should like to reassure the representative of Jordan that not only have I listened to and heard what he said, but that I was reminded, while listening to his statement, of an old Jewish rabbinical saying: "When Falsehood saw he had no legs to stand on, he made himself wings." It seems that the wings the representative of Jordan made for the falsehoods he chose to incorporate in his statement today are somewhat like the wings of Egyptian airplanes; they rarely stay aloft for long.

67. For example, the representative of Jordan found it necessary and appropriate, to refer to the cause of the fire. Several hours after the outbreak of the fire on 21 August, the Jordanian Governmental television and radio informed the Arab world that the Israeli Cabinet had met in a special session, had deliberated and had decided on the burning of the Mosque. Now that the entire world has become fully cognizant of the facts and it is difficult for even the representative of Jordan to deny that it was with the assistance of the Moslem authorities in Jerusalem that a suspect has been arrested and charged with arson, the representative of Jordan comes before the Security Council

with the ridiculous accusation that the suspect, a young Christian visitor, had been brought to Israel by Israeli authorities to commit the crime of arson.

68. He bases this flight of fantasy on the fact that the young man, being a friend of Israel, worked in a kibbutz and had even learned Hebrew. I should like to assure the representative of Jordan that there are thousands of Christian and Buddhist, as well as Moslem, friends of Israel who spend their time in kibbutzim, attracted by their special atmosphere and society, who work there and learn Hebrew. In fact, there is nothing in principle to prevent the Jordanian representative himself from doing the same thing—and I do not think he has to fear that, if he does, he will necessarily be accused of preparing himself to commit arson.

69. The Jordanian representative has also voiced the slanderous libel that the Israeli authorities were slow in fighting the blaze, whereas, unlike the fire at the Holy Sepulchre in 1949, which it took the Jordanian authorities 24 hours to extinguish, this time the fire at Al Aqsa was extinguished after one hour and the firemen were busy thereafter only with the embers. He went so far as to assert that the Israeli authorities cut the water pipes. I do not think allegations of this kind even deserve a reply.

70. I shall confine myself to quoting from the Catholic weekly *The Tablet* of 30 August:

“It is ominous that before any evidence was produced, the first reaction of some Arabs was to lay the blame on the Israeli authorities. Even now, when these fantastic accusations have been abandoned, the Arabs are still accusing the Israeli authorities of incompetence in their fire-fighting, although since Arabs themselves cut the pipes rather than allow infidels into the Holy Place, it is not easy to make much sense of such an accusation. It merely proves the sad and self-evident truth that when tempers are inflamed, any accusation will be believed and issues that in a calmer atmosphere could be easily resolved become insoluble.”

The credibility of the other allegations by the Jordanian representative is not much greater.

71. I deem it appropriate at this stage to convey to the Council the principal charges laid against the accused, Michael Rohan, suspected of having committed the arson at Al Aqsa on 21 August. The indictment is in two parts, one dealing with an attempted arson on 11 August 1969, and the other with the arson of 21 August. It points out that Rohan acted out of extreme religious impulses. Both parts of the indictment describe in detail the meticulous planning, the acquisition of the equipment and materials for purposes of arson, and the preliminary reconnaissances that he made in the Al Aqsa Mosque.

72. After his unsuccessful first attempt, Rohan executed detailed reconnaissances almost every day in order to find the most vulnerable part of the Mosque, and then he decided to set fire to the steps of the wooden pulpit, the *minbar*.

73. The indictment mentions that on the first occasion traces of the attempted arson were left, but the case was

not reported to the police. In the days before 20 August Rohan became friendly with the watchmen of the Mosque, and on the 20th he received permission from one of them to enter it the following morning, before the normal hours for public visit, on the pretext that he wanted to take some photographs under tranquil conditions. This explains how, on 21 August, Rohan entered the Mosque before 7 a.m. and was able to place cans of fuel under the steps of the pulpit. He linked the cans with a scarf soaked in kerosene and set it alight. Subsequently he walked out of the Mosque through the main entrance, took leave of his friends the watchmen, and left the Old City through the Lion's Gate. On his way to the Rockefeller Museum, Rohan threw away a sack and a bottle, drove in a taxi to the Egged bus station, and left Jerusalem. The fire spread to the southern wing of the Mosque. Thirty-two witnesses for the prosecution have been invited by the police.

74. The case being now *sub judice*, I will say nothing more about it.

75. I wish to reiterate that my Government would have no objection to the attendance at the trial, or to the visit to the Mosque, of anyone wishing to form his own first-hand impressions.

76. At the 1507th meeting of the Council, the representative of Pakistan quoted from the Hebrew Bible. “Pray for the peace of Jerusalem”, says the Book of Psalms. From time immemorial, day after day, three times a day and in grace after every meal, Jews the world over pray for Jerusalem and for the peace of Jerusalem. It is the peace of Jerusalem that is uppermost in our minds today.

77. It was not of peace, unfortunately, that the bellicose statements we heard today spoke. They were echoing the calls to war that have been voiced in ever-growing intensity in the Arab capitals since 21 August. They were echoing President Nasser's pronouncement of 23 August: “Our eyes are on Al Aqsa. . . . The next war will not be a war of liberation but a war of purification.” A war of purification—such as the Mongolian massacres promised by the Arab League when its member States invaded Israel in 1948; purification of the land from Jews, as in Hitler's macabre slogan *Judenrein*—purified of Jews.

78. We shall not give up hope, however. We still pray that the sacredness and serenity of Jerusalem and its Holy Places will not be disturbed by the generation of a controversial atmosphere on a matter which should unite all men of sincere faith and goodwill. I shall leave it, therefore, to world opinion to pronounce judgement on the deplorable incitement and absurd accusations directed against Israel.

79. Rarely has world opinion been more united and more outspoken. The Committee for Human Rights of neutral Switzerland issued a statement on 24 August in which it declared, *inter alia*:

“A short while ago, two representatives of this committee visited Holy Places in East Jerusalem, particularly the Mosques Omar and Al Aqsa. They personally witnessed the care of the Israeli authorities to assure free access to Holy Places for people of all religions. The testimony of

pilgrims indicates that Holy Places to some extent are in an even better condition today than when they were under Jordanian administration. In conversations with Israeli citizens and Government officials, it has clearly emerged that there had been no manifestations of inter-faith hostility. There can be absolutely no basis to the suggestion of a plan or idea of destroying Holy Places of other faiths. This would be contrary to Israel's interests.

"The Arab accusation has no foundation in fact. It was voiced before the cause of the fire had been investigated. These accusations serve as evidence of the fact that Arab leaders systematically incite their people in a campaign of hatred of Israel and do not hesitate to exploit religious emotions for political ends. This kind of exploitation runs counter to the very spirit of religion and principles of human rights. The true spirit of religion would never utilize false evidence in order to undermine understanding amongst peoples in accordance with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

80. Mr. Chabi Mama, Dahomey's Minister for Education and a prominent Moslem leader, declared on 28 August:

"Jerusalem can no longer be divided into two cities. It should remain united. I say this not only because I am in favour of unity and against anything that is divisive, but also because cutting a city in half is stupid and inhuman. As for the Mosque, I have seen it, and it does not seem that it has suffered much; and the damage is, at first sight, easily repairable. As for the culprit, Michael Rohan, he has been arrested and has admitted his guilt. Israel bears no responsibility for this act, and world as well as African opinion judges on the basis of facts as they are being revealed in the inquiries presently in course and in the trial that will take place."

81. Al-Haj Garba-Jahumpa, another Moslem statesman and Gambia's Minister of Education, Health and Social Welfare, declared to the press on 27 August, following a visit to Al Aqsa:

"I firmly reject any claim that Israel and the Jewish people as such had anything to do with the fire in the Mosque. The current campaign against Israel is rooted either in ignorance or propaganda opportunism. It has nothing to do with any religious motives. I was in Jerusalem last Thursday and had the opportunity to watch the fire brigade go about putting out the fire. They worked very hard and did a marvellous job in saving the dome of Al Aqsa.

"I am fully convinced that Al Aqsa was saved from far greater damage through the good work done by the firemen. I have full confidence in the inquiry commission and am looking forward to its findings."

82. The Chad Minister of Public Affairs, Mahamat Rahama Saleh, stated at a press interview in Jerusalem on 8 September:

"Israel did everything she could to contain the fire at Al Aqsa. . . . I do not believe charges that Israel is respon-

sible for the fire. Israel has in no way neglected her duty to protect the Holy Places. I myself have seen evidence of this today when I prayed at Al Aqsa and at the Mosque of Omar. . . . I am profoundly impressed by the freedom enjoyed by non-Jewish religions in Israel."

83. The outcry against exploitation of the fire for purposes of warlike incitement has been even stronger.

84. The Supreme Pontiff himself found it necessary to voice a public plea and warning. Pope Paul made a statement on 31 August in which he deplored the fire at Al Aqsa and expressed understanding for the religious feelings of the Moslems. He added, however:

"We understand their bitterness but we hope it will not worsen conditions in the Middle East, already so tense and fragile, and we hope that the situation will not degenerate into further violence or more fierce hatreds which would prejudice even more the higher and impelling cause of justice and peace."

85. On 26 August, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil declared in a press conference: "Brazil is very much concerned about the conflict in the Middle East lest it become transformed into a holy war, capable of provoking genocide."

86. From all continents of the world came similar expressions of concern by statesmen, spiritual leaders and laymen. Even in Tunis voices were heard against enflaming passions. The Tunisian daily *El-Amal* wrote on 26 August: "The calls for a jihad against Israel were unwarranted." On the following day the Tunisian daily *L'Action*, the organ of the Socialist Destour, protested against the incitement to war by certain Arab leaders. It stated: "How can one fail to see the most inopportune and clumsy nature of these calls for a holy war launched openly by certain Arab leaders."

87. On 30 August, the International Buddhist Association Maha Sangha, with headquarters in Colombo, sent a telegram to the Secretary-General stating *inter alia*:

"With all our respect for followers of Islam at large, we request them not to use this fire incident in Jerusalem Mosque for political purposes and for inciting millions of followers of Islam for a holy war as this may bring untold suffering and misery for humanity."

88. International editorial opinion has been no less critical of the exploitation of the fire for political incitement than public figures and organizations. I shall mention only a few characteristic comments. The daily, *El Espectador* of Bogotá, on 24 August stated:

"The unfortunate incident of the Mosque Al Aqsa in Jerusalem serves as an excellent pretext to inflame a holy war of Moslems; it is a windfall for the political leaders to keep up the flame of fanaticism and to conceal their own errors.

"As in all criminal investigations one should ask who is the one that stands to gain? In novels of crime, whenever a murder occurs it is elementary to ascertain who

benefited from the death of the victim: the heirs, those that nourished secret rancour, political or personal friends. In this case, there is no doubt the crime is being capitalized on by Arabs, the only ones who stand to gain politically from it . . . exploiting to the fullest the evident indignation of the people.

"In this difficult situation, the Government of Israel and its people have no other defence but that of enlightened public opinion and common sense which precludes even the remotest possibility of their being responsible for this crime. And with all this, we should bear in mind that, during the Arab occupation of Jerusalem, Jewish Holy Places and cemeteries were deliberately desecrated, a small detail which those that call for a holy war will undoubtedly forget now."

89. *Le Figaro* of Paris commented on 29 August:

"The Arab States have opted for a case that must fail in any test of logic. Nor must Israel be blamed for negligence, because the Arabs themselves guarded the Mosque and no police can prevent a crime of a madman or a *provocateur*."

90. In an editorial entitled "Blindness of Passions", *Le Monde* of 22 August admonished:

"An old Roman saying states that the author of a crime is the one who gains from it. It is evident that the fire of Al Aqsa Mosque does not benefit Israel at all. It is fatal, in the climate of over-excitement that prevails in the Middle East since the Six Days War, that the notion should spread of a new crime by Zionists."

91. The daily, *Bangkok World*, observed in its editorial of 25 August: "The fire is a transparent attempt on the part of Arab leaders to make use of religious feelings for political purposes."

92. The political commentator of the Radio Malagasy broadcast on 25 August:

"The Arab Governments have exploited the incident that must under no circumstances be blamed on Israel, for political calumny. In many of its aspects this fire is reminiscent of another, the fire of the *Reichstag*."

93. *The Rising Nepal*, published in Katmandu, wrote in an editorial on 25 August:

"From what can be made out of the whole affair, from this distance, and as the matter now stands, it is that while the occurrence is naturally a most regrettable blow to all Moslems, it does not follow that the Israelis themselves had a hand in it . . . The Israelis as a God-fearing people and as hard-boiled pragmatists have never interfered in matters of religion and the fact that Arab and not Israeli guards were on duty at the Mosque when the fire broke out not only lends credence to this view but also suggests that the Arab charges have little evidence, so far, to go by. In U Thant's reply message to the call made by the twenty-four Moslem countries, too, the implication of Israeli complicity in the affair is very conspicuous and significant in its absence."

94. The *Times of Zambia* of 3 September, referring to the Arab calls for war, stated:

"This is a step back into the era of the crusaders to the time when the real problems of disease, poverty and oppression were obscured by religious fanaticism."

95. The prominent Madrid daily, *Ya*, wrote on 28 August:

"It seems to be exaggerated that the fire in the Mosque should have given rise to another complaint in the Security Council."

"It is precisely Israel that is most interested in not giving a motive to religious resentment of Moslems in this warlike period."

96. The *Daily Telegraph* of London wrote on 27 August, under the heading "Nasser fans the flames":

"The Arab cause in the outside world will suffer from the latest blood bath in Iraq, the bomb outrage in London and the reckless eagerness with which the fire in the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem has been exploited to whip up a 'Holy War' frenzy against Israel."

97. The *Economist* of 30 August 1969 commented:

"At first it seemed that last week's fire in the third holy shrine of Islam had given the Arabs a political bonus. It won them much sympathy. . . . Yet, just as in May and June 1967, the Arabs are forfeiting this sympathy. The charge made by the Arab Foreign Ministers in Cairo that Israel has 'plans against Moslem and Christian shrines' is as irresponsible as much of the vindictive nonsense that has poured out of Arab radios. It is remarkably difficult to believe the apparent Arab claim that the fire in the Mosque was an act of deliberate Israeli policy, or that the Mosque was more vulnerable to a firebug, or accident, under Israeli administration than Arab."

"It may be that, at least in Jerusalem, the trial in September of the young Australian who has been charged with the fire-raising will dispose of the wild stories and mitigate Arab bitterness. The Moslem religious authorities were helpful in securing his arrest."

98. *The New York Times* of 28 August admonished:

"The real danger, however, is that the Arab Governments will be carried past the point of no return on a floodtide of Arab rhetoric and emotion, even as President Nasser at the showdown was forced by his own zealots into the 1967 war."

99. One of the most thoughtful comments comes from a country which is a neighbour of both Israel and the Arab States. The *Cyprus Mail* of 31 August declared in an editorial:

"The world has rarely been witness to such unprincipled and fanatical political and religious exploitation of events as the Arabs have been pursuing following the fire, despite the fact that prompt police action

resulted in the arrest of one man suspected of having started the blaze. It has been denounced as an Israeli act of sabotage and there has been a crude campaign to whip up a war fever, demands for strong punitive action by the United Nations and an attempt to drag the whole Islamic world into the Israeli-Arab confrontation.”

100. Referring to the complaint submitted to the Security Council by the Arab delegations, the newspaper observed:

“They feel with very good reason that they have the United Nations Security Council completely in the hollow of their hands and can persuade it to take sides with them against Israel whenever they wish. This was again demonstrated by the Council resolution [270 (1969)] on the recent incident in Lebanon. . . . It is now clear that the Al Aqsa incident is to be brought before the Security Council within the next few days. If it is handled in the same prejudiced fashion that has been characteristic of all recent debates on the Mid-East, it will do untold harm to prospects of averting a new Arab-Israeli war and will make utter nonsense of its own much-quoted resolution [242 (1967)] of November 1967.”

101. The real question which confronts the Security Council today in this debate is how to deal with the exploitation of the fire at Al Aqsa for political purposes and how to prevent the vindication of incitement to belligerency.

102. The Chief Rabbi of Israel issued on 22 August, the day after the fire at Al Aqsa, a statement expressing his feelings of participation in the sorrow of all the faithful of Islam and of their religious leaders. Emphasizing that it is inconceivable that a Jewish hand should have caused the fire, the Chief Rabbi declared:

“Let us hope that the truth will soon be established and that all distortion and incitement will vanish like smoke and that in their stead will prevail brotherhood which is the essence of all the great religions in the world.”

103. Will the Security Council of the United Nations contribute to this brotherhood?

104. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Before calling on the next speaker on my list, the representative of Hungary, I wish to inform the members of the Council that a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council [9443] has just been received from the representative of Saudi Arabia requesting permission to participate in the debate on the item before the Council.

105. If there is no objection, I propose to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take part in the discussion of this item without the right to vote. In view of the limited space at the Council table, I shall ask the representative of Saudi Arabia to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia) took the place reserved for him.

106. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): Comrade President, before stating the views of my delegation on the subject under

consideration, I should like to express to you my delegation's warm welcome to you as President of the Council. We are convinced that your great experience in and knowledge of the work of the Council will guarantee the smooth work of the Council and will facilitate our task. At the same time I cannot fail to associate myself with those who have paid a tribute to the representative of Spain, Ambassador Piniés, for the excellent way in which he presided over our deliberations in August.

107. The Security Council is forced again to consider a serious incident which took place in Jerusalem and which shocked the whole civilized world. Al Aqsa Mosque is a valuable monument of the cultural inheritance of mankind; it has a priceless historic value and is a sacred place for the religious, spiritual life of several hundred million persons. The Hungarian Government—although Hungary is a secular State—fully understands how deeply shocked were the Governments which requested the convening of the Security Council by the barbarous attempt to destroy the Al Aqsa by arson.

108. The representative of Israel put a false complexion on this question by interpreting the circumstances of the arson as if it were an event connected only with the sphere of religion. He even tried to make us believe that the event brought Arab and Jew nearer to each other. He declared:

“It is not what separates us that Israel and the Arab States must search for, but that which unites us. No matter how complex the political controversy, no matter how grave the military confrontation, there is kinship between Jew and Arab in their civilization. If it is the vision of ultimate peace that guides us, we must nurture it with care and reverence.” [1507th meeting, para. 126.]

Those are very fine words; they were tailored for this event. I should be happy to welcome that statement by the representative of Israel as a change of policy, since not long ago, in justifying the Israelis' military adventure, he boasted that they taught their neighbours a lesson. However, I think such a welcome would be over-hasty.

109. Had Mr. Tekoah analysed the arson in the proper context, it would have been unnecessary for him to assure the Council that the Israeli authorities had done and would be ready to do everything to preserve the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The basic question in this incident is not how the Holy Places were or are to be safeguarded but why the Israelis are the ones who want to undertake the safeguarding. It is very difficult to deny that it was the Israeli occupation that nurtured the development of a climate in which the arson seemed to be natural and desirable. To prevent a repetition of such grave violence, the first step should be the liquidation of the climate favourable to it. Therefore the first step should be the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from the Arab territories, from the area of the Holy Places of Jerusalem. Then tension would ease in the whole region. If the Israeli Government's concept of “ultimate peace” is not connected with the life beyond the grave, if they wish to live in peace with their neighbours, they should show their goodwill; and it would not be too complicated to indicate some signs of it.

110. The resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on Jerusalem adopted during the past

three years clearly indicate that the community of Governments, that is, the membership of the United Nations, cannot accept any change in the legal status of Jerusalem. Why does the Israeli Government fail to declare that it complies with the provisions of the latest Security Council resolution [267 (1969)] of 3 July 1969? A declaration to the effect that the Israeli Government agrees with those who cannot recognize the acquisition of territory by force would also be instrumental in letting us accept at face value the statement of the representative of Israel. However, Israel at present continues its policies of annexation.

111. My delegation considers that the question of the Al Aqsa Mosque is an integral part of the whole situation in the Middle East and cannot be separated from it. The Israeli Government must bear the responsibility for the arson and for the tense climate in which it occurred. The basic problem is not how to repair the damage, although it should be done, but how to ease the tension in the region, a tension that endangers world peace and security. The solution is the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967): a withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the occupied territories. The Council should force Israel to abandon the aggressor's "vision of ultimate peace", its present impudent attitude towards the United Nations. My delegation is ready to vote for a forceful resolution on this issue.

112. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Hungary for the kind words he has addressed to me as President of the Security Council.

113. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call in exercise of his right of reply.

114. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): In comparing Mr. Tekoah's earlier statement to the Council with the one he made today, one can see this: Mr. Tekoah has not abandoned his style as he apparently tried hard to do two days ago. He has come with the same charges, with the same accusations, imputing falsehoods to the delegation of Jordan. All my quotations were from sources other than Arab sources. I quoted Radio Israel. I quoted *The Jerusalem Post*, which is here for anyone to read. I quoted sources which have no relationship of any kind to Arab sources. Yet Mr. Tekoah chose not to rebut the issues raised, not to answer a single one of my six questions. He found it more convenient to shout in his usual manner, throwing out lies so that some might stick and become acceptable to those listening to him—and, when I say that, I have in mind those invited by Mr. Tekoah who are sitting over there in the gallery. I have not come with empty charges. I am introducing evidence. To determine what happened one must look at the motives. What are the motives? Let us go to the time of the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem, on 5 June 1967.

115. Here is what an Israeli said on 30 June 1967, 25 days after the occupation. Dr. Israel Eldad, a well-known Israeli historian, said, according to *Time Magazine* of 30 June 1968:

"We are at the stage where David was when he liberated Jerusalem. From that time until the construction of the

Temple by Solomon, only one generation passed. So will it be with us."

Then he was asked a question: "What about that Moslem shrine?—referring to Al Aqsa. This was the answer, which I underline: "It is, of course, an open question. Who knows? Perhaps there will be an earthquake."

116. Fifteen days later, that is, on 15 July 1967, what did that same historian say, according to an article in the *De-Of* magazine on 15 July 1967, six weeks after the occupation:

"I always say that one of the deepest of our hopes, and the most expressive, is the hope that salvation will be attained with the construction of the sacred Temple. It is obvious that we are not going to build this Temple in the Maghrabi quarter."

Remember that the Maghrabi quarter was bulldozed by the Israelis, and that they made a plaza adjacent to the wall. He is saying here: "It is obvious that we are not going to build this Temple in the Maghrabi quarter, but we shall build it on the Mountain of the House. That is why it is obvious that the mosque on this mountain must disappear."

117. Those are the words of Israel, not my words. Those are facts. "The mosque must disappear" one of these days, in one way or another. It was for this reason, and being aware of everything that had been going on—the bulldozing of the Maghrabi, followed by excavations, then approaches towards the mosque—that I came before this Council on 30 June 1969 and warned that it was my duty to tell the Council:

"What will happen, may I ask, when cracks are discovered there too—as doubtless, if permitted, they will be? Will this unique mosque, Al Aqsa, the third holiest in all Islam, be condemned and demolished as well? Where will the line be drawn? Or will Israel be left to continue unhampered its 'excavations', its looting and wanton destruction, its desecration of holy places and its gross disregard for the rights of others? Only the members around this table can answer these questions. And time . . . is running short." [1482nd meeting, para. 33.]

Time is of the essence.

118. Then Mr. Tekoah spoke about the cause of the fire. We know that Rohan did not appear in the picture in the beginning; there was a claim that welding was the cause of burning. Then there was another fabrication—and the Israelis are gifted in fabrication—that it was a contact of the wires up in the roof. Then when our people—the guards and the Sheikh, that is, the people in charge—came with the evidence and the world found out, and *Reuters* conveyed information here and there, it was Radio Israel which said many things about the delay; it was not Jordan. And I have it right here; I have a book—I do not want to take the time of the Council—showing what Radio Israel said. These are the facts; I put them before the Council.

119. When the Israelis announced the news at 8.30, no mention was given that the fire was put out, although it was one hour and ten minutes later. Later on, at 10.30, there

was another piece of information. They said at 10.30 that they had extinguished the fire. These are the Israelis. But Mr. Tekoah apparently did not compare notes with his own Government, nor with Radio Israel. He came here to impute falsehood to me, but citing Radio Israel and Israeli sources does not amount to falsehood. This is the tongue of Israel speaking. And the great Powers have radios; they monitor everything said in the area, and I am sure some of them are the friends of Israel. They can come openly and say if these announcements are not true; these are monitored.

120. What I am stating here are facts. I challenge the Israelis to answer my question and to say that Radio Israel did not convey this information; it is as simple as that.

121. Then came the question of learning Hebrew. It is always a pleasure to know foreign languages—Hebrew, English, Russian, French, Spanish, Chinese; it is a privilege and a pleasure. But was this Rohan sent by the Jewish agency—and I challenge Mr. Tekoah to say this man was not sent by the Jewish agency, because I am quoting his semi-official newspaper, *The Jerusalem Post*—was he sent by the Jewish agency to live in a kibbutz, to work for Israel, only to learn Hebrew? He could have gone to Berlitz in New York, or Australia to learn Hebrew—they have Berlitz, too. But he came to Israel for a purpose: he came for a mission; he came tempted by many means of temptation—and there are many in Israel—to do what he did; and all circumstantial evidence leads to this result. There was a fire; fire brigades were delayed; water was interrupted—and again this was reported on Radio Israel; this was said by the man from the fire brigade. He said that the water was running normally for eight minutes, then it was interrupted. Why? It had been normal for two years. Why should it be interrupted that last minute, at the time of the fire?

122. The delay in extinguishing the fire is admitted by the Israelis. In fact, they have tried to show excuses, pretexts, justifications. But the question of delay is admitted by Israel. I want to emphasize that because it is very important. It is not admitted by Mr. Tekoah, but by his authorities.

123. He referred to a statement in a Catholic weekly. I do not know what the statement was, nor its text, nor the magazine—I only know that he referred to it. But I do not have to go to gentile material. I gave him Jewish material—Israeli material, Radio Israel. Can this be a thing which is falsehood?

124. Then came the question of the investigation: he saw there is a committee. I know the Council agrees with me that all the findings of that committee are illegal; they are based on laws which the Council rescinded, which you declared invalid, which you called on Israel to rescind. So we will be discussing things in a vacuum, because they are based on something which is null and void, on laws made to accommodate Israeli designs; and I am certain the Security Council is not here to endorse what Israel has enacted and what the Council has annulled and declared invalid. Neither the Committee's report, nor the findings nor the evidence to be introduced by that Power are valid. Israel cannot be

the accused and the champion of justice at the same time; it cannot be both. Israel is now charged with this crime. It cannot be the organ to decide what happened during the act of arson, especially when Israel is the accused.

125. Then Mr. Tekoah referred to Maha Sangha. He said that our Secretary-General had received a cablegram from Maha Sangha of India supporting Israeli points of view. This is very interesting, because I also tried to find out the reaction of world public opinion to this crime. I discovered that over 100 communications, either cablegrams or letters, had been received from responsible institutions, organizations, individuals and leading figures in the world by the Office of the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. Other communications came in about what had happened in Jerusalem. I do not have the exact number of communications here; I have it in my office. But I know there were over 100 of them and they had the following to say.

126. First, they emphasized their outrage, shock and dismay at this horrible crime. Second, they said that Israel cannot be absolved of its responsibility for the tragic fire at the Mosque of Al Aqsa, caused by arson. Third, they said that Israeli violations in Jerusalem had led to such acts and that Israel should abide by the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Fourth, they said that the solution to preventing such acts could be achieved by the complete withdrawal of the forces of occupation from Jerusalem and the other Arab territories. Fifth, all demanded strong and effective United Nations action in this regard.

127. I could go on citing these communications. I have them here. One comes from Japan and says:

“The Moslem community in Japan strongly protests the burning and damaging of the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem and urges the responsibility of the Israeli authorities for this action.”

128. Here is one from Colombo:

“The burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque is an unpardonable assault on the spiritual domain of man. We trust that immediate and effective measures will be taken for the safety of valued institutions of Moslem and other religions from unscrupulous forces and also to ensure that people are not pushed forward towards the abyss of world chaos.”

129. This came from Sierra Leone, in Africa:

“Africa's Moslems are greatly shocked by the Israeli crime of the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque. They strongly condemn the barbaric action. They are appealing to the United Nations to take the necessary measures for the implementation of its resolutions.”

130. This came from Manchester, England:

“The Moslems of Manchester saddened by fire in Al Aqsa Mosque. Request action restore Jerusalem guardianship to Moslems.”

131. This came from Bonn:

“The calamity of the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem is a tragedy for 700 million Moslems in the world. This incident cannot be ignored or tolerated.”

132. Other communications came from Singapore, Burma and India. I have them here, and with the permission of the President I may have to request their circulation if we think that would be helpful to the Council. I have a volume of letters deploring and condemning and seeking and requesting urgent action by the Security Council.

133. Mr. Tekoah ended his intervention by saying that the real question is how to deal with the exploitation of Al Aqsa. Are we exploiting Al Aqsa? Have we tried to exploit any case when we call for a remedy by the Security Council? There is nothing to exploit. You exploit when you have no cause and no reason to come to the Council; but when you have right on your side you have nothing to exploit, you need no exploitation. This question was not brought to the Council because Jordan wanted to come before the Council. We joined our other Moslem brothers who felt that the question should be brought to the Council, and in their wisdom they thought it would be the right thing because this is the organ created to consider situations threatening international peace and security. We went along, although we will be coming to the Council soon on other aspects of the question of Jerusalem. We want to ask the Council what it wishes to do about its past resolutions. We have come to the Council to remind it of its definite and clear commitment to convene a meeting for action against Israel if its resolutions continue to be ignored and defied by Israel. We have come to the Council to ask it what it is going to do about this promise for effective action. We shall again come to request action against Israel when we receive definite and final information that Israel is continuing to ignore and defy the will of this world body.

134. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

135. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): When the representative of Israel took the floor this afternoon, some might have thought that he would address himself to the pertinent questions put to him by the representatives of Somalia and Jordan. Those questions related to facts bearing on the question before the Council, facts relating to the circumstances of the crime of arson committed against the Holy Al Aqsa Mosque. They covered a wide range. They related to his allegations that one tenth of the Mosque had been damaged. A question was put to him by the representative of Somalia, to the effect that reports indicated that considerable damage and considerable destruction had been caused to the Holy Al Aqsa Mosque. The question of the duration of the fire was another pertinent question put to him. He alleged that the fire had been completely put out after an hour. Corroborative evidence was submitted by the representatives of both Somalia and Jordan to prove that this was not the case.

136. The questions also covered statements of the President of the Supreme Moslem Council, Sheikh Hilmi

Al-Muhtasib, which the representative of Israel deemed it fit to misquote. He did not reply to these questions. He did not address himself to the matter before the Council. We did not share the thought which might have been entertained by some here, that the representative of Israel would this time, for a change, in deference to this highest organ of the world Organization, address himself to the matter before it. He did not address himself to the question put at the end of the statement of the representative of Jordan when he said: we offer all co-operation to implement the resolutions of the Security Council, the resolutions of the General Assembly, the resolutions of the United Nations—and when he asked the representative of Israel to make the same offer.

137. Did the representative of Israel deem it fit to reply to that question? Some might have entertained the hope that he would have stated before the Council that he would also offer his co-operation to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council on the rights of the people of Palestine, to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories, which would pave the way to peaceful settlement and, as the representative of Jordan put it, to genuine peace in the area. Did he address himself to any of those pertinent, relevant and constructive questions? He did not. We all regret that he did not.

138. When the representative of Israel spoke this afternoon, some might have entertained the hope that he would continue the exceptionally moderate tone which was reflected in his two statements at the 1507th and 1508th meetings, statements which included an appeal to understanding and brotherhood and were ostensibly devoid of his usual pattern of abuse, arrogance and defiance. We did not, I must confess, entertain that hope. His statement this afternoon bore us out; he decided to revert to his usual pattern.

139. With your permission, Mr. President, may I take up a few points which were included in the statement of the representative of Israel. This is not an attempt to reply to him; there is no need to reply to his abuse. But I wish to put the record straight on questions which have a bearing on the authority of this body and on the responsibility of the United Nations for international peace. The representative of Israel did not hesitate, here in the Security Council, the organ which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to address the gallery and to boast about the wings of Israeli planes, to boast about the instruments of destruction, to boast that these instruments of destruction are effective, and to reflect on wings of other planes. In the defence of legitimate rights, the wings of some planes may fall, but the determination to uphold rights and to stand fast in the face of aggression will not fall. It is the hope of all who yearn for the restoration of peace that the Security Council will clip the wings of the planes of destruction.

140. The representative of Israel protested against statements by some Arab leaders that this will be the year of liberation. The representative of Israel wants this third year following the Israeli aggression on 5 June 1967 to continue to be the year of occupation and of aggression. He resents

the fact that some Arab leaders say that this year should be the year of liberation. As usual, he omits quoting from these same Arab leaders such phrases as: "We have opened every door for peace, but Israel has closed all the doors to peace." He does not quote these phrases, but he chooses to misquote and misinterpret other phrases, and to protest against the hope of some Arab leaders that this year will be the year of liberation, the year of the end of occupation, the year of the implementation of the Security Council resolutions—the Security Council resolutions which reiterate the established principle of the inadmissibility of conquest and the inadmissibility of the seizure of territory by the illegal use of force. He misquotes the war of purification and he ascribes to the Arab people alien ideas they have never known, and he likens them to Nazi ideas.

141. The world knows by now who introduced to the Middle East the Nazi techniques and the Nazi ideas, and who continues to practise these Nazi techniques and these Nazi ideas. The world knows by now, and the world has long known, the record of tolerance of the Arab people. And history is there. Whatever the representative of Israel may say here will not change history—and neither will his Prime Minister, Mrs. Gold Meir, when she says that Palestine never existed. As reported by *The Times* of London on 19 June 1969, she said:

"It was not as though there was a Palestinian people in Palestine, considering itself as Palestinian, and we came and threw them out and took their country away from them. They did not exist."

That is the pattern of historic facts as represented by the Prime Minister of Israel. No wonder that the representative of Israel today accuses the Arab people of racial and Nazi concepts.

142. The representative of Israel spoke of and quoted from some human rights committees. It would be more pertinent if he were to come and quote the resolution of the Human Rights Commission to establish a committee to investigate violations of human rights.² Why did Israel choose not to co-operate with that Committee? It would be more pertinent if he quoted the reports, and later the evidence that will be submitted by such committees.

143. Now I come to a point of great importance. Today again the representative of Israel spoke of the Security Council as being in the hands of the Arab countries, and this time he chose to hide behind certain quotations. He did not do this before. Is this not the representative who, after the Council unanimously adopted a resolution, stated before the Council that the Council is corrupt politically, legally and morally? Is he not the representative who, a few weeks ago, in a statement to the Council at its 1504th meeting on 26 August 1969, stated that the unanimously adopted resolutions of the Council "must be regarded as being primarily a reflection of the arithmetical vagaries of the vote, always dominated by the fact that of fifteen members of the Council no less than six have no diplomatic relations with Israel"? [1504th meeting, para. 77.]

² Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.

144. According to the representative of Israel, membership in the Security Council should be based on the criterion of a country's relationship with Israel. But this is not the criterion which is laid down in Article 23 of the Charter of the United Nations, which says:

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

145. The members of the Security Council have been elected on the basis of this criterion, not on the basis of the criterion of their countries' relationship with Israel. Members of the Security Council have been elected by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly, and with practical unanimity. But what I have quoted is the representative of Israel's concept of this highest of organs.

146. I wish here to recall a solemn reminder which was voiced, Mr. President, by your predecessor as President of the Council, Ambassador de Piniés of Spain, when he stated on 14 August 1969, in his capacity as President of the Council:

"I should like to point out that, in my capacity as President of this body, I definitely cannot allow direct or indirect attacks to be levelled against its authority and dignity. This is one of the principal organs of the United Nations, on which Member States have conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security; moreover, they have agreed that in carrying out its duties, the Security Council acts on their behalf." [1500th meeting, para. 2.]

147. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and call on him to address the Council.

148. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, it augurs well that you have assumed the Presidency while this item is under consideration. It is a religious item, and people at large—and more so in the Moslem world—consider religion not only as a conglomeration of articles of faith but also, as in the case of Islam, as a way of life. Islam defines spiritual and moral values in the Koran, its Holy Book; but it also sets forth the law which regulates the life of the individual in relation to his God and his fellow men. Religions preceded political ideologies in motivating, if not directing, the attitude of the individual to his Creator, this in the form of worship, and his conduct vis-à-vis the community in which he lives. Inasmuch as ideology has been considered as transcending ethnology in many countries of the world, to the Moslem his religion supersedes ideology and personal interests, or even national interests. To the Moslem, his religion is the most precious thing on earth.

149. I said, Mr. President, that it augurs well that you are in the Chair because your great Revolution was motivated

by an ideology. Islamic society in its conduct is still motivated by its religion. Thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions were sacrificed in order to serve a cause, whether political or social, or for some sort of reform. In modern times this has happened. But Islam remains the motivating factor in moulding the life of the individual as well as that of Moslem communities and nations.

150. Having said that, I must refer to the threats that are being received by some delegations. I have not yet received any; I have just come back from a fact-finding trip. But I did receive quite a number of threats in the past. Mr. President, you did well to request the host country, as well as our beloved Secretary-General, to look into this matter, because the essence of the United Nations is freedom of speech. It so happens that there are certain people amongst us who may be sensitive and who may react subconsciously in such a way as not to be able to express themselves freely when they receive threats of the nature that our colleague from Jordan mentioned this afternoon.

151. I do not think that this City of New York is the right place for the Security Council. I mentioned that a few years ago. I have been with the United Nations for 23 years and I know how the United Nations is subjected to pressures from every direction; there are lobbyists and propagandists everywhere. Just because the host country contributes a large sum to the United Nations should we be here at the risk of our lives? Let the Council function in a neutral country, neither big nor small, but a neutral country so that freedom of speech can really be enjoyed.

152. We must serve notice through you, as the President of the Council, and through our illustrious Secretary-General, that such threats will not be tolerated in the future. If pornography and obscene literature are masquerading under freedom of expression, that is another matter. There is enough demoralization in society, but to curb the freedom of speech, which is the essence and the life of the United Nations, I submit, is inadmissible from whatever quarter it comes.

153. I was away but I had the opportunity to read the provisional verbatim records of the meetings of the Council. I must salute the representatives of Pakistan, India and Indonesia, because, after all, they represent one half of the population of the Moslem world. But it is not a question of numbers, it is a question of principle.

154. Before this incident of the Al Aqsa Mosque, I happened to be in Saudi Arabia and, of course, had occasion to discuss the question of Palestine with His Majesty the King. I can assure you that the King, although he is a man of few words, has assured me that he and his sons and his brothers, and many Moslems who have declared their intention during the pilgrimage, will, when the time comes, be prepared to martyrize themselves in order to defend Islam and defend the Holy Places of Islam. I believe that his Majesty the King had mentioned the question of Jerusalem time and again since 1967, when the usurpers occupied all Jerusalem and parts of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. But he reiterated in unmistakable terms that Jerusalem is as holy to Islam as are Mecca and Medina. I do not think I would be repeating

myself if I were to remind the members of the Council that the United Nations is responsible for the creation of the usurping State of Israel. Why the usurping State of Israel? Because there was in Palestine an indigenous people who had a personality like any other people in the region. And let us forget that they were Arabs. I mentioned time and again that they were Arabized. But this still does not preclude their having been the indigenous people of the region. And what has the Council done with all those resolutions that were passed about the partition of Palestine, about the return of the refugees, about the sanctions that would be used against Israel, the pet State that was created by the United Nations because of pressures that I need not reiterate here. Why has nothing been done so far? We know that the Zionists have permeated themselves in most Western countries to the extent that in some countries they formulate the policies of the Middle East. This statement is being made by someone who has been familiar with Western policies since 1929, and I am not saying this idly.

155. The item before us is the question of Jerusalem, some might say, because after all Jerusalem is the heart of Palestine. Although it is revered by Jews, it is none the less revered by Christians and Moslems. And what do we find happening in Jerusalem? There are plans to change the character of that Holy City. It is a paradox that people and Governments in the West try to preserve monuments, leaving aside holy shrines. But these Zionists from Western Europe, because they had fared badly at the hands of Hitler, are made to flock into the Holy Land of Palestine and desecrate it, by all kinds of modern concepts of reconstruction, with their scholars digging the earth to find where the temple of Jerusalem had been built, as if the town belonged to those Khazars from Eastern Europe.

156. "Well", they say, "this is an Australian, a Christian, who was a fanatic, who thought that by burning the Al Aqsa Mosque and by rebuilding the Temple of Solomon"—which, incidentally, Solomon himself did not build, but which the Canaanites of Lebanon built—"there will be a new era"—Christ may come again into this world, or something of that sort. I do not know what his philosophy is.

157. Now, I am reminded of van der Lubbe—you are of my age, Sir; you remember 1933, do you not, when van der Lubbe, that poor Dutch half-witted person was used as a medium to burn the *Reichstag*. That served as an excuse for a pogrom by Hitler against Communists and Jews. You remember the name Georgi Dimitrov; he was a Bulgarian. I am saying this as a monarchist. Dimitrov was a Communist. Poor Dimitrov was accused. Van der Lubbe was the medium and Georgi Dimitrov was considered the arch-fiend by Hitler, who initiated those pogroms against Communists and Jews. There is a sort of parallel here.

158. I do not go into the question of why this Australian should come to the Holy Land of Palestine. We know from certain statements made in Israel itself that he resembles, in a way, van der Lubbe—so that the Zionists may achieve their end by destroying the Al Aqsa Mosque in order to rebuild the Temple.

159. As far back as 1922, Lord Melchet—the English choose names for their nobility, but he was known before that as Sir Alfred Mond—I do not know whether that was his real name, too, because the Jews are quite adaptive and they Anglicize their names when it suits their purpose. Not all of them—the Orthodox Jews are as tenacious as the Arabs in preserving their names. It is like calling myself “Brody” in America; I am Baroody. So Mond, I do not know what he was; it must be some Ashkenazi name, coming from I do not know where. I know the Sassoons came from Baghdad, they preserved their name; but those people calling themselves Rothschilds and Melchets, Anglicizing or Frenchifying their names—Cassin is one of them—we know them. When it suits them, they embellish their names and garnish them with all kinds of appellations.

160. To go back to Lord Melchet, who said in 1922:

“The day on which the Jewish Temple will be rebuilt has become near. I shall dedicate the rest of my life for the reconstruction of Solomon’s Temple on the site of the Aqsa Mosque.”

161. Who reacted to that statement? None other than my good friend whom I saw recently in Beirut, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. He reacted to that statement in 1922. He wrote to the British High Commissioner—I do not know whether Lord Caradon was a magistrate at that time, in 1922. For the benefit of Lord Caradon I recall that the Grand Mufti wrote to the British High Commissioner. And then he received the following letter in 1922 from the Secretary of the British Mandatory Government of Palestine:

“His Eminence the Grand Mufti of Palestine,

Sayed Mohammad Amin El-Husseini,

“Your Eminence,

“With reference to the conversation which your Eminence had with His Excellency the High Commissioner in which you protested against the statement of Sir Alfred Mond openly demanding the reconstruction of the Jewish Temple on the site of the Aqsa, I wish to inform your Eminence that His Excellency referred the matter to the proper authorities in London and received the following answer.

“Reference your number 248 dated the first of July, the statement by Sir Alfred Mond was as follows: “He believes that Palestine can again give the world religious inspiration; furthermore, Sir Alfred Mond was very careful about this subject. He stated that it is his fervent hope to construct a new huge Jewish Temple on the site, and instead of the Aqsa Mosque”.”

Very confusing—“a new . . . Jewish Temple on the site, and instead of the Aqsa Mosque”. I can produce that letter any time the Council wishes me to do so. It is in the archives of the Mufti. The Mufti is well guarded in Beirut, so that no one can pilfer his archives. But this is not all.

162. Our colleague Mr. Tekoah speaks here of brotherhood when it suits his purpose. He could not hide his

bitterness. In the speech he made while I was travelling from Paris to New York on 9 September, he stated—and I read from the provisional verbatim record—that all that is taking place in the Council is “to exploit religious feelings for political and even warlike purposes”. [1507th meeting, para. 87.]

163. I mentioned advisedly that before the fire broke out in the Al Aqsa Mosque not only His Majesty King Feisal but other Moslems had vowed that they would see to it that all Jerusalem would one day return to the indigenous people of Palestine.

164. Mr. Tekoah spoke of the ecumenical spirit. This ecumenical spirit began when the late Pope John XXII—may his soul rest in peace—said that the Jews were not responsible for the crucifixion of Christ. Of course the Jews of today were not responsible for the crucifixion of Christ, and, happily, Mr. Tekoah’s ancestors and Mr. Abba Eban’s ancestors and Mr. Ben-Gurion’s ancestors and Mrs. Golda Meir’s ancestors were innocent because they never came from the area; they came from the northern tier of Asia, tribes that moved from near Mongolia—and he referred to Mongolia; I will come back to that—westward, and settled where southern Russia is today.

165. Of course, the Jews of Europe did not crucify Christ. Christ was a reformer. We in Islam do not believe even that Christ was crucified. But that is not the question. The question is one of trying to exploit the ecumenical spirit that Pope John XXIII tried to initiate among all religions. The Israelis exploit the ecumenical spirit for their own advantage. The representative of Israel—and I was shocked by this—called the Moslems his brethren. It reminds me of Abel and Cain. They were brothers too. One killed the other. For the benefit of the Council, I must repeat what Mr. Tekoah said: “The torment and bloodshed inflicted upon us on account of our religion are ever present in our minds.” But the Christian tormented one another. They are not the only people who were tormented for their religion. Religious intolerance has been world-wide: the Inquisition, Catholics and Protestants, Protestants and Catholics, after the Inquisition. In Islam itself various sects fought against one another. No doubt among the Hindus and the Buddhists there were some sects that thought others were wrong. Mr. Tekoah is always wailing, on behalf of those Khazars of Eastern Europe, that the Jews were persecuted on account of their religion. So were others persecuted on account of their religion. That is a misleading statement.

166. I could go on quoting chapter and verse, but one thing he said bears repetition here:

“All attempts, however, whether in the area itself or in the Security Council, to seize on the fire as a weapon for intensifying belligerency towards Israel and assailing Israel’s rights and standing are unworthy and unacceptable.” [1507th meeting, para. 125.]

The emphasis is on Israel’s rights and standing. By what right is Israel in Jerusalem or in Palestine? By the religious argument: because Judaism flourished in Palestine, Palestine should therefore be Jewish? So did Christianity flourish in Palestine. On the basis of the demographic

argument? Let us see whether the demographic argument is valid. How many Jews are there in the world? They say there are 16 or 17 million Jews. I do not know whether any census has been taken. There are a billion Christians. The Holy Sepulchre is in Jerusalem, and the first Qibla in Islam is in Jerusalem—there are 600 million of 650 million Moslems. By what yardstick, therefore, should Jerusalem belong to those Zionists? Just because they have money which they deploy in Europe in order to corrupt certain Governments or legislators, even in Western Europe, to get their own way—just because they can wield financial influence, because one of their erstwhile abilities is knowing how to manage financial loans abroad? Is it because they have permeated the chanceries of many Governments that have sent them as emissaries to under-developed countries in order to proffer aid. They say, to the under-developed countries, “We will do this for you if you will kindly do this for us.” I have been told that by persons who had a certain revulsion about it and spoke out to me and to others.

167. On what grounds is Israel in Jerusalem, or in the Holy Land of Palestine for that matter? It is because of a dream of Herzl that was no longer valid when Jews after the French Revolution and later, after the Dreyfus affair, were accepted in most Western countries on an equal footing without discrimination. The dream is no longer valid. Those architects of Zionism are secular, and I feel sorry for the Jews on whose sentiments they played—not only in Central and Eastern Europe but prosperous Jews here in the United States, who can wield such power as to tip the balance in elections, who could persuade the Government of a mighty Power to send aircraft to destroy the Arab people.

168. But the Arab people are indestructible, I can assure you—100 million of them, and they procreate fast. There will be 150 million. There is space for them. We are not afraid of the population explosion. Poor, tiny Israel is there. Why should we begrudge it that area among us? I have said time and again that if they want to come and stay with us as Jews they are our brothers in humanity as well as in religion. But if they are going to come to exploit us, which they will do if we let them—of course, we the Arab people are not going to stand for that.

169. Now, I will bolster my argument by quoting from none other than Jewish leaders. “The Al Aqsa Mosque is situated on the Sanctuary of Sanctuaries, in the Temple, and it belongs to the Jews.” That is a statement from none other than Mr. Klausner, whom, no doubt, Mr. Tekoah knows. He is the President of the Society for the Defence of the Wailing Wall. He wrote that in the *Palestine Weekly* of 6 August 1929, 40 years ago.

170. Then Dr. Schlesinger—I do not know if it is a German name or a Germanized name—said: “I see in the presence of the Mosque of Omar on the Mountain of the House a grave tragedy. I want to destroy it, for I possess the power, and I am not sure that I do not have the power to do that.”

171. When we come to economic exploitation, Western Asia is still virgin territory, in so far as markets are concerned. The standard of living is moving up, and in the Western world taxes have been on the rise. The pressures of

the population for social welfare have been increasing, and the wealthy Jews who at first shunned Zionism, like the Rothschilds, before the Balfour Declaration was enunciated, wanting to make sure they would not be chased out of the United Kingdom should a national home for the Jews be established one day in Palestine, began to see that they did not need to put all their eggs in one basket. So, whilst playing on the religious motives of the devout Jews all over the world, they were supporting this movement in order to exploit the whole of West Asia and Northern Africa and go from there even to the heart of Africa. This is their scheme and their project. Some Jews who are non-Zionists told me this. They would be threatened if I gave their names, so I do not have to give their names here. And that Frenchman, M. Cassin—I do not know whether he is a Frenchman—is a Jew first and foremost. They gave him the Nobel Prize, too. He not only defends Israel but deplored the fact that the Palestinians had banded themselves together and were trying to fight back to regain their homeland. He called them terrorists.

172. Where were they in 1940, when he fled to join the illustrious General de Gaulle and organize in France, on French soil, the Resistance Movement? Those were the heroes. Why? Because they are Europeans. They must be heroes. Terrorists who are Europeans are heroes. In my terminology, I call them nationalists; I would not call the French Underground “terrorist”. But it suits M. Cassin, whom I have known, and who is still writing and active in those circles which bolster Israel and its tyranny over the Arab world. And he calls the nationalists of Palestine “terrorists”.

173. This is a preview of what I have to say. I have some exhibits here on the Mosque of the Rock, and also other exhibits about the Al Aqsa Mosque, embroidered with Hebrew slogans about the Temple of Solomon that should be rebuilt. I have articles from various Western newspapers, recent and old. I recited some old passages which unmask the motives of Israel.

174. The tone of Mr. Tekoah at this meeting, I noticed, was mellifluous, except that he gave himself away when he talked about the “perverted methods”—I am paraphrasing—for rousing religious feelings against that little tiny Israel, an oasis of democracy in the Middle East. What kind of democracy is it? Perverted democracy? The perverted democracy of the voting machine, or the democracy of the heart or the spirit? A democracy that has its principles as humanism, or the democracy that believes in napalm and the weapons of destruction? What kind of democracy is that which is bolstered by some great democracies that have become corrupt in their own lands—where their youth is rebelling against them because of their lies and rationalizations? Is this democracy, when they talk of humanism and sell engines of destruction to wipe us out? And those who abet in the crime are criminals themselves.

175. Mr. Tekoah mentioned something about the Mongolian hordes that committed genocide. Who committed genocide in Palestine, except those Zionists who came to our region like a cyclone from Central and Eastern Europe, devastating the land, driving the people from their homes in

the name of a noble religion, Judaism? Judaism was the motivation for their political and economic ends.

176. This is something recent I am going to quote for the benefit of our Israeli colleagues. In a symposium that was held on 15 July 1967, Dr. Israel Eldad mentioned what a great war it was. Of course I am paraphrasing what he said so as not to take up more of the time of the Council. He said:

“Joshua killed all, even their animals, in the same way that David did, and this is what the Torah orders us, and what the Arabs would have done with us if they had been victorious.”

The Arabs are defending themselves. The Arabs protected the Jew; the Arabs never persecuted the Jew when he lived amongst us, because he was one of us, not like those Khazar Jews from Eastern and Central Europe. These are European Jews, ethnologically European and culturally European. They simply have Judaism as their religion just as a Scotsman is a Christian. That does not make him a Semite. Incidentally, Semitism is not something of the blood. It is a conglomeration of culture, language, customs, tradition. Do you consider these people coming from Europe, those usurping Zionists, as neo-colonialists? You honour them if you call them neo-colonialists; they are usurpers. They are the ones that swept over the land, chasing the people of Palestine from their homeland.

177. The account of the symposium continues: “A voice interrupting: or as we did in Deir Yassin . . .” he is referring to what Dr. Eldad said; Dr. Eldad replied—“Yes, the same as Deir Yassin, for had it not been for Deir Yassin, a half million Arabs would have remained in Israel and this means that Israel would never have been created.” This is not fabricated by the mass media of information in the Arab world or in any other place. I am not going to read all of it. These excerpts appeared in the *De-Ot* magazine on 15 July 1967 and then were repeated in *Ha-olam Ha-zeh* on 27 August 1969.

178. That is the spirit of European Zionism, not the Zion of the spirit, but the Zion of destruction.

179. What are you going to do here in the Council? That is the question. Pass another resolution, no doubt, with the European Zionists laughing up their sleeves. The first instalment has arrived. How many are there, 25 or 50 Phantoms, raining destruction over our region? I have just come from Europe and I have learned something that the Council should know. An Eastern European country is being sold certain planes as destructive as the Phantoms. To use against whom? I am not going to embarrass the country and name it. Against your country, Sir? Russia is not to be fooled with. Against whom are they going to use them? They are going to be sent to Israel. Who told me? One who did not get his full commission on the deal. I hope that the deal will not go through. Was it fabrication when we were told in 1965 that certain great Powers would not send arms to Israel? Mr. Ben-Gurion came and saw the West Germans. The West Germans sold those arms that were shipped from that big country which promised never to send arms to Israel. That was a scandal. It was glorified

in Israel. All of a sudden the German guilt, which was a broken record that had been heard in Israel, vanished from the press of Israel and in mellifluous phrases the Israelis began to say that the Germans were now seeing the light, just because they sold Israel arms to destroy us.

180. Whom do they think they are fooling, those Central European Zionists and Eastern European Zionists? Themselves. Because sooner or later the Arab people will see to it that in defending their rights—and Islam will see to it that in defending its holy places—Israel will be curbed.

181. Jews thrown into the sea? Who wants to throw Israel into the sea? Stay there if you want, as Jews. But Israel from Europe dominating us, the headquarters for our exploitation: No. Jerusalem is the heart of the problem and it is only by insisting through those who exercise power that Israel be restrained—and not only by passing resolutions but by sending ultimatums to Israel that if it does not obey certain resolutions adopted since 1947 with regard to the partition of Palestine and with regard to the refugees and their return, if they so wish, to their homeland, then Israel will be punished—that the Council will really become effective. Otherwise it will be an academic forum for debating questions as if it were a court of justice, with the difference that no justice is rendered.

182. *The Times* of London two days ago referred to what some Western countries—in order to sing the song of Israel—call guerrillas, the Palestinian fighters. In an editorial referring to the incident of the hijacked plane and other similar matters, *The Times* of London stated: “No doubt they feel that, having been deprived of their lands, they cannot be expected to respect international law or conventions.” They are referring to the Palestinian fighters. It goes on to say: “But the one certain consequence of the terrorism they threaten is that it will promote sympathy for their opponents”—as if they do not have enough sympathy—“and not for them, and that the most determined action will be taken to stop them.”

183. I have warned the Council since 1966 that the question of Palestine has gone out of the hands of Arab Governments. Even some of my colleagues thought that I was dramatizing the situation. It came to pass. The Palestinian people are resolved. I have come now from that part of the world—not only from Saudi Arabia, but from certain other Arab countries—and it is heartbreaking to see that the psychosis of retrieving one’s homeland has taken hold even of boys and girls, not only in their teens but younger than that. They will not rest until Jerusalem is restored. They will die by placing their lives in the palm of their hands and throwing away their lives for the cause.

184. What are we going to do here in the Council? Adopt resolutions with no teeth in them? Even sanctions are not working—the sanctions of the Council. If you do not believe what I say you only have to read in today’s *Wall Street Journal* an article by Ray Vicker entitled “Rhodesia: Booming Despite Sanctions”—the sanctions of the Council.

185. I shall take the floor again, but I should like to conclude this statement by appealing to the representatives of the major Powers to see that our voice is heard by their

policy-makers in their home Governments, to see that they understand that this question is far more serious than many people think it is. It is not a game of words or a string of resolutions to be adopted by the highest organ of the United Nations.

186. I warn you, my brothers sitting around this table, that it is possible for the Zionists, who are suffering from a psychosis, pitted as they are against 100 million Arabs, to draw in the big Powers which have interests in the area and cause a conflict that will burn us all, following the legendary mentality of Samson when, allegedly, he brought down the Temple over his head and the heads of his enemies.

187. With all the lethal weapons lying around and with interests blinding the eyes of wisdom in men, if this Council fails to heed such warnings as those I am voicing it may come to pass that there will be no voice left to say: "We wish we had acted with justice instead of with expediency."

188. It is high time that we set our house in order. We, as diplomats here, receive instructions from our respective Governments; but I think it is our duty, not only as messengers of our respective Governments but as human beings in our own right as well, to make those responsible in our Governments see that the time is getting late, and that, judging by past history, miscalculation may very well plunge us into the chasm.

189. Why do I say this time and again? Because time and again I have been assured that the Palestinians are inflexible in their determination, and that no Arab Government dares stop them because they would destroy it. They are as dangerous to the Arab Governments as they are to Israel

itself. They remind me of a certain episode in history from which the word "assassin" derives. It is an Arabic word, *hashashin*. It reminds me of the Old Man of the Mountain, although the conditions are different because at that time there was no nationalism. Here, however, we have a combination of nationalism motivated by religion, which in Islam, as I stated before, is a way of life and not a fact of principle. And anyone who tampers with the way of life and the sacred beliefs of 600 million persons will end in sorrow. I say this to the Israelis because they are human beings and I do not wish to see them, as human beings, suffer.

190. Let us hope that those responsible for the policies of the big Powers will heed the words of someone who has witnessed two world wars, lest, as I said, the United Nations end up like the League of Nations before it. Thank you, Mr. President, for your kindness, and with your permission, and after I hear what Mr. Tekoah has to say, I will take the floor again.

191. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I wish to thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for the kind words he has addressed to me.

192. The list of speakers is now exhausted. As a result of consultations among the members of the Security Council concerning the next meeting, it has been agreed that the next meeting of the Council, to continue its consideration of this question, will be convened tomorrow, 12 September, at 3 p.m. If there are no other comments or objections, I shall take it that the proposal is accepted.

The meeting rose at 7:15 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.
