

302118



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/9008
13 February 1969

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 13 FEBRUARY 1969 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE
SECURITY COUNCIL, TRANSMITTING A LETTER FROM THE MINISTER OF
FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

I have the honour to enclose herewith a letter of the Minister of Foreign
Affairs of the United Arab Republic addressed to you.

I will be grateful if that letter were circulated as an official document of
the Security Council.

I avail myself, etc.

(Signed) Mohamed Awad EL KONY
Permanent Representative of the
United Arab Republic to the
United Nations

13 February 1969

Your Excellency,

I have the honour to put before you and the distinguished members of the Security Council the following:

The first purpose of the United Nations as stipulated in the Charter, is to maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention of threats to peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression.

The Security Council bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and carries out its functions according to the purposes and principles of the United Nations that prohibit aggression. Member States of the United Nations have agreed in the Charter to confer these responsibilities upon the Security Council, in order to ensure that action by the United Nations shall be carried out promptly and effectively. It cannot be claimed that the Security Council has achieved that purpose if it confines itself solely to making recommendations for the settlement of a situation, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. In addition to the Council's functions in recommending procedures or methods of adjustment and terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate, the Council's responsibilities as well as those incumbent upon its members, and the permanent members in particular, require continuous efforts on their part to settle a situation that threatens international peace and security.

The Charter in its letter and spirit is based fundamentally on the concept of the prohibition of aggression. The purposes and principles of the Charter which Member States have resolved to uphold, and the primary responsibility conferred upon the Security Council cannot and should not condone the state of continuing aggression still persisting for eighteen months on three Arab countries as a result of Israel's aggression committed against the Arab States on 5 June 1967 and despite the Security Council's resolution adopted on 22 November 1967 which provides for peaceful settlement. The Council cannot accept the continuation of a situation that threatens international peace and security, resulting from the aggressor's persistent refusal to accept and implement that settlement. In pursuance of the United Nations principles, the Organization and its Members shall

/...

act in accordance with the seven principles enumerated in Article 2 of the Charter, which include the principle that all Members shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The purpose of the resolution which the Security Council adopted on 9 June 1967 was to stop the aggressors and to prevent them from pursuing further their aggression. The Council was expected to call at the same time upon Israel to withdraw from the territories it occupied as a result of its aggression. However, the Council failed at that stage to take this logical step, which has always been the case in similar circumstances in the past. It was then argued that other resolutions should be adopted to secure peace before calling upon the aggressor to withdraw.

Israel lost no time in exploiting that lapse on the part of the Security Council, and sought to reap the fruits of its aggression in spite of the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions and annexed Jerusalem, thus facing the world with a new fait accompli. The General Assembly, at its fifth emergency special session, refused to accept as legal, in its resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967, the measures taken by Israel to alter the status of the City of Jerusalem and considered them invalid. It called on Israel to rescind all those measures and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. On 14 July 1967, the General Assembly once more, by its resolution 2254 (ES-V) expressed its deepest regret that Israel did not comply with the previous resolution and reiterated its call to Israel to rescind all measures taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. Furthermore, the Security Council, in its resolution 252 dated 21 May 1968, reaffirmed the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by military conquest and deplored the failure of Israel to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly in this respect. It also considered invalid all the legislative and administrative measures and actions taken to alter the status of the City of Jerusalem, and urgently called upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and desist forthwith from taking any further action.

Israel, however, continues to refuse compliance with those resolutions. Its leaders have repeatedly made clear their intentions to retain usurped Jerusalem; suffice it to refer to the press conference dated 26 May 1968 during which the Prime Minister of Israel announced that the Security Council resolution of 2 May 1968 was irrational and not practical, and it was the best measure for hampering peace in the Middle East. He stated once again on 22 September 1968

that Israel's insistence on what he called the preservation of the unity of its "capital" Jerusalem, is a matter above any discussion or evaluation and that the "liberation" of Jerusalem is beyond any military or political analysis.

As for the other resolutions which, as was claimed, should be taken to secure peace before calling upon Israel to withdraw, the Security Council, on 22 November 1967, unanimously adopted the British draft resolution for the peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East. On its submission as well as on subsequent occasions, the sponsors of that draft and its supporters were careful to affirm that it contained a delicate balance upon which depended the peaceful settlement provided for in it. They also stressed that any addition to or detracting from it would destroy the resolution since it was a balanced whole as it stood and should ensure a mutuality of rights and obligations.

The United Arab Republic declared its acceptance of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and its readiness to implement it. The United Arab Republic also pointed out that this acceptance, on its part, stood unequivocally on the basis that the resolution called on Israel to withdraw from all the Arab territories it occupied as a result of its aggression against the Arab countries on 5 June 1967. It is only normal that the United Arab Republic's acceptance of the resolution and its readiness to implement all of its obligations emanating from it requires, likewise, that Israel accept the resolution and further accept to carry out the obligations provided therein. Moreover, the United Arab Republic has informed Ambassador Gunnar Jarring that it accepted the Security Council resolution and that it was ready to implement it. We suggested that he draw up a time-table for the implementation of all the provisions of the resolution. We have, furthermore, asked that the implementation of the resolution be carried out under the supervision and with the guarantee of the Security Council.

As to Israel's stand so far, it can be summarized in its refusal to implement the Security Council resolution, its determination to act against it, its refusal to withdraw and insistence on continuing the occupation.

In the Knesset on 5 November 1968, the Prime Minister of Israel declared that, "... when we say the River Jordan is our security border, we mean that once a peace agreement is signed, no foreign forces will be allowed to cross that security border even after a peace treaty had been signed. Israel will insist

that no Jordanian, Arab, or any other army will be stationed west of the Jordan in any final peace settlement." Again in the Knesset on 11 November 1968, Mr. Eshkol declared, "Israel would hold on to the captured Straits of Tiran as part of any Middle East settlement." In an interview with Newsweek magazine published on 9 February 1969, Mr. Eshkol stated that, "The Jordan River must become the security border for Israel with all that that implies. Our army shall be stationed only on the strip along that border." In the same interview, he also said that, "... as for the Golan Heights, we will quite simply never give them up. The same goes for Jerusalem. Here there is no flexibility at all."

As to Sharm El-Sheikh, he said that he would demand the stationing of Israeli troops at that point. This latest statement clearly explains why Mr. Eshkol now chooses to deride the establishment of demilitarized zones. And while he tries to deny the expansionist aims of Israel, he declares in his interview that Israel would never return to the boundaries that prevailed before 5 June 1967, and that the Armistice Agreements are dead and buried.

When we add previous and subsequent declarations made by the Israeli Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defence to the statements made by the Prime Minister of Israel, the complete picture of the real ambitions of Israel at the present stage emerge clearly.

Mr. Eban, in his interview with "Le Figaro" on 5 February 1969, reaffirmed the ambitions of Israel in Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, the West Bank, and that Israel is unrelenting in its position on the occupation of Sharm El-Sheikh. He had also alluded in a press conference on 17 January 1969 to the intention of Israel to continue the occupation of Sharm El-Sheikh as well as a strip of land along the eastern edge of Sinai.

General Dayan made numerous declarations concerning the West Bank. The most recent one, according to press reports of 11 February 1969, reiterates his demand for the economic and administrative integration of the Jordan West Bank into Israel and the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

Hence, the leaders of Israel, in clear and unequivocal terms, have now uncovered one aspect of their intentions, while still thinly disguising the others. Their declarations concerning the West Bank clearly underscore their territorial ambitions in that part of the Arab land.

Israel demands a continuous Israeli military presence along the Jordan River, that no Arab forces be stationed to its west, that it be economically integrated into Israel and the establishment of Israeli settlements therein. It is evident, therefore, that Israel seeks complete domination of the area, which amounts to an official declaration of annexation.

As to Sharm El-Sheikh, Israel demands not only an Israeli military presence there, but also the domination of a strip of land in Sinai under the pretext of protecting that presence.

Thus Israel's expansionist plan, at this stage, as reiterated in the declarations of its Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, as well as the Minister of Defence, can be summarized in the following:

- (1) The annexation of Jerusalem;
- (2) The continued occupation of the Golan Heights in Syria;
- (3) The continued occupation of the West Bank in Jordan and its complete domination, practically terminating the Jordanian sovereignty in that part;
- (4) The economic and administrative integration of the Gaza Strip into Israel;
- (5) The continued occupation of Sharm El-Sheikh and the Gulf of Aqaba area, as well as the continued military presence in parts of Sinai; and
- (6) The establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

Israel's expansionist aims and its ambitions in acquiring new Arab lands create a situation which is in clear contradiction with the Security Council resolution.

Israel refuses to implement the Security Council resolution. Furthermore, after quibbling over specific questions addressed to it by Ambassador Jarring, who sought to clarify her understanding of secure boundaries, Israel now uncovers her expansionist ambitions through the declarations made by its Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Defence, as well as other Israeli leaders.

Israel is now acting overtly against the resolution adopted by the international community as reflected in the unanimity of the Security Council on the peaceful settlement provided for in its resolution of 22 November 1967.

It is natural, therefore, that the international community should expect the Security Council, and in particular its permanent members, to take the positive steps necessary to repress the aggressor, to eliminate the consequences of the aggression and to implement the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, thus removing a situation the continuance of which endangers international peace and security.

Please accept, etc.

MAHMOUD RIAD
Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the United Arab Republic
