

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

JAN 17 1973



UN/SA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1483rd MEETING: 1 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1483)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 26 June 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9284)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 1 July 1969, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Ibrahima BOYE (Senegal).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1483)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:

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

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): It is my pleasant duty and privilege, as President of the Security Council, to pay a tribute to my predecessor for the great contribution he has made to the work of the Security Council, over which he presided during the month of June. On behalf of all the members of the Council, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Ambassador Solano López who constantly combined modesty and courtesy with the highest competence.

2. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to express my deepest thanks to you for the generous words with which you referred to my work as President of the Security Council during the past month of June.

3. At the same time, I am very happy that you yourself, one of the finest and most brilliant representatives of Africa in the United Nations, are now assuming the Presidency for the month of July. I am certain that you will guide our deliberations with your characteristic tact, diplomatic skill and devotion.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

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

4. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): At its 1482nd meeting yesterday afternoon the Council decided,

at their request, to invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Morocco to participate in our debate, without the right to vote. Since then, further requests for participation have been received from the representatives of Iraq [S/9297] and Indonesia [S/9298]. In accordance with the practice of the Council, I propose that these representatives also be invited to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

5. In view of the limited space available at the Council table, and in conformity with the established practice in such cases, I shall invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table and the other representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that when one of these representatives wishes to speak he will be invited to take a place at the Council table.

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

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item on the agenda. Before calling on the first speaker on the list, I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General dated 30 June 1969 [S/9149/Add.1] submitted in pursuance of resolution 252 (1968) adopted by the Council on 21 May 1968. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to whom I now give the floor.

7. Mr. El KONY (United Arab Republic): Allow me to express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for permitting me to participate in the Council's deliberations on Jerusalem. The Security Council is confronted with a serious and grave act of defiance and utter disregard of the will of the United Nations and the principles enshrined in its Charter. By persisting in its illegal measures of annexation and the systematic obliteration of all that is Arab in Jerusalem, Israel has again confirmed its real expansionist designs.

8. The issue before the Council is Jordan's complaint concerning Israel's outrageous refusal to honour its obliga-

tions under the Charter and to carry out the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council regarding Jerusalem. The question before the Council is definitely not the discussion of licence permits or the registration of commercial enterprises as Mr. Tekoah contended in his usual manner in order to divert the attention of the Council. Mr. Tekoah has desperately attempted to belittle the irrefutable legitimacy of the Jordanian complaint; but his barren arguments have no chance of misleading anyone, for the Council, on 21 May 1968, has already passed its judgement and invalidated Israel's arbitrary measures.

9. It must be made clear that Israel is appearing before the Council not to preach or be given a forum to propagate more falsehoods. Israel is present at the Council table for one reason only: to answer for its unacceptable delay in carrying out the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council on Jerusalem. It is in the light of the aforementioned facts that we participate in the Council's deliberations.

10. Over the centuries, Jerusalem has always been the living symbol of a peaceful city in the Land of Peace and the cradle of civilization. Jerusalem has throughout the centuries been a haven for religious freedom and a harbour for safety and tranquillity. This was the state of affairs in Jerusalem until the Zionists injected their alien practices of racism and religious discrimination. Jerusalem has now been transformed into a city of tension, of persecution against its Arab inhabitants. The Israelis are trying to make it a city untenable for any Arab to live in. Those who were not expelled, deported, imprisoned or dispossessed are under constant and unrelenting pressure to yield to the yoke of the occupier. The Israeli measures of annexation, destruction of houses and economic installations, and deportation, which are being carried out daily in the Arab territories, are meant to achieve but one objective—namely, the consolidation by all methods of Israel's occupation. The Arab populations of the occupied territories are enduring hardships and all forms of atrocities, arbitrary imprisonment and mass deportation. Even Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, the Major of Jerusalem, who had an opportunity to present his case before the Council last year [1421st meeting], was not spared.

11. The Israeli machinations are actively pursuing a dual policy: to blackmail and despoil possessions in the occupied Arab lands and simultaneously to attempt to refurbish Israel's nefarious and illegal behaviour, presenting it to the world community in an entirely different form. The form might vary, but the crux of the matter has not changed. We hear Israeli spokesmen audaciously justifying such measures by invoking all kinds of irrelevant elements, whether touristic, administrative, civil or civic. In point of fact, all that Israel has been seeking throughout the last two years is more territories. I need hardly dwell on the "rosy" picture which the representative of Israel tried to convey to the Council yesterday [1482nd meeting] when he treated the gallery to a guided tour of present Arab Jerusalem. All of us realize his predicament, but certainly it takes audacity to speak unabashedly on this subject while the facts belie his false pretences. What is happening in Jerusalem now, under

the guise of administrative measures, is but a glaring example of the Zionists' usurpation tactics.

12. 'Ambassador El-Farra has lucidly presented to the Council the true picture of what is occurring in Jerusalem. I do not need to repeat the manifold illegal Israeli measures that prompted Jordan to bring its legitimate complaint before the Council. Likewise, I hardly need to emphasize that the provisions of the new Israeli laws, as well as its Absentees' Property Law of 1950, could not easily be dismissed simply as administrative formalities, as referred to by the representative of Israel yesterday. All this was fully presented and documented by Ambassador El-Farra yesterday. I shall therefore confine my remarks to pointing out some of the legal and political implications of the serious offences committed by Israel.

13. In this regard, permit me to cite from the principles of international law recognized in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal, which were reaffirmed by a unanimous General Assembly resolution [95 (I)] in 1946 and later elaborated by other organs of the United Nations. In article 6, sub-paragraph (b), of the Charter of the Tribunal, it states that war crimes include "plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages . . .". In sub-paragraph (c) of the same article, the crimes against humanity are listed as: "murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population . . . or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds".¹

14. It is appropriate at this juncture to recall that the membership of the United Nations reacted indignantly in the face of the Israeli measures. Mr. Pérez Guerrero, the representative of Venezuela, stated before the General Assembly the views of his country, which epitomize the conscience of mankind, in the following words on 14 July 1967:

"It is intolerable that the attempt to annex the part of a city held in veneration by three major world religions should be consummated by the refusal of the Government of Israel to implement the General Assembly resolution. There can be no possible justification for this or for any annexation brought about by force, and it is outrageous that the fact that the inhabitants of the Old City are now enjoying the social services of Israel should be advanced as an argument to justify this illegal act . . .".²

Moreover, the representative of Ethiopia, Mr. Makonnen, stated in the General Assembly on 4 July 1967:

"I would also like to make it clear beyond any doubt that my Government cannot accept any right of conquest, nor indeed any arbitrary adjustment of international territories or frontiers. In this connexion I wish to say here and now that the steps taken by the Government of Israel with regard to the Old City of Jerusalem are unacceptable to my Government."³

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 82 (1951), p. 288.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1553rd meeting, para. 97.

³ *Ibid.*, 1547th meeting, para. 39.

15. I could continue to cite from the records of the General Assembly and Security Council, which abound with similar statements by the overwhelming majority of representatives. The will of the international community on the question of Jerusalem and its status has been demonstrated in two General Assembly resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] as well as in Security Council resolution 252 (1968). The three resolutions have a common denominator. As already mentioned, they invalidate Israeli measures, reaffirm the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by war and call upon Israel to rescind and desist forthwith from changing the status of the Holy City. The resolutions were adopted by a virtually unanimous vote. Thus, it is inconceivable to entertain any of the circuitous argumentation put forward by Israel in order to procrastinate about its compliance with the decisions of this lofty body. Israel is under a clear-cut obligation to carry out the decisions on Jerusalem of the competent organs of the United Nations.

16. The members of the Council will recall that after the Israeli's perfidious attack of 5 June 1967, Israel promulgated its Law and Administration Ordinance (Amendment No. 11) Law of 27 June 1967, which was declared invalid by the General Assembly. The Assembly, moreover, at its fifth emergency special session [resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967], called upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. Ten days later, faced with insolent non-compliance by Israel, the Assembly adopted resolution 2254 (ES-V) which, *inter alia*, deplored Israel's failure to implement the earlier resolution and reiterated verbatim its earlier call on Israel. Israel's reaction to these two virtually unanimous resolutions was in the negative. Its Foreign Minister stated in the Assembly that he would not respect, comply with or implement resolutions expressing the will of the international community, and, ironically enough, he kept his promise. In 1968, due to Israeli persistence in the annexation, the question was brought before the Security Council. The Mayor of Arab Jerusalem, Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, gave abundant and irrefutable evidence before the Council [1421st meeting] of Israeli illegal practices, and on 21 May the Council adopted resolution 252 (1968) which reaffirmed the Assembly resolutions already referred to.

17. Thus, it is clear that the United Nations has from the outset refused to accept any of the flimsy Israeli argumentation to annex or change the status of Jerusalem. The Arabs of Jerusalem have consistently refused to accept Israel's attempts to annex their Holy City. They have clearly conveyed their response to the United Nations through the Secretary-General's personal representative, Mr. Ernesto A. Thalmann. On 12 September 1967, the Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly, under resolution 2254 (ES-V), that the inhabitants of Jerusalem:

"... were opposed to civil incorporation into the Israeli State system. They regarded that as a violation of the acknowledged rule of international law which prohibited an occupying Power from changing the legal and administrative structure in the occupied territory and at the same time demanded respect for private property and personal rights and freedoms.

"It was repeatedly emphasized that the population of East Jerusalem was given no opportunity to state for itself whether it was willing to live in the Israeli State community."⁴

18. At this very moment, a competent committee is discussing how to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [see General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960]. The balance-sheet of the United Nations is, nevertheless, still marred by the continuation of *apartheid* practices in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, as well as by the continuation of Portuguese colonialism in Africa. It is our firm belief that the Security Council will not wish to tarnish the anniversary of this Declaration by tolerating another colonial situation in the Middle East.

19. The status of Jerusalem should be determined within the framework of certain fundamental legal norms. Israel occupied Jerusalem in June 1967 by force. It is thus imperative to apply the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, to which Israel is a party; article 53 of that Convention stipulates that:

"Any destruction by the Occupying Power of real or personal property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or to the State, or to other public authorities, or to social or co-operative organizations, is prohibited..."⁵

Israel has adamantly refused to heed United Nations resolutions and has persisted in its destruction of Arab homes and disposal of Arab property, despite its clear-cut obligations under the article just quoted. It is also relevant to quote here article 54 of the same Convention which states that:

"The Occupying Power may not alter the status of public officials or judges in the occupied territories, or in any way apply sanctions to or take any measures of coercion or discrimination against them, should they abstain from fulfilling their functions for reasons of conscience."⁵

20. It might be redundant for me to remind the members of the Council that Israel has throughout the past two years perpetrated all the violations which are strictly prohibited under the aforementioned Convention. The Security Council has been promptly apprised of all such serious violations. The world press has also fully reported their occurrence. The cruel and inhuman treatment to which the Arab people in Jerusalem and the other occupied Arab territories have been subjected at the hands of the Israeli oppressors is a cynical reminder of the atrocities committed by the Nazis in the occupied European territories during the Second World War. Those crimes have been condemned by all and are still bitterly remembered long after the downfall of the

⁴ A/6793. For the printed text of this document, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1967*, document S/8146, paras. 131 and 132.

⁵ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, No. 75 (1950), No. 973.

Nazi oppressors. The Israeli oppressors, who have learned and are applying these repellent acts of persecution, should also learn the lesson of history that their crimes will, for a long time, be strongly condemned and bitterly remembered.

21. The Israeli representative, in his desperate attempt to divert the attention of the Council from the item on the agenda, has referred to what he called warfare and acts of aggression against Israel openly pursued by Arab States. Such deceitful statements by the representative of Israel reveal once more how an aggressor still occupying other people's territories attempts to mislead world public opinion. In this respect, it might be useful to shed more light on the situation in the Middle East at present. I do not intend to take much of the Council's time, but may I be allowed to state in a few words the following facts? First, we have declared time and again that we accept Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which the Council adopted unanimously for a peaceful settlement. Secondly, we have made clear our readiness to implement all the provisions of that resolution. Thirdly, Israel has refused to accept or implement the resolution, and its repressive actions and expansionist designs in the occupied Arab territories clearly manifest its utter disregard for the Council's decision. Fourthly, we have co-operated fully with Mr. Gunnar V. Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and we have replied positively to his questionnaire, while Israel, for its part, cannot claim any positive co-operation. The least that could be said about its attitude is that it is completely negative. Fifthly, we did not object to the talks between the four permanent members of the Security Council, in the hope that their assistance in the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) would be conducive to the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East.

22. Israel, on the other hand, as is well known, is rejecting all methods which might assist in the implementation of that resolution. For the past two years the attention of the Security Council has focused on the Palestine question. Time and again we have expressed the gravity of the deteriorating situation in our part of the world. We have pointed out that the continuation of Israeli occupation of Arab territories portends evil for international peace and security. Time and again we have conveyed to this important body the legitimate rights of the Arab people and their resolve to regain their lost lands. The time has come for the Council to move from the stage of passing resolutions of condemnation and injunction, which Israel disregards, to the stage of measures and actions to enforce its decisions. My delegation fully supports the measures suggested by the representative of Jordan, Mr. El-Farra, in his statement at the previous meeting of the Council.

23. To conclude, I should like to stress again that Jerusalem is as dear to us as any city in my country. These same feelings of affection and attachment bind every Arab to that sacred city. For the sake of peace, based on justice, let this Council pronounce itself clearly and firmly against usurpations and all related Israeli measures. Only by such a firm position will the Council be able to discharge its responsibility and forestall unnecessary strife which, however long and fearful it may become, cannot change the ultimate fate of the city, which will remain Arab.

24. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before calling on the next speaker, I wish to inform the Council that I have just received a request [S/9300] from the representative of Lebanon who wishes to participate in the Security Council's discussion. If I hear no objections, I shall invite him to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote. I shall first invite him to take a place at the side of the Council Chamber, and when the time comes for him to speak he will take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

25. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, may I first of all congratulate both the retiring President and you, Sir, who now succeed him. The English historian Macaulay once said of Ministerial office that it is "a laborious, invidious, closely-watched slavery which is mocked with the name of power". The same might be said of the high office of President of the Security Council.

26. I congratulate the Ambassador of Paraguay on so successfully completing his period of "closely-watched slavery" and doing so with such good sense and such good humour. At the same time I congratulate the Ambassador of Senegal on his arrival today at such an exacting elevation. I have little comfort to offer him except to report to him that my careful enquiries indicate that there are several highly placed representatives who hope that July will be a month devoted more to bilateral than international diplomacy. May I add very respectfully that the Ambassadors of Paraguay and Senegal, so different in themselves and so different in the countries they represent, are both amongst the most respected and best-loved Ambassadors at the United Nations.

27. I wish to speak shortly, but I hope very plainly. I can speak shortly, for what I need to do is to reaffirm the position of my Government, the position which my Government has taken all along. Since June 1967 the position of my Government on the question of Jerusalem has been absolutely clear. I will repeat the words used in the General Assembly by my Foreign Secretary on 21 June 1967:

"Article 2 of the Charter provides that

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State . . .".

"Here the words 'territorial integrity' have a direct bearing on the question of withdrawal, on which much has been said in previous speeches. I see no two ways about this; and I can state our position very clearly. In my view, it follows from the words in the Charter that war should not lead to territorial aggrandizement."

I continue with the words of my Foreign Secretary speaking in the General Assembly just over two years ago:

"Reports suggest that one particular point may be of special urgency. This concerns Jerusalem. I call upon the

State of Israel not to take any steps in relation to Jerusalem which would conflict with this principle. I say very solemnly to the Government of Israel that, if they purport to annex the Old City or legislate for its annexation, they will be taking a step which will isolate them not only from world opinion but will also lose them the support that they have.”⁶

We have spoken and voted throughout in support of the principle that no unilateral action should or can change the status of Jerusalem. We reaffirm that position.

28. It is mainly to confirm the position of my Government that I speak today, but I wish also to say something about the violence of which we hear daily from the Middle East—violence which serves no purpose except to increase suffering and to add to hate.

29. I wish also to say something about the place of Jerusalem in the wider negotiation and in the final settlement, and then I wish to refer shortly to the obligations of the members of this Council and our hopes for advance to a settlement.

30. It is sad that we cannot speak about Jerusalem without also speaking of violence. Whatever we think about the future of Jerusalem and whatever we think about violence I wonder if we could not all agree that violence is specially offensive and contemptible in the Holy City. More than that, we surely should all abhor violence which kills and maims innocent people. Such violence is indiscriminate. It kills and wounds old and young, women and children, irrespective of nationality.

31. I would certainly include in the spiral of violence the blowing up of houses, and the expulsion of innocent people from their homes. We include reprisals generally and particularly the use of napalm. What good can this do? We are entitled to ask that question, both from those who initiate violence and those who escalate violence, from all those who trade in hate.

32. I have heard it said that some believe that violence will encourage the four-Power talks. Others apparently believe that violence will discourage the talks. The two are equally wrong. Every act which brings human suffering and every violent act against innocent people is an act directed not against talks or no talks, but against justice and against peace, a just peace for everyone. These are acts directed against the true interests of the people of both sides. Is it too much to hope that there are still people on both sides who see that justice does not come from violence and peace does not come from hate?

33. I turn for a moment to consider what place Jerusalem has in the wider context of negotiations for peace in the Middle East. To prejudice the future of Jerusalem would be to deny the hope, the possibility, of any peaceful settlement at all. It would be to declare against any settlement. It would bar the door to peace. It would be to make another conflict inevitable. Let me put it the other way round, for I

like to be positive. It is essential, so I believe, for the Council to require that nothing should or can be done by unilateral action to prejudice the future of Jerusalem. That is essential in order to hold open the door to a just settlement, to keep alive the hope of a permanent peace.

34. I go on to say that when we insist that the future of Jerusalem must be kept open, and when we say that it must be discussed and decided as part of a final settlement ensuring a permanent peace, we mean that it must be settled with respect to the rights of all, including both sides and all the religious denominations which look to Jerusalem as the Holy City. We do not wish to attempt any final answer now to the question of how that can be achieved. All we say now is that no permanent obstacles should be put in the way of free negotiation, no permanent barriers should now be erected to prevent eventual agreement, no permanent divisions should now be created which cannot be later bridged, no permanent wall should be erected now to bar the way to peace.

35. Let me now say something else about the function and the duty of the Council. I have heard it said that the problem of the Middle East can be settled only by the peoples of the countries immediately concerned, and that all the rest of us should mind our own business. No one is likely to dispute the vital concern of the countries of the Middle East. Their commitment and their agony and their sacrifice and their need for peace are not in any doubt. Their need to live together in peace is paramount; it is desperate. Nor do I doubt the need for them to negotiate about their future, to negotiate without malice and without duress. But to tell the rest of the world that it has no legitimate interest in peace in the Middle East would be extraordinary. Every country here represented has a legitimate interest. Even if we had no legitimate interest in peace we would certainly very soon find that we had an immediate interest in another war.

36. Above all, the Council has a legitimate interest in a permanent peace. To suggest otherwise would be to deny the whole conception of international responsibility for peace and security. My country will certainly not be denied the right to continue to search for and to work for a permanent and just peace. Agreement by outside Powers without the agreement of the countries and the peoples directly concerned would not secure a permanent peace. But if there were no agreement in the rest of the world, if past divisions persisted, if the Middle East were to be again a fishing-ground for anyone liking to fish in troubled waters, there would be little or no hope. Worse still, if the Middle East were to become the centre and the prize of international rivalry and international ambition, as some would say it has been for long past, if there were no assurance of international acceptance of the settlement and commitment to it, then also there would be little or no prospect of maintaining a permanent peace.

37. To be permanent, the peace must be just. To be permanent, it cannot be imposed or dictated. It must be just and seen to be just and internationally accepted as just. No one has a monopoly of interest in peace. We all want it. We all need it. We can all make a contribution to getting it. My country, in any event, does not propose to spare any

⁶ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 1529th meeting, paras. 15 and 16.*

effort to find it and to secure it. We are not to be told that we should not search for and work for a peace which is just and lasting. What is more, the Council is not to be told by anyone that its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is diminished or deferred.

38. What is needed is not less international effort, but much greater international effort and much more urgent international effort in the search for agreement. It is only on the firm ground of agreement—agreement in the Middle East and agreement in the wider world—that peace can be soundly built. We believe that everything else must be subordinated to the need to facilitate and accelerate a just, over-all settlement. I am not likely to underestimate the difficulties. They have been formidable. So they are now. But I believe that the news we get daily from the Middle East provides the best argument for increasing and speeding our efforts to find the settlement so desperately needed—desperately needed if only to escape from the vicious circle of violence and the dead-end of suffering.

39. Jerusalem is the heart of the whole problem. All we ask is that the just and complete settlement we seek should not be ruled out in advance, should not be rendered impossible, by any act designed to prejudice the future status of the city. We hope that this debate will contribute to that purpose, and we trust that the debate will in no way add to the difficulties of the search for agreement on which we are engaged. That search is our constant aim and our overriding obligation.

40. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he has spoken about me. Like him, and for a number of reasons—if only that I may be released from the enslaving bonds of the Presidency—I sincerely hope that the rest of the month of July may be devoted to bilateral diplomacy.

41. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Allow me, Mr. President, to follow in your footsteps and add my thanks to those which you addressed to your predecessor, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay, who presided last month over the debates of the Security Council in what I would term a masterly fashion. I use this term in its fullest sense. I mean that Ambassador Solano López was, and should be, an example for us to follow. If I were asked what a President of the Security Council ought to be, I would say: "Look at what Ambassador Solano López was during the past month; that is exactly what a President ought to be".

42. Our regrets at seeing him give up the Presidency are mitigated by our satisfaction at seeing you assume this office. The time you have already spent at the United Nations has enabled us to appreciate in you qualities which we like and admire: the great experience of the United Nations which you have rapidly acquired, great discernment, qualities of good sense, moderation, and a sense of justice, which lead all of us around this table to have full confidence in you. And it is with pleasure that we have seen you take over the direction of our work today.

43. The situation in Jerusalem, which the Jordanian Government has invoked as grounds for requesting this urgent meeting, has already been the subject of many debates in this Council. A number of resolutions have been adopted on this question. Without going back very far, I shall confine myself to recalling resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, which constitutes the legal basis for the complaint before us today; this resolution, in paragraph 2, states that: "all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid," and, in paragraph 3, "urgently calls upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action" of this kind.

44. On 8 February 1969, the Amman Government requested a meeting of the Security Council on the same question. Referring on that occasion also to resolution 252 (1968), it stated in its request that the Israeli authorities had never relented in their disregard of this clear warning and of the Assembly resolutions on the subject. It also stressed the fact that the most recent Israeli measure was "the enactment of legislation designed to destroy the character of the city and incorporate the Arab life and institutions into Israeli life". [S/8998]

45. It is, in fact, public knowledge that, since June 1967, various measures affecting persons and property have been taken in the occupied territories, and particularly in Jerusalem. These measures have been the subject of numerous protests addressed to the Council and to the General Assembly by the Jordanian Government. In February, when France was presiding over the Council's work, a meeting of the Council was postponed [*see S/9000*] after the Israeli Government had decided to postpone for three months—that is, until 23 May 1969—the entry into force of the legislative provisions of which the text was annexed to the report of 11 April [S/9149] of the Secretary-General. Some time later, information which was unfortunately not confirmed gave grounds for hoping that the postponement might be extended for an additional period of six months.

46. The Jordanian complaint of 26 June 1969 [S/9284], which appears to be a continuation of the previous one, also denounces the Israeli Government's defiance of the provisions of resolution 252 (1968). It states that on 27 April "further provisions and new regulations were enacted". It mentions "arbitrary arrests, detention, torture, demolition of houses and deportation" which it accuses the Israeli authorities of having committed. It affirms that the Tel Aviv Government has "plans for the establishment of Israeli settlements in the city and re-peopling of its inhabitants".

47. An exact assessment of the violations of the provisions of resolution 252 (1968) is hampered by the difficulty of obtaining specific information from Israel regarding its intentions, and even regarding the purport of the legislative provisions involved.

48. At its fifth emergency special session, which was prompted by the events of June 1967, the General Assembly was informed of the measures taken by Israel on

29 June to "unify" Jerusalem. In its resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967, it expressed its deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of those measures. It considered them as invalid; it called upon Israel to rescind them and to desist from taking any action which would alter the status of the city. In a second resolution, 2254 (ES-V) of 14 July 1967, the Assembly took note "with the deepest regret and concern of the non-compliance by Israel with resolution 2253 (ES-V)" and reiterated the call it has addressed to that country in its previous resolution.

49. France voted for these resolutions, as it did in the following year for Security Council resolution 252 (1968). The French delegation explained its vote then as follows:

"In our view there is no legal basis for such measures and they are likely to have the most serious consequences. They can only stir up ill-will, increase tension and complicate a problem which should be solved by peaceful means." [1417th meeting, para. 50]

50. France, which spared no effort to prevent the conflict of June 1967, has since opposed with conviction and determination anything more that could complicate the tragic situation created by the conflict, or perpetuate and intensify tension in the Middle East, or lead to increasing bitterness and hostility between the parties which would make it even more difficult to establish between them the real peace which my country so whole-heartedly desires.

51. It seems incontestable that all the legislative or other measures taken by the Israeli authorities with a view to facilitating and accelerating by virtue of a *de facto* occupation—the process of integration of part of Jerusalem—are contrary to all the resolutions of the United Nations. Some of these measures are also contrary to the rules of international law governing armed occupation, and to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

52. The Israeli authorities have indeed repeatedly given assurances that they would take all necessary measures to protect the Holy Places and ensure free access for all to places of worship. But the problem is a political, religious and legal one and not only an administrative and social one. Obviously, the future of Jerusalem cannot be decided unilaterally. However, that is what we are now witnessing, in a political context in which one might have hoped for other results.

53. It is to be deeply regretted that, at a time when serious efforts are being made to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis, steps should be taken to alter the existing state of affairs and further complicate the task of the negotiators. Everyone is aware that Jerusalem, the Holy City of three religions, will constitute one of the most delicate points of any settlement. It is therefore all the more important that the Government at present exercising authority over the city should refrain from any action which might have irreversible consequences and jeopardize the results of current talks.

54. My delegation, which cannot remain indifferent to the fears expressed by the Jordanian Government, hopes that

Israel will consent to discontinue forthwith the measures which have been condemned and to safeguard the character of a city whose future status should in no way be prejudiced. Therefore we wish to express the hope that the Council will again pronounce itself, in the clearest possible way, in favour of compliance with its previous resolutions aimed at maintenance of the *status quo* in this divided city which represents for all of us one of the highest seats of culture, thought and civilization.

55. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I wish to thank the Ambassador of France for the flattering words he has addressed to me. I will simply say that, if I have very rapidly acquired experience in United Nations matters, I owe it largely to you, M. Bérard, and I have always had the most frank and complete co-operation with you.

56. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): First of all, Mr. President, I am happy to welcome you to the Presidency of the Security Council, and I take this occasion to express our satisfaction at the good relations constantly existing between our countries. We are convinced that your experience and your devotion to the principles of peace and the United Nations Charter will have a beneficial influence on the work of the Council.

57. I also take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the distinguished representative of Paraguay, Ambassador Solano López, for his efforts and the skill he displayed in the office of President of the Security Council.

58. The Security Council is again obliged to consider the question of the situation in Jerusalem in connexion with the continuing arbitrary action of the Israeli authorities in that city and the illegal attempts of Israel to annex the Arab part of it. The question of Jerusalem reflects the essence of that dangerous situation created in the Middle East by Israel's aggression against the Arab States in June 1967, and by Israel's subsequent policy aimed at the seizure of Arab territories and the undermining of efforts to achieve a peaceful political settlement.

59. In this connexion we should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the assessment of the situation in the Middle East presented in the basic document of the International Congress of Communist and Workers' Parties which was recently held in Moscow. This document, which reflects the will of the peoples fighting for peace and progress, states *inter alia* that:

"The ruling forces of Israel, supported by world reaction including Zionist circles, are disregarding the demands of the Arab States and the peace-loving peoples, are ignoring the decisions of the United Nations calling for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, continuing to pursue a policy of expansion and annexation and are constantly committing new acts of military provocation."

The document further states:

"The Arab peoples are continuing their determined struggle in deference of freedom, independence and

national progress, for the restoration of all the occupied territories, and recognition of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. The resistance movement against the occupation is spreading, taking various forms, and receiving increasing support. On the side of these peoples are the Soviet Union, the other socialist States, the international communist movement, and the solidarity of the national liberation forces in an increasingly wide section of the public in the capitalist countries.”

60. At present the Security Council is considering only one aspect of the general question of the situation in the Middle East: the situation in Jerusalem. The fate of this city after Israel's attack in June 1967 became a matter of immediate concern to the United Nations and the world public, since Israel advanced its claims to all of Jerusalem including the Arab part of it, immediately following its seizure by Israeli armed forces.

61. Since June 1967, the Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly considered the question of Jerusalem and have unequivocally expressed their firm opposition to Israel's annexationist actions. They have termed these actions illegal. In the decisions of the General Assembly on this matter, based on the authority of the 100 States which in July 1967 voted for resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) and reflecting the conscience of the entire world community of States, it was stated that the measures taken by Israel to change the status of this city “are invalid”; and Israel was called upon “to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem”. However, subsequent events have shown that the Government of Israel has remained deaf to this appeal of the General Assembly and has defiantly continued to pursue its annexationist policy with regard to Jerusalem.

62. The Security Council, after having considered, in April and May 1968, the question of the situation in Jerusalem, confirmed the above-mentioned resolutions of the General Assembly and noted that “Israel has taken further measures and actions in contravention of those resolutions” [*resolution 252 (1968)*]. That having been said, the Council also declared, in its resolution 252 (1968), that all legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel were invalid and urgently called upon Israel to rescind them and to desist from taking any action which tended to change the status of Jerusalem. However, the actions of the Israeli authorities in Jerusalem, which have been described in detail here yesterday and today by the distinguished representatives of Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia, show that the Government of Israel is obstinately ignoring these demands of the Security Council as well.

63. The statements by the Israeli leaders, calling for the so-called unification of Jerusalem through annexation of the Arab part of that city by Israel, are well known. These statements, which have never been denied by the Government of Israel or its official representatives, are directly contrary to the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. But the matter is not confined to mere statements. The Israeli occupation forces are, in fact, carrying out a programme of measures in Jerusalem aimed

at changing the Arab character of the Old City; they are forcefully expelling the Arab inhabitants from it, they are destroying the Arab residential quarters and public buildings, they are establishing Israeli settlements in the Arab part of the city in order to change the national composition of its inhabitants, they are trying to extend to Jerusalem the application of Israeli laws and to subordinate its economy to the needs of Israel's economy. All these actions of Israel are illegal and constitute criminal arbitrary conduct by the occupation authorities.

64. The example of Jerusalem is highly typical of the way the Israeli occupiers act. Disregarding the decisions of the United Nations, flouting international law, and paying no attention whatever to the demands of public opinion, they are trying to expel the Arab population from lands that have belonged to it for centuries, and to seize those lands for further Israeli expansion. If anybody still needs confirmation of Israel's expansionist policy towards the neighbouring Arab States, of its aggressive policy against the sovereignty and integrity of Arab countries, such confirmation will be found particularly in Israel's actions with regard to Jerusalem. Having seized foreign territory by armed aggression, the Israeli leaders now loudly proclaim that they are prepared to give the Arabs and other peoples the possibility of access to the historical and religious monuments and Holy Places in this city, assuming that, by doing so, they will be able to compel the world to reconcile itself to the fait accompli of their aggression.

65. This was the very theme developed by the representative of Israel in his speech in the Security Council yesterday, in which he carefully evaded the substance of the item on the agenda of the Council—namely, the question of Israel's violation of the Council's decisions on the question of Jerusalem. Instead, the Israeli representative again propounded a colonialist and predatory philosophy, implying that prosperity and civilization had been brought to the Arab land of Jerusalem on the bayonets of the Israeli occupiers. He did not conceal the fact that Israel not only has no intention of complying with the demands of the Security Council concerning the city of Jerusalem, but is not even intending either to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab part of the city of Jerusalem in order to put an end to illegality and arbitrary rule. This alone shows the need for a serious warning and severe condemnation of Israel by the Security Council.

66. The annexationist plans of Israel with regard to Jerusalem have been condemned and rejected by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations and by world opinion, including representatives of various religions. If Israel is hoping that the peoples of the world will yield to the cynical claims of the aggressors and their attempt to dictate their terms, it is profoundly mistaken. The designs of the Israeli extremists are not destined to succeed. The Israeli leaders should seriously ponder the dangerous consequences of such a policy for the State of Israel itself.

67. With each new provocation, with every month of delay in the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict and in the withdrawal of Israel's forces from all Arab territories, the position of the Israeli

invaders—in the eyes of world public opinion and in view of the growing opposition of the Arab peoples to the illegal occupation—is becoming increasingly complicated.

68. The situation in Jerusalem again confirms the need for the speediest possible elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and the restoration of peace in the Middle East. In order to arrive at a peaceful settlement in this area, it is essential that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 is complied with in all its parts and provisions; it is essential that Israel withdraws its armed forces from all the Arab territories it has occupied as a result of the aggression of 5 June 1967, including the Arab part of the city of Jerusalem. This is the firm position of the Soviet Union on the question of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East.

69. The Soviet Union fully supports the just struggle of the Arab States. The Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev, declared at the International Congress of Communist and Workers' Parties that:

“The Soviet Union is giving and will continue to give every kind of assistance to the Arab States which are victims of aggression. We strongly advocate full implementation of the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, which opens the way for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.”

70. We consider that the Security Council must draw conclusions from the fact that Israel has failed to comply with its decisions on the question of Jerusalem, and with the resolutions of the General Assembly on this question. The Security Council, discharging its duty in conformity with the United Nations Charter, must take the necessary measures to ensure implementation of its decisions and must resolutely condemn Israel for its illegal actions in Jerusalem. The Council must call upon Israel to cease forthwith its attempts to Israelize occupied Arab Jerusalem.

71. Yesterday, the representative of Jordan, Mr. El-Farra, set forth in his statement some considerations regarding the actions the Security Council should take. The Soviet delegation supports those well-founded and just demands by Jordan. That is exactly the way the Security Council should act.

72. In this connexion, we were somewhat surprised that the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, today raised the question of so-called acts of violence in connexion with the consideration of the question of Jerusalem—or, to be more accurate, the question of Israel's disregard for the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. The Soviet delegation considers it is its duty to draw attention to the fact that we are now talking about the unlawful acts being committed by Israel in Jerusalem, which are entirely unjustified and which are contrary to the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations. It is specifically this, and nothing else whatever, which should be the subject of consideration by the Security Council. The Council must not be diverted from this problem which has been raised by the representative of Jordan.

73. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I wish to thank the representative of the Soviet Union and to stress that, as he has just said, Senegal was one of the first countries of French-speaking Africa south of the Sahara to maintain, since its independence, diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. We hope these relations will develop harmoniously in the obvious interest of the Soviet and Senegalese peoples.

74. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Before referring to the item on our agenda, my delegation wishes to associate itself with you, Mr. President, and with the delegations preceding us in congratulating Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay on the way he presided over our work last month, when a problem of critical importance to Africa was debated.

75. As far as you yourself are concerned, Mr. President, you can readily imagine how happy the Algerian delegation is to see you presiding over our work this month. This feeling is justified by the fraternal ties which unite our two countries in a single destiny—that of Africa. We are convinced that your human qualities, and your talents as a lawyer and diplomat are proof of the greatness of Africa, a greatness which rests not on military or economic power, but on generosity of feeling and a deep sense of justice and dignity. We are convinced that under your guidance our work will have a happy conclusion.

76. A year has already elapsed since the Security Council adopted its resolution 252 (1968) on Jerusalem. That resolution, needless to say, followed upon two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] immediately after the Israeli aggression of June 1967 against the Arab countries. By promptly and almost unanimously adopting those resolutions, the international community intended to show the occupier the particular importance it attached to the fate of the Holy City.

77. In fact, however, defying the wishes of the hundreds of millions of human beings for whom Jerusalem is the symbol of faith, on 8 June 1967 the Zionists began taking preliminary measures to absorb the Old City. A week later the Cabinet of the invading power was asked to consider new laws for its annexation. Since that time we have been witnessing the implementation of this plan, in flagrant violation of all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the one hand, and despite the opposition of the population of Jerusalem on the other hand.

78. Resolution 252 (1968) of the Security Council, adopted on 21 May 1968, states that: “all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status”, and it calls upon Israel: “to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem”.

79. To these two imperative provisions adopted by the supreme organ of the United Nations responsible for the

maintenance of international peace and security, the Tel Aviv authorities have responded first by the adoption of administrative measures imposing the occupier's legislation on the Arab population of Jerusalem; secondly, by the systematic destruction of the possessions and property of the Arab population; and, thirdly, by intimidation, torture and daily expulsions aimed at the total disintegration of the Holy City.

80. The inhabitants of dozens of buildings have also been expelled from their homes. Even schools have not been spared. For example, a hundred-year-old Moslem institution, the Tankaziye, was evacuated at the order of the occupation authorities. This led to a protest from the Supreme Moslem Council, which has just issued an appeal to the municipalities and the Chambers of Commerce of the occupied territories, calling on them to draw the attention of world public opinion to the barbarous acts perpetrated by the Zionists against the population.

81. Furthermore, in his statement yesterday, the representative of the Zionist authorities praised the results of the measures taken in response to the decisions of the Security Council, and drew a complete picture of the alleged benefits of Zionist colonization. According to him this colonization has brought the benefits of modern civilization, art, town planning, and even trade union rights to the people of the region.

82. The arguments used yesterday to justify the annexation and occupation of the Arab territories by brute force can only be likened to those of the advocates of *apartheid* in Rhodesia and South Africa. Have we not heard all too often that South Africa is the most prosperous country, where Africans enjoy a high standard of living never attained by the Africans of other independent States?

83. The false excuses and alibis put forward to try to justify the brutality of the occupation in no way change the true nature of the problem. The colonial venture of the Zionist movement in Palestine cannot escape the laws and methods of all colonization. This phenomenon is so well known today that the peoples who have experienced it have learned all its lessons. In 21 years the Zionists have occupied Palestinian land and that of other Arab territories as a result of three successive aggressions. With each aggression the over-all objective was the same: to possess more Arab lands and have fewer Palestinians. This, moreover, is the very essence of the Zionist doctrine.

84. The object is to destroy, to disintegrate the Palestinian people, to turn it into a mass of refugees which in the course of time will be displaced in small scattered minorities all over the world. In short, to bring about a new Diaspora.

85. The systematic destruction of dwellings, sometimes even of whole villages such as Qalqiliya, is part of the depersonalization of the people and the territory. The land of Palestine as a whole is being subjected to this sorry undertaking.

86. This objective has been clearly stated by the enemy of the peoples of Palestine and of the other Arab States; any

apparent disagreement concerns only the methods. All of them, military men and civilians alike, are unanimously in favour of creating faits accomplis and settling foreign and hostile populations in the midst of the indigenous population. This expansionist process is also intended to destroy the economic structures of the neighbouring countries of Palestine in order to keep them in a state of permanent under-development.

87. The events occurring in Jerusalem are attracting the particular attention of the international community. This is quite understandable, since we know that Jerusalem, the symbol of Arab identity, is being depersonalized and destroyed by the Zionist occupier. It is also wholly understandable when we know that Jerusalem, the city of peace and a lofty centre of spiritual life, has become the headquarters for conferences of Zionist millionaires who are financing the occupation and consolidating the faits accomplis created by the Zionists, and who are attempting, first and foremost, to impose the economic domination of international monopolies on the Arab peoples of the region. This shows how great is the determination of the Tel-Aviv authorities to maintain their occupation, with the support of the Zionist financiers, in defiance of the entire international community which has opposed the annexation of Jerusalem.

88. The Security Council must today consider the refusal of the Zionist authorities to comply with its previous decisions on the question of Jerusalem. It is that refusal which is the cause of the permanent tension which characterizes the situation in the Middle East. How can we believe that in these circumstances a just solution of the conflict in the Middle East can emerge, when the Security Council allows this decision to remain a dead letter and tolerates the fact that, in complete disregard of all resolutions, Israel has for the last two years continued to occupy the territories of Member States of the United Nations and to annex the Holy City of Jerusalem? The vacillations of international bodies—and we must stress this—encourage the aggressor to persist in his attitude.

89. With respect to the problem concerning us today, the Security Council must condemn Israel for its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly Council resolution 252 (1968); it must take specific measures within the framework of the Charter to ensure compliance with these resolutions, and to fix a deadline for the implementation of the resolutions in order to put an end to the policy of destruction, expropriation and oppression.

90. The Algerian delegation considers that it is high time for the Council to assume its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter, and to tackle the causes of the crisis which has been convulsing the Middle East for 21 years. Refusal to recognize the national rights of the Palestinian people and the continuation of the occupation of the territories of the Arab countries by the aggressive forces of Israel are the principal causes of that crisis.

91. In order to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East it is essential to restore their lawful rights to the Palestinian people, and to ensure the total withdrawal

of the aggressive forces from the occupied Arab territory. In so doing, the Council would merely be assuming its responsibilities in conformity with the principles of self-determination, the sovereignty of peoples, and the territorial integrity of States. To continue to ignore the existence of the Palestinian people, and its struggle to regain its national rights as a decisive element, is to disregard the political realities of the region and to overlook one of the indispensable factors in the search for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

92. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Algeria for the fraternal sentiments he has so kindly addressed to me. As he knows, Algeria holds a privileged place in the hearts of the Senegalese, and we shall have occasion to express our solidarity and fraternity at the next Pan-African Cultural Festival which is to be held at Algiers.

93. Mr. YOST (United States of America): Mr. President, may I first of all express my admiration and appreciation for the tact and dexterity with which your predecessor, Ambassador Solano López, conducted the difficult deliberations of this Council last month. We are all deeply grateful to him.

94. May I also welcome you, Mr. President, and express our confidence that you likewise will lead us, with your great experience and wisdom, your customary ability and authority, to constructive action. You will have our full support in so doing.

95. Once again the Council has been summoned to deal with certain actions taken by the Government of Israel in Jerusalem. We have listened carefully to the statements of the representatives of Jordan and several other Arab States, as well as to the reply of the representative of Israel.

96. The discussion thus far has made amply clear that the status of Jerusalem is not an isolated problem, but, rather, an integral part of the whole complex of issues in the current Middle Eastern conflict which must be resolved. This is not a novel conclusion. The Council clearly recognized that fact in its resolution 242 (1967), which treats the entire Middle Eastern situation as a package. That resolution remains the basis of our approach to a just and lasting peace in the area. You are all well aware of the strenuous efforts my own Government is making to help Mr. Jarring promote a peaceful settlement. Progress in those efforts has, admittedly, been slow. This is not surprising when one reflects on how deep the roots of the conflict go. But the important thing is that some progress is being made. The fact that it has not been crowned with dramatic success should not give grounds for despair. Nor should it be exploited as justification for action which will make greater progress even more difficult. This applies to actions in Jerusalem as elsewhere in the area. Indeed, Jerusalem occupies a very special place in all our minds and all our hearts as one of the holiest cities in the world. Jerusalem is a sacred shrine to three of the world's largest and oldest religious faiths: Islam, Christianity and Judaism. By virtue of that fact, the United States has always considered that Jerusalem enjoys a unique international standing and that no action should be taken there without full regard to

Jerusalem's special history and special place in the world community. Unfortunately, there have been acts of many kinds that have broken the peace in Jerusalem and that are of deep concern to my Government and to the international community.

97. We understand the deep emotional concerns which move all parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute on the subject of Jerusalem. We do not believe, however, that any of those concerns are served by what is now taking place in East Jerusalem, whether it be actions by those now exercising authority there or by individuals considering themselves aggrieved and therefore justified in resorting to violence. The expropriation or confiscation of land, the construction of housing on such land, the demolition or confiscation of buildings, including those having historic or religious significance, and the application of Israeli law to occupied portions of the city are detrimental to our common interests in the city. The United States considers that the part of Jerusalem that came under the control of Israel in the June 1967 war, like other areas occupied by Israel, is occupied territory and hence subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying Power. Among the provisions of international law which bind Israel, as they would bind any occupier, are the provisions that the occupier has no right to make changes in laws or in administration other than those which are temporarily necessitated by his security interests, and that an occupier may not confiscate or destroy private property. The pattern of behaviour authorized under the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 and international law is clear: the occupier must maintain the occupied area as intact and unaltered as possible, without interfering with the customary life of the area, and any changes must be necessitated by the immediate needs of the occupation. I regret to say that the actions of Israel in the occupied portion of Jerusalem present a different picture, one which gives rise to understandable concern that the eventual disposition of East Jerusalem may be prejudiced, and that the private rights and activities of the population are already being affected and altered.

98. My Government regrets and deplors this pattern of activity, and it has so informed the Government of Israel on numerous occasions since June 1967. We have consistently refused to recognize those measures as having anything but a provisional character and do not accept them as affecting the ultimate status of Jerusalem.

99. I have explained in some detail the opposition of the United States to certain measures taken by the Government of Israel in Jerusalem, since this is the precise object of the complaint brought before us by the Government of Jordan. But, as I suggested earlier, we cannot logically and intelligently consider the problem of Jerusalem without putting it in its proper perspective—the Middle East situation as a whole. In this connexion I would recall that one of the first major policy decisions taken by President Nixon after assuming office this year was that the United States Government should take new initiatives in helping to try to bring peace to the Middle East. For the past several months we have been devoting our best efforts to this task. We shall continue to do so, but for these efforts to succeed we shall require the goodwill and co-operation of the

parties themselves. A just and lasting peace in the Middle East is long and tragically overdue. It will not be found through terror bombings, which inevitably harm innocent civilians, any more than it will through unilateral attempts to alter the status of Jerusalem. It will be found only through the instruments and processes of negotiation, accommodation and agreement. It will come only through the exercise by the parties of the utmost restraint—not just along the cease-fire lines or in public statements, but also on the ground, in Jerusalem itself.

100. In treating the problem of Jerusalem, since we view it in the context of the total situation in the Middle East, my delegation will subject any proposal for Council action first of all to the test of whether that proposal is likely to help or to hinder the peaceful settlement process. I hope all members will do likewise. For example, one constructive move the Council might make would be to request the parties to lay aside their recriminations, to desist from any action, in Jerusalem or elsewhere, that might be construed as prejudicing or prejudging a final, comprehensive settlement, a just and lasting peace. Thus, our consideration of the situation in Jerusalem could provide a fitting occasion on which to insist once more that the parties to a dispute which keeps the world's holiest city in turmoil act responsibly to resolve the whole dispute; and until it is resolved, that they take no action anywhere which could further jeopardize its resolution. ↘

101. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of the United States for the all too generous words of praise he has addressed to me. As you know, long before acquiring independence, my country maintained consular relations with the United States, with what I might call, if you will forgive me, the benevolent complicity of France. Since its independence, my country has been maintaining close relations with the United States, and it is our hope that these relations may continue to develop felicitously.

102. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, who wishes to exercise his right of reply; I now call on him.

103. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to extend to you, Mr. President, my delegation's profound respect and best wishes in your exalted office; may I also join in the expression of appreciation to the Ambassador of Paraguay for the sagacity and tact with which he guided the Council's deliberations last month.

104. I feel that certain comments in the course of today's meeting on talks between permanent members of the Security Council on the situation in the Middle East make it necessary and appropriate for me to bring before the Council the following excerpt from a statement made in the *Knesset* yesterday by Israel's Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir:

"There are those who complain of Israel's intransigence and quote as an example our attitude to the Big Four talks. It would be a fatal error to try to explain Israel's stand in psychological terms such as stubbornness, suspicion and the like, whilst disregarding our balanced

attitude, both in principle and in practice. In principle, we do not hold with a situation whereby Powers arrogate to themselves the right to discuss the destinies of nations and countries without the participation of those concerned and in lieu of the immediate colloquy between the nations themselves. From the political and practical point of view, we cannot but react negatively to the discussions of Powers concerning our destiny while we are fully aware that one of them is engaged in a trend hostile to us, as the outspoken representative of the Arab States, the rationale of the discussions being that the representatives of the other countries should try to reach a compromise with this Power."

105. At the 1481st meeting of the Security Council, on 24 June 1969, the representative of the USSR, Mr. Malik, declared: "Experience of life shows that malice and slander have always been and continue to be signs of falsehood and impotence" [*1481st meeting, para. 124*]. It is regrettable that the Soviet representative who today occupies Mr. Malik's seat has not followed that opinion. What is it, I should like to ask in plain language, that the Soviet Union really wants? After all, it has never recognized Jordan's occupation of part of Jerusalem. On the contrary, the representative of the USSR, at the 197th meeting of the Security Council, on 20 May 1948, stated that:

"... none of the States whose troops have entered Palestine can claim that Palestine forms part of its territory. It is an altogether separate territory without any relationship to the territories of the States which have sent their troops into Palestine."⁷

106. What is it, then, that the Soviet Union objects to: that Israel succeeded in chasing away, in 1967, the foreign troops which the USSR declared in 1948 to be aggressors? What is it that the Soviet Union objects to in the Jerusalem of today? Is it that the average monthly salary of unskilled Arab workers in Jerusalem has risen in the last two years from \$23 to \$109? Shall I draw any comparisons between these salaries and those of engineers and doctors in certain parts of Europe? Does the Soviet Union object that there are Arabic-language newspapers in Jerusalem free to criticize the Israel authorities? Or is it the fact that Arab inhabitants enjoy complete freedom of movement and travel?

107. As the Soviet representative, as well as others, has referred today to the general situation in the Middle East and to Israel's policies in general, I should like to observe that even if this debate may serve no other useful purpose, it has again unmasked the USSR's intransigent position and destructive policy in the Middle East; and thus Israel is still being abused with accusations of aggression in 1967, two years after the USSR had failed in the United Nations, together with the Arab States, to shift responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities from itself and from the Arab States to Israel. A year and a half after the Security Council, in its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, called for the establishment of a just and lasting peace through agreement between the parties, the Soviet Union still proposes, as the

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 70, 297th meeting, p. 5.*

Soviet representative has today, political settlements, and other such make-shift arrangements. In response to the Security Council's decision and the expectant hope of the entire world that secure and recognized boundaries would at last be established between Israel and the Arab States, the Soviet Union continues, as it has again done today, to demand withdrawal to the chaos and vulnerability of the pre-June 1967 military lines.

108. Even on the question of the cease-fire, the Security Council's first step towards lasting peace, not a word is heard from the Soviet Union in this Council to the effect that it should be observed scrupulously by regular and irregular forces. On the contrary, the Soviet representative finds it appropriate even to express encouragement for the continuation of terror warfare against Israeli civilian men, women and children. The Soviet position remains, thus, as extreme as before, its attitude towards Israel as hostile as ever, its total identification with and support, military and political, for Arab belligerency and relentless warfare against Israel unchanged. Under these circumstances, to regard the Soviet Union as a partner in the search for a solution of the Middle East conflict is to expose the situation to sinister manoeuvres, destructive counsel and dangerous designs.

109. It was only yesterday that I indicated the frivolity of the Jordanian complaint. I could not have expected that this would be demonstrated so convincingly and so soon by the proponents and supporters of the complaint. Surely, had there been any genuineness in Jordan's alleged concern for the situation of the Arab community in Jerusalem, had there been any foundation for the Jordanian arguments and claims, had Jordan truly sought recognition and remedy from the Security Council for any real difficulties that might have arisen in Jerusalem, it would not have brought before this organ the advocacy of the delegations that appeared on its behalf today. It would not have looked for support to countries that stand condemned in the eyes of the Security Council, countries which by their behaviour have put themselves outside the fold and deprived themselves of the right to be heard on questions of international obligations, civilized conduct or human rights.

110. How can Egypt and Algeria speak of law and justice if they do not even attempt to conceal their repudiation of the United Nations Charter in relation to Israel? How can they invoke Security Council resolutions if they reject the call for a just and lasting peace through agreement with Israel contained in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, which remains the basis for all peace-making efforts in the area? The United Arab Republic and Algeria pursue openly warfare against Israel with regular and irregular forces. Algeria has not even gone through the motions of accepting the cease-fire but has publicly proclaimed Israel's destruction as the primary objective of its policy. What right, then, do these two countries possess to put forth views in this Council on what Israel does or does not do or to assess Israel's actions in the light of the very tenets which they have debased, defied and discarded? Since when are criminals to be allowed to masquerade as judges?

111. Egypt pretends concern about the Arab community of Jerusalem. Is it to conceal Egypt's utter lack of concern

for the fate of millions of its own citizens plunged into catastrophe by their Government's persistence in aggression? Egypt is up in arms because of the relocation of seventeen families, made necessary by measures to protect the lives of thousands who visit and worship daily at the Western Wall. Is it so that the world should forget that Egypt has made half a million of its citizens homeless and has driven them out of the towns and villages along the west bank of the Suez Canal for the sinister purpose of turning this sector into a line of incessant armed attacks in breach of the cease-fire?

112. The representative of the United Arab Republic has found it proper to criticize the demolition of two slum structures after compensation had been paid to their owners. He must surely remember how the armed forces of his own country destroyed entire villages in Yemen and used poison gas against their own Arab brethren. Has his Government, before deciding to participate in this debate, made a comparison between security measures Israeli authorities are sometimes compelled to take in defence against Arab terror warfare and the manner in which Egyptian security forces killed, last year in Alexandria, 16 demonstrating Egyptian students or the way in which the United Arab Republic used brutal force to put down the frequent demonstrations and riots in Gaza during the occupation of the area by that country?

113. Last but not least, when Mr. El Kony asked for the floor to speak of human rights, did he give any thought to the Jews of Egypt, still oppressed, still deprived of their liberties and human rights, still lingering in concentration camps? It may be that the United Arab Republic regards the Security Council as only a stage on which the wickedest of players can act the roles of saints. If this is so, however, it becomes even more important to bear in mind that Egypt's appearance before the Security Council is only a play, or rather a farce.

114. Can anyone consider seriously advice from such Governments? Can anyone suggest that Israel should learn from their ways? It is obvious, however, that Jordan has found it appropriate to accept and even request support from those States, because its complaint to the Council is nothing but another exercise in hatred and hostility towards Israel. In such an exercise the credentials of participants are of little import as long as they are able to contribute abuse and slander, and this in fact they have done today in great profusion. Of such Cato said: "We cannot control the evil tongues, but a good life enables us to despise them."

115. A few random examples will suffice to illustrate the baseness of the Arab statements we heard today and the baselessness of the allegations contained in them. The Arab representatives and some of their supporters have spoken repeatedly of Jerusalem as being Arab. Repetition of the falsehood does not turn it into truth. At the 1482nd meeting, I quoted the President of the Institute of Holy Land Studies, who on 9 December 1968 stated *inter alia*:

"It is also erroneous to say 'Jerusalem has been overwhelmingly Arab from the seventh century until the modern influx . . .'. Historically the opposite is true. The

Jewish population has been the majority in Jerusalem for many, many years; long before modern times.”

In modern times, of course, we have the census to rely on. In 1844, according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, of the total population of 15,510 there were in Jerusalem 7,190 Jews, 5,000 Moslems and 3,300 Christians. In 1876, according to the *Guide Indicateur de la Terre Sainte*, there were 12,000 Jews, 7,560 Moslems and 5,470 Christians. In 1896, when the Jewish population rose to 28,112, the Moslems numbered 8,560 and the Christians 8,748, this according to the *Calendar for Palestine of 1895-1896*. The number of Jews in Jerusalem reached 40,000 by 1905 in a total population of 60,000. The number of Moslems declined to 7,000. In 1910 there were 47,400 Jews, 9,800 Moslems and 16,400 Christians. By 1931, the Jewish inhabitants of Jerusalem numbered, according to the Government census of Palestine, 51,222. There were 19,894 Moslems and 19,335 Christians. In 1948, Jerusalem was a city of 100,000 Jews, 40,000 Moslems, 25,000 Christians; and on the eve of the June 1967 hostilities, 200,000 Jews, 54,903 Moslems and 12,646 Christians resided in Jerusalem. Today there are in the city more than 200,000 Jews, about 60,000 Arabs and 5,000 persons of other nationalities.

116. There seems to be, however, a strange tendency among our Arab cousins to bestow the title “Arab” on various parts of land and sea even if there is no foundation for it. Thus, the Gulf known universally as the Persian Gulf is claimed by the Arabs to be the Arab Gulf. Parts of certain countries in Africa and Asia are marked on Arab maps as Arab for no other reason than the Arab desire to consider them as such. And the same method seems to be applied to Jerusalem. The Arab element has undoubtedly been prominent in the city, but not predominant; and this has been the situation for centuries. Even within the walls of the Old City of Jerusalem the Arab Quarter was only one of four Quarters, the others being the Jewish, the Armenian and the Christian. There is no doubt that a good part of the Christian Quarter would protest against being regarded as Arab.

117. What is no less important, however, is the fact that Jerusalem, holy to Islam, Christianity and Judaism, and venerated as such by the Israeli authorities, has throughout its history of thousands of years served as the capital of one nation only and one nation alone: the Jewish people.

118. After the Arab conquest of Jerusalem in 635 and during the relatively brief period of Arab rule, Jerusalem remained neglected and forlorn. It became a capital again only with Israel’s rebirth; and this is the mystery and miracle of Jerusalem’s eternal link not only with the Jewish religion, but with the Jewish people.

119. Another claim which was voiced today by the Arab representatives was that the various projects and security measures have left Arab families homeless. I should like to state categorically that not a single Arab family has been asked to leave its house or apartment without receiving either alternate accommodations or compensation. It is to be observed that compensation was paid not only to tenants actually residing in a particular house, but also to

the title-holders of empty structures. The attitude of the Israeli authorities is illustrated by the example of Mr. Mahmud Mustafa al-Balbishi, the owner of a small souvenir kiosk in one of the structures recently cleared away. His annual rent for the store was 1,500 Israeli pounds. The compensation he received was 150,000 pounds; that is, the equivalent of rent for 100 years.

120. The true situation in Jerusalem today, not the one painted in a distorted manner by the Arab representatives, is characterized by simple but significant facts as, for instance, the following: the municipal budget for the Arab inhabitants—the Arab inhabitants—of the part of Jerusalem formerly occupied by Jordan was, in 1968, \$3.7 million. This is five times more than the total municipal budget under Jordanian rule, which in 1966 was \$700,000. The wages of Arab workers in East Jerusalem have risen in the last two years in terms of real constant wages—that is, allowing for changes in purchasing power—as follows: unskilled labour by 264 per cent; construction workers by 137 per cent; hotel employees by 125 per cent; municipal employees by 164 per cent.

121. The Security Council has been flooded with outcries about the clearing of slum dwellings. Has any of the Arab representatives, however, thought of mentioning the fact that, since June 1967, 91 new houses have been constructed in Jerusalem by private Arab owners, including 14 public institutions, a church, a school, a boarding-house and a youth club?

122. What could give the lie to accusations we heard at today’s meeting more effectively than the observation in the Magazine section of *The New York Times* of 11 May 1969 made by Ahmad Barham, a forty-six-year-old staff member of the Arabic daily, *Al-Anba*, published in Jerusalem? Speaking of the days under Jordanian rule, Mr. Barham says:

“Had I written then half of the things I write now against the Government—and I have a lot against the Israeli Government—I would have been thrown into jail. Being a journalist now is so much easier.”

It is understandable, of course, that Arab representatives find it difficult to accept such facts. This does not alter, however, the reality of Jerusalem’s life today. Life in the city goes on and must go on. No harassment by the Jordanian Government and its supporters, whether by acts of sabotage in the city or by political campaigns in the United Nations, can arrest it. The Jordanian and the Arab Governments must realize once and for all that violence, harassment and pressure will not weaken Israel’s determination and will not deter it from pursuing its goal of real peace and real security—for Jerusalem, for Israel as a whole, and for its inhabitants.

123. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Israel for the words he has addressed to me. The next speaker on my list is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table, and on whom I now call.

124. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I would not have taken the time of this important body had it not been for the invectives

expounded by the representative of Israel; these are the kind of invectives usually resorted to by that representative whenever he finds himself in utter despair, not able to say anything but trying to disguise himself as a lamb when he is known to be a wolf. To begin as he did, let me say that it looks as though the representative of Israel supposes that all of us are ignorant about what the press relates every day. Just to refute his last allegations, let us look at the statement that was made by his Defence Minister on 27 June 1969. From Jerusalem the following was reported:

"Defence Minister Moshe Dayan indicated today that Israel planned to retain considerable territory on the west bank of the Jordan River that she seized in the 1967 war. Speaking at a meeting of industrialists in Jerusalem, Mr. Dayan said: 'We are not talking of minor rectifications of the border, but major ones'.

"We must have great faith and confidence in ourselves and believe in the most elementary things. This is our homeland, and if I say 'homeland' I mean also Nablus and Jericho."

The report adds that:

"The reference was to two west-bank area towns taken from Jordan in the six-day war. As for the Golan heights territory captured from Syria, Mr. Dayan said that this was no longer negotiable and suggested that 'we consider it part of Israel like the Jezreel Valley or the Galilee'."

125. Such statements which abound and which have become legend by now, made by responsible Israeli speakers who are speaking irresponsibly, would indeed form a volume. But Mr. Tekoah today went again into an argument about which the least that can be said is that it is a pity that it should be repeated in the second half of the twentieth century, after the signature of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. What does his argument amount to? It amounts again, as stated by the representative of Algeria, to picturing in a very rosy manner the benefits that have accrued to the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem and of the occupied area as a result of the Israeli aggression in 1967. In other words, we are told that Israel waged the six-day war in order to build schools for the Arabs and bring in water and build houses. That is ridiculous, to say the least, and it is an insult to the intelligence of people who have to listen to such arguments.

126. However, I have here in my hand a document from Israel itself. It is a speech delivered by Archbishop Joseph Raya of Acre, Israel, on the occasion of his visit to the Israeli Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir. It is dated 13 June 1969 and reads in part as follows:

"Now, gazing at our situation as minority groups in Israel, we wish to pour from our hearts into your own, Madam Prime Minister, an anxious thought which is disturbing us.

"Having lived in America for many years, I have seen the dangers that ensue from the presence of a minority in the midst of a majority group. I have seen and experi-

enced the hatred, the division, the bitterness and resentment, that come from small incidents of neglect, from insignificant oversights, from discrimination, which result in hatred, bloodshed and disaster. The history of our Jewish people everywhere in the world is full of such lessons.

". . .

"The Arab population of Israel . . . are a people in need of a prophet, a people in pain, a people filled with fear. They have much to say and wish to be heard. I come to you today as their representative, bowed down by the weight of their problems, the outpourings of their hearts, the yearnings, deep, silent, profound yearnings, which have issued from their very depths."

In an official text handed by the same Catholic Archbishop Raya to Prime Minister Meir, he says this:

"I have, for the past four months, made daily rounds of the villages and small towns, as well as the major cities. My office in Haifa is filled every day and at every hour of the day and part of the night with delegations and individuals who come and pour out their difficulties and worries of their daily lives. Everywhere I go, and from everyone I see, I discover an attitude, a psychological situation, which disturbs me greatly and which should be of primary concern to our Government."

Then he goes on to refer in detail to the many acts of discrimination to which the Arab minority in Israel is subjected, and he says this:

"Many of the young people wish to study, but they are without hope that following the completion of their studies they will be able to find suitable employment. They are bluntly told that 'as Arabs', even capable and qualified, they are not welcome to responsible positions. The 'Arabs' are not permitted to broaden their fields of intellectual endeavours. They are limited to the humanities and social sciences. The other fields of science and electronics are closed to them. Many of the young men resent the fact that they are not allowed to pursue their interests in the scientific field, and this resentment is turning into gall and bitterness."

127. Now, in the same vein, I wish to speak about the rosy picture which the neo-colonialist, the representative of the Government of Tel Aviv, tried to paint when earlier in this meeting he talked about the rise in the wages of labourers. Now, statistics, for those who know statistics, are really a very tricky question. You can play with them any way you want and you can always prove things by them the way you want. However, the President of the Catholic Women's Guild gave an account, in April 1968, of the life of the Arabs in Jerusalem. Her name is Mrs. Giustiniani, and she said:

"Laborers have difficulty in locating work, and eight months after the war the banks of Arab Jerusalem remain closed. A Palestinian printer has only 5 per cent of the work which he had formerly and he has been forced to pay his employees out of his own savings at one half their

former rate of pay. Although Jordan collected 1967 taxes from the people of Jerusalem, Israel is exacting Israeli taxes for the same year: those who cannot pay have their property confiscated. The Israelis have also interfered with the tourist industry upon which many Arab residents of Jerusalem depend for their livelihood.

“Schools in Arab Jerusalem are experiencing economic difficulties. All non-local students from St. George’s School have been removed, and the school run by the Sisters of Zion will be closed at the end of this academic year for lack of students.”

This Italian Catholic lady goes on to say, quoting an article which appeared in the *International Herald Tribune* about the desecration of the Holy City of Jerusalem:

“The most reprehensible thing is the conspicuous display of smut on the newstands of recently occupied East Jerusalem and Bethlehem. One can hardly avoid seeing magazines, published in Israel . . . with photographs of unclad women and of far worse unprintable pornographic scenes on the covers, exhibited and sold close by Bethlehem’s Manger Square, hung up just outside Old Jerusalem’s Damascus Gate and near other historic shrines. For all their shortcomings in other matters, the previous Hashemite and British mandatory régimes strictly prohibited such obscenity in the two holy cities.”

128. In his usual manner the Israeli representative went on at great length, delving into the past and into the present, in an attempt to prove that Israel as a whole and Jerusalem in particular have always been Jewish, predominantly and only Jewish. I would be taxing the patience of the Council if I were to go into detail to disprove these fallacies and this propagandized version of history. I shall revert to this at a later meeting. But in what context should we place this argument that the Arabs possess nothing and that the Jews possess everything? Here again the best and the most eloquent and telling answer was given very recently by the Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, about whom Mr. Ben-Gurion once said when she was a member of his cabinet: “She is the only man in my cabinet.” Mrs. Meir, in an interview published first in London and later in the *Washington Post* on 16 June 1969, was asked the following question:

“Do you think the emergence of the Palestinian fighting forces, the *fedayeen*, is an important new factor in the Middle East?”

She stated in reply:

“Important, no. A new factor, yes. There was no such thing as Palestinians. When was there an independent Palestinian people with a Palestinian State? It was either southern Syria before the First World War and then it was a Palestine including Jordan. It was not as though there was a Palestinian people in Palestine considering itself as a Palestinian people and we came and threw them out and took their country away from them. They did not exist.”

That is the most eloquent answer that could be given to Mr. Tekoah’s figures and numbers and historical diatribes: the Palestinians have never existed. Yet if the learned Israeli

representative were to review the text of the British Mandate for Palestine⁸ he would find therein the following two articles: article 7, stating that the nationality of this country is the Palestinian nationality and that Jews who come to settle in Palestine may acquire that nationality, and article 5, stating that the Mandatory Power has no right to cede any part of Palestine to foreign elements. That is not a figment of the imagination; it is an international document. It is the British Mandate for Palestine. But it might be said that this is ancient history.

129. When the Mandatory Power, Great Britain, threw, so to speak, the problem of Palestine into the lap of the United Nations, it also supplied information indicating the ownership of land in Palestine as divided between Arabs and Jews; I have it with me here. With particular reference to Israel, this information⁹ submitted by the Mandatory Power proves that, in Palestine, the percentage of Jewish land ownership in the sub-district of Jerusalem was 2 per cent as compared with 84 per cent owned by the Arabs and 14 per cent by public and others. But to throw the Arabs out of Jerusalem in particular and Israel as a whole is part and parcel of the Israeli master plan to occupy Israel.

130. We know of the assassinated Count Folke Bernadotte, who was a messenger of peace. He had said in his report:

“There have been numerous reports from reliable sources of large-scale looting, pillaging and plundering, and of instances of destruction of villages without apparent military necessity. The liability of the Provisional Government of Israel to restore private property to its Arab owners and to indemnify those owners for property wantonly destroyed is clear . . .”¹⁰

For that, Count Folke Bernadotte was assassinated by Israeli Zionist assassins and terrorists.

131. However, it is not sufficiently known that, after the cessation of hostilities in 1948, and between 1948 and 1953, 160 Arab villages and towns were razed to the ground by the Israelis. I give as a reference for that a publication of the Greek Catholic Episcopate in Haifa, *Al Rabitah*, No. 12, November 1953, pages 10 to 15.

132. The Israeli representative again tried, in his routine manner, to describe the Arabs as the aggressors in the 1967 war. Here again I will give the answer to Mr. Tekoah from his own leaders. *The Times* of London on Sunday 16 July 1967 quoted Brigadier Mordecai Hod, Commander of the Israeli Air Force, who led the *Blitzkrieg* on the morning of 5 June 1967—when we were deliberating in this same Security Council—having said the following:

“Sixteen years’ planning had gone into those initial 80 minutes. We lived with the plan, we slept on the plan, we ate the plan. Constantly we perfected it.”

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11, vol. II, annex 20.*

⁹ See the Report of Sub-Committee 2 to the *Ad Hoc Committee on the Palestinian Question* dated 11 November 1947: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Ad Hoc Committee on the Palestinian Question, Summary Records, documents and annexes, document A/AC.14/32 and Add.1, appendix V.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, *Third Session, Supplement No. 11, part one, chapter V, para. 7.*

On 5 June 1967, at 0837 hours GMT, the Jerusalem Israel Domestic Service broadcast General Moshe Dayan's statement:

"We have no invasion plans. Our only target is to foil the Arab armies' aim of invading our country."

On 10 August 1967, *The Jerusalem Post* published the following summary of a statement by General Dayan, not unlike the one I quoted at the beginning of my reply. He said:

"People abroad must realize that with all the strategic importance to Israel of Sinai, the Golan heights, and the Tiran Strait, the mountain range west of the Jordan lies at the heart of Jewish history . . . If you have the Book of the Bible, and the People of the Book, then you also have the Land of the Bible—of the Judges and of the Patriarchs in Jerusalem, Hebron, Jericho and thereabouts.

"On no account will we force ourselves to leave the Hebron . . . This may not be a political program, but it is more important—it is the fulfilment of a people's ancestral dream."

133. And on the evening of Friday, 2 June 1967, the Minister of Labour, Yigal Allon, in uniform, spoke to a rally in Tel-Aviv at the end of a day in which broadcasts sought to minimize military dangers to Israel in the event of war. This was reported in *Ha-Aretz* on 4 June 1967. Mr. Allon said: "There is not the slightest doubt about the outcome of this war and each of its stages, and we are not forgetting the Jordanian and Syrian fronts either." Now, if any proof needs to be given of the premeditated, vicious and malicious aggression, these words, these statements, speak for themselves.

134. I do not wish to take any more of the Council's time or tax its patience any further, except to say that the arguments repeated time and again by the Israeli representative are, to say the least, taken from the garbage can of history and its greatest criminals.

135. Ambassador Charles Yost, towards the end of a remarkable book, entitled *The Insecurity of Nations*,¹¹ published in 1968 before he assumed his new position as Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, quoted Albert Camus as follows: "I'm going to tell you a great secret, my friend. Don't wait for the last judgment. It's taking place every day."

136. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table, and I give him the floor.

137. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, were I to extol your virtues or those of Ambassador Solano López, the previous President of the Council, I am sure it would be embarrassing, because it would be like trying to praise brothers. I will therefore not say anything other than that I am deeply grateful to you for allowing me to exercise the right of reply in order to correct certain historical distortions on the part of the gentleman sitting to my right. I see

that today he did not leave the Chamber when I began to speak.

138. Mr. Tekoah characterized the Arab participation in this debate as an exercise in hatred. He used such words as "abuse" and "slander", saying that these had been directed against his people. But what modern Europe has done to us during the last half-century is something that I cannot express in words. The wounds are very deep. After they had healed a little bit when the Mandates were terminated, what happened? What do we find? A new incursion into our midst—not merely people treading on our doorsteps, but people slaughtering the indigenous people of Palestine. And we are supposed to say nothing, in spite of all that happened. I am sure my brothers from the Middle East do not harbour any rancour, any malice or hatred, because, were they to do so, they would become sick. I am sure, too, that the Israelis will try to banish malice and hatred, for if they were not to do so they would become psychopathic.

139. What we are witnessing in Jerusalem is not only a clash between Arab nationalism and a brand of imported European colonialism masquerading under the banner of Zionism; it is also a clash between Judaism and Islam. I am sorry to say this. Such a clash is deplorable, because there is much in common between Judaism and Islam. The question, however, is not religious; the whole question is political. People come from Eastern and Central Europe, holding up the banner of a new ideology foreign to our land, and they expect the inhabitants of the area to be docile and not to react. If we sit around this table, it is to express the displeasure, the violent reaction, of the people. We, as Arabs, deplore this. After all, why should we be gratified in casting aspersions on others? Most of us, I believe, try to avoid doing so. But if you carefully read Mr. Tekoah's speeches, his eloquence in the use of insulting terms is becoming proverbial. There is an Arab proverb which says: "He struck me, but he was the first to cry." They came from outside, they struck us, and they are still weeping. This happens not only in our area. When someone wants to rationalize his conquest of a land or a country, or to rationalize some violent act in order to make it acceptable to the community—whether a national community or the world community—he says: "I have always been maltreated and I should now be excused for crying and weeping."

140. But then we come to the historical distortions. I do not know how deep Mr. Tekoah has gone into the history of that land. I derive a lot of my knowledge from Jewish sources—from Jewish scholars, not publicists. He said that in the seventh century, when the whole fertile crescent surrounding the peninsula was Arabized, Jerusalem was not Arab. But it was Semitic; it was neither Arab, so to speak, nor Jewish. It was Semitic. Who lived in that part of the world after the Romans disappeared? We had Alexander the Great before the Romans; then the Ptolemies; then the Romans; then the Byzantines. It was the indigenous people of the land. And who were those indigenous people of the land? They were a conglomeration of peoples that were semitized—they did not all have to be Semitic—just as Mr. Tekoah was semitized. The Khazars were semitized—in religion only, but not in culture. They are now studying Hebrew, since only 50 years ago or so they spoke Yiddish,

¹¹ New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1958.

which is a combination of Hebrew and German, without even a grammar. There is nothing wrong with having a weak grammar in a language. Hebrew is a basic language; Yiddish is not a basic language.

141. These are the Ashkenazim, the Khazars of Eastern and Central Europe, who, because they embraced a Semitic religion, think that they should wear the mantle of Semitism not only in the Middle East, but all over the world. Hence when anybody speaks against a Jew they say he is an anti-Semite. If anybody is an anti-Semite he is against me: I am the Semite of the Semites. It so happens that my family comes from the Arabian peninsula; but there are many Arabs who are better Semites than I and they were Arabized. The Berbers of North Africa were Arabized and actually semitized. The Sudanese, of another part of Africa, who happen to be pitch-black, are Arabs, not by force, but because they found culture in Arabism. The religion which happens to be Islam is a Semitic religion. They embraced Islam. So the Arabs do not claim that they have so-called pure Arab blood; nor do the Semites have such a claim.

142. As I have said time and again there are cultures, languages, traditions, customs, and not physiological characteristics, that determine a people. If a people were determined by biological factors, then it would be like the Samaritans, who live not far from Nablus. The Samaritans in Palestine would never marry anyone from outside; and today we find that they have liquidated themselves: there are only 150 left. There is nothing wrong in the inter-marriage of peoples.

143. And where does the Semitism of our colleague Mr. Tekoah, or of the Zionist leaders from Eastern and Central Europe, come from? They adopted the Jewish faith; and we are happy, because otherwise they would have been pagans. They were pagans in the sixth century. We are glad they adopted a monotheistic religion. But for them to claim that they are the Semites of Palestine is, I think, very grossly wrong, because their background is more European; their customs are European; their technology is European; their language is Yiddish—but mostly European. They are not racially or ethnologically Semitic, nor, for that matter, are the people of the fertile crescent purely Semitic; but they evolved a culture, a common language, which happened to be Arabic. At one time they spoke Aramaic, or Syriac; in a few enclaves in Syria they speak Aramaic or the Syriac language, the language that Christ used. Incidentally, Christ did not speak Hebrew. Perhaps that is why the Jews in those days disclaimed him. He spoke Aramaic.

144. So when Mr. Tekoah talks about the seventh century and the fact that the country was not Arab, of course it was not Arab. But it was Semitic, and those people embraced Islam and Arabism; and time and again I have told him that many of the people who had embraced Arabism and Islam no doubt were Jews. So the Zionists are fighting those who were originally Jews. But where do they come from? Again I say they come mostly from Eastern and Central Europe. And this is a European intrusion in the midst of the Middle East. It is a clash, another clash between Europe and the Middle East. Yesterday I mentioned the clash that took place between the Christianized Europeans—because most

of them were Christianized by St. Augustine, who came from the shores of Lebanon, as you know. He lived in Tunis. He went to England; and in England and in France the people were, I would not like to say heathens, but they were pagans. And then they thought that because they had become Christians they had a right to Palestine; and their hordes marched into the Holy Land to massacre the people of Palestine. But I said they were swept by the winds of history, so let us set the record straight. The Zionist movement was born in Europe, was nourished in Europe, and, from Europe, was forced into our part of the world. It is neo-colonialism. If it is not neo-colonialism, I would like to know what is neo-colonialism, as the term is used here in the United Nations.

145. Our colleague, Mr. Tekoah, recited certain statistics. He said that in 1844 there were approximately 7,000 Jews, 5,000 Moslems and 3,000 Christians in Jerusalem. But of what nationality were they? Those Jews were really Semitic Jews. They were Jews of the area. They were real Semites. They were not Europeans, Khazars. There might have been a sprinkling of them, motivated by religious sentiments, who had chosen Palestine. We know that in the nineteenth century many Jews went and lived there out of religious sentiment, but not under a political banner. I mentioned yesterday that one of the Montefiores in England in 1858, if my memory is correct, out of philanthropy established what was later known as the Jewish Quarter; but this does not make the Jews of Palestine European, those very Jews who had lived in Palestine for centuries.

146. I must also correct other distorted statements by our colleague from Israel, because I believe he has not yet understood the ethos of the people of the area. In the best tradition of Europeans, he talks of standards of living. This reminds me of the white man's burden during colonial days. Those Europeans who went to civilize Africa and Asia carried what was termed the white man's burden in doing so. Perhaps some Asians and Africans were fooled, but they went there to exploit Africa and Asia. If we go by standards of living, every country that has a better standard of living should go and encroach upon another with a lower standard of living. I thought these yardsticks had been forgotten, but they are being revived by none other than the European Zionists in our part of the world. They recite, "Those skilled workers were receiving \$23 and now they receive \$129."

147. I go back to the Crusades; the Crusaders tried to buy the people with wheat after they had stayed on for a hundred years or so. Wheat was the grain of life. In those days, people bartered things more than they bought them. It became a proverb in our part of the world: "Content yourself by eating tears and do not be tempted by the golden wheat of the Crusaders." This is what is happening today. We do not want European skills or technology to be imposed on us. We are sending our young men all over the world. Here in the United States and in Canada we have 12,000 students; they learn technology. I do not know whether so much technology is making the world happier. These students go back and develop their countries. Likewise the colonialists, when they went there, were bringing civilization; they were bringing bathtubs. He spoke

yesterday of latrines. They were bringing all those things, toilets and basins. We had baths, public baths and private baths, in our own way. We do not want those baths of theirs. He said the Jordanians and Arabs lived in filth and squalor. I would remind my colleague from Israel of a passage in the Bible that says one should not be too much attracted by the white sepulchres. They are white from outside but they are putrid inside. It is what you are inside that matters. All the perfumes of Arabia will not cleanse the stench of the soul.

148. I do not want to answer for my colleague from the Soviet Union. Mr. Tekoah tried to inject some politics, to arouse the Western world, as if all our evil comes from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is playing its own game. It is a big Power. It found an opportunity to set foot in the Middle East. I will not go into this. That is their business. Yesterday I told you who paved the way for the Soviet Union there. I watched the game at Lake Success, the game of power politics. None other than the late General Marshall, who was United States Secretary of State, advised Mr. Truman not to be hasty about the partitioning of Palestine, because, according to the experts in the Pentagon, it might open the door to trouble. The State Department experts told Mr. Truman the same thing. Look at the trouble we are having today. That is how Israel was created. If it were not embarrassing, I would show documents and letters I received in 1947 from persons whom the Zionists tried to purchase with money. There was an Ambassador from Latin America; when he returned home, his wife returned with a fur coat. I suppose that everything is fair in war, but that was before the war, even before Palestine was partitioned.

149. Our colleague has spoken here of a just and lasting peace. What kind of peace, I should like to know? An arbitrary peace, a forced peace? If it is to be just, let us heed the aspirations of the Palestinian people. He described some of my brothers here as engaging in criminal acts and he takes exception to their sitting around this table and arrogating to themselves the right to be judges. If there is anything more wounding and sarcastic and cynical than these phrases, I should like to know what could be worse.

150. He talked of demonstrations in Egypt. He forgot to mention the demonstrations these days all over the world by students. It is a symptom of the age. Taking things out of context to bolster his argument that the Zionists are the owners of the land is really puerile and childish, to say the least.

151. But I was heartened a little when he said "our Arab cousins". Well, I have always said the Jews of the area were our brothers; they were not our cousins. It is heartening to hear the Israelis now counting themselves as our cousins. But how well they treat their cousins in the Holy Land and in Jerusalem!

152. Then our colleague from Israel said there was a concentration of Jews in Jerusalem. He cited certain figures from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to prove that there were more inhabitants, according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, of the Jewish faith in Jerusalem, without taking into account their ethnic origin or their nationality

at that time. By the same token, I think New York City should be declared a Jewish city and should have a Jewish mayor. Anyway they have twenty Commissioners here, I have heard, who are Jewish. Why not? There are more Jews here in New York City, I understand, than there are in Israel. Two hundred thousand Jews emigrated to Israel, but many of them returned to America or went to other parts of the world, where there is less tension and more opportunity. If we use this yardstick, we should then declare New York City the fifty-first State of the United States. But I think people would laugh at us. The Jews themselves would not want that because they are good American citizens, prospering here. As I said at the last meeting, this is their promised land, not Jerusalem; otherwise, they would have gone to Jerusalem. How many have gone to Jerusalem from the United States? It shows you that most Jews are intelligent and know which side their bread is buttered and where they can lead a decent life, to their liking.

153. But Mr. Ben-Gurion and his successors still want them to be Israeli citizens, whether the whole world like it or not; and this is their grudge against the Soviet Union. They want the Soviet Union to give honorary citizenship to the 2.5 million Jews—Israeli honorary citizenship. Of course, the Soviet Union is not prepared to do so. If it were, it would have already issued two passports, one a Soviet passport and the other an Israeli passport. It is unacceptable that a person should have dual nationality, because nationality involves loyalty to the State where a person is born or the State which he has adopted as his homeland.

154. Then Mr. Tekoah speaks about compensation to the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem. Suppose they do not want to be compensated? Suppose they cling to their ancestral land? I want to remind him of a famous episode that took place in Egypt, an episode which he maligned today. Egypt was conquered and subsequently Arabized. The famous General 'Amr Ben Al'aas wanted to build a mosque in Egypt. Egypt was not a Moslem country, but it was subsequently Arabized and became Moslem. It so happened that a Jew owned a corner of a plot of land, and he would not sell it because he was attached to that piece of land; he was a real Semite, that Jew, just as are the Palestinians now attached to the land. So 'Amr Ben Al'aas said, "Try and compensate him." They tried to compensate him. He would not accept any price. He was really attached to the land where his ancestors had lived since the Jews had gone to Egypt during the seven-year famine in Palestine. For thousands of years his ancestors had lived there. Then 'Amr Ben Al'aas, being a military man, said: "Raze that house." And the house was razed. The Jew asked, "Who has authority over 'Amr Ben Al'aas?" They said, "The Caliph." "Where is the Caliph?" he said. They said, "The Caliph is in Mecca." And that Jew was a very tenacious Jew. He made the trip. And those were difficult times in which to travel to Mecca. He asked to be received by the Caliph. He said, "Where can I see the Caliph?" They told him the Caliph was praying in the cemetery outside the town. He went to the cemetery and he found there a Bedouin, an Arab guard. He asked him, "Where is the Caliph?" The guard replied, "I am the Caliph." He said, "You?" "Yes, I am the Caliph, a simple Bedouin. What can I do for you?"

He said, "I am a Jew." And he told him what had happened in Egypt. According to the history of that episode, there was on the ground a scapula of an animal, probably a sheep. He scribbled a few words on it and he told him to take that to the General, the conqueror of Egypt, and that he was sure justice would be rendered unto him. The 'Amr Ben Al'aas had gone to Persia. The Persians had a civilization that had gone on for centuries before, and Kisra Anisharwan—Kisro as he is called by Europeans—was the King in Persia. Of course, the Arabs came from the desert and they were enamoured by what they saw in Persia. There was a famous Palace called Al Iwan. It was a most symmetrical palace, a most beautiful palace, architecturally speaking. But a corner was rounded. And the curious Arab visitors, 'Amr Ben Al'aas and the Caliph, asked, "Why is this corner rounded?" And they replied: "Because at one time there was a house whose owner would not sell, and finally the King of Persia asked that the house should be spared and that the architects should make that corner of the palace rounded rather than encroach on somebody else's property." We go back to that scapula. That Jew from Egypt began to rue his lot and regret that he had come to Mecca only to have something scribbled on a piece of bone, not knowing what it meant. And all that 'Amr Ben Al'aas wrote; it was about what they had seen in Persia: "Is Kisra of pagan Persia to which we brought Islam more just than we are, Oh 'Amr?" And that General wept and knew that he had done wrong to that Jew. That is the Arab tradition.

155. But what do you do? You find a few houses that have been occupied for centuries by Semites who may originally have been Jews—they may have been Islamized or Arabized—and you raze them. Because you are from Europe, you go for utilitarian things. The next thing we hear you will build a Hilton or an Intercontinental hotel near the Holy Sepulchre. We prefer maintaining the antiquity of the Holy Places, the quaintness.

156. I made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1925, and that was 44 years ago. We went with the reverence we had for the Holy City. We revered every cobblestone there. We do not want asphalt roads in the Holy City. Here in the West and in America they buy wooden shacks where Washington slept, or where somebody else in Europe spent the day, and they revere them. This is a Holy Place to us, Jerusalem, a Holy City. You demolish it; you expel the people, you European Khazars, embracing Judaism, which should have instilled more fear of God in accordance with the Mosaic law, and what Isaiah said and Micah and Job said in the Bible. Your prophets are our prophets but you are Europeans. Religion did not touch your heart enough, it seems. Otherwise you Europeans would not have engaged in that carnage within 50 years, killing one another, Christians killing one another. Why should you not kill us? This religion is only a motivation for a political and economic end. You know that Western countries are increasing their taxes because of the pressures of population. Only the rich know how to use the loop-holes, but they will not be able to use the loop-holes for long, the multimillionaires here who are exploiting the people. So Palestine is a *pied-à-terre* for the exploitation of the whole of western Asia.

157. You are secular. I pity only those who are prompted in Israel by a genuine religious sentiment. But you are

secular. You are economic; you talk of statistics; you talk of technology; you talk of skyscrapers; you talk of bathtubs, you talk of all kinds of modern facilities.

158. We want to keep Jerusalem holy for all the three faiths. It is the indigenous people of Palestine who have title to Jerusalem, who have title to the whole of Palestine. These distortions cannot be left unanswered. You speak of budgets. You speak of money all the time. Remember that we do not live by bread alone.

159. Shall we go on like this in the Council, interminably, day in, day out; year in, year out? I believe the situation is getting dangerous. Islam is becoming conscious that Jerusalem is as holy to 600 million, as it is to 3 million Zionists. The mills of history grind slowly, but they grind persistently. Do not think that people like myself, now and in the future, will be happy to see human beings, regardless of their religion or ethnic origin, sacrificed for that narrow nationalism of today. We deplore the loss of every single life, those of us who are committed to the United Nations—and we are all committed to the United Nations.

160. We hear our fellow diplomats weighing every word they say, to balance it lest one might take one phrase as meaning something tangible. I do not want to mention who they are, but they open new loop-holes in their arguments here, so that people may scan what they have written and see where they can get out of the impasse in which we are today.

161. The Soviet Union is helping the Arabs because, originally, the Western countries brought this neo-colonialism in our midst. Of course, it is not doing it altogether for the beauty of Arab eyes. It is a big Power and is serving its own interests, like the other big Powers. But who will suffer? As we say in Arabic, there was a big conflict between the wind and the sea; in other words, it was a tempest. But who paid the price? The sailor in the small boat. Israel is in that small boat; we are in that small boat. If you do not watch out, it will sink, because of power politics and the conflict between big Powers. We will sink in the area, but there will still be some Semites, do not worry.

162. Sephardic Jews living in America, who came from Brazil in the sixteenth century, had left Spain in the fifteenth century, after Columbus; they had come to Recife. They are our brothers here in America. I know their families. They are Jews. But I do not think that many Ashkenazim, converted Jews from central Europe, will survive. If they do survive, the other Semites who happen to be Arabs will see to it that they will not suffer because, after all, they are human beings and in our tradition, leaving aside excesses that are spontaneous here and there, we have never maltreated anyone because of his faith. The Jews flourished amongst us.

163. You mentioned the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Go and read about Maimonides. Go and read about an Arab of the Jewish faith who was one of the most generous of men. Go and read about how the Caliph in Baghdad, when the Chief Rabbi went to the Synagogue, sent his guard of honour to accompany him. Go and read how well you were

tolerated—not you, but those of the Jewish faith—in the Ottoman Empire.

164. We are Asians, we have suffered a great deal. We have mixed with many peoples of different ethnic origins, and our traditions, our sufferings and our tribulations in that area have caused the prophets to emerge from amongst us, the prophets of the area who are the common prophets of us all. They all belong to the monotheistic faith and worship the same God. But I hope that you Europeans will learn a new lesson, that you will not continue to rationalize the exploitation of your fellowmen, whether they be in Asia or in Africa. We are your brothers no matter where we are. It does not have to do with the colour of our skin. All we ask is that the Council get out of its rut and do something besides deliberate. Of course this means that the statesmen or politicians who are behind us in our respective countries should take a more serious attitude about this matter so that peace may prevail in the end.

165. In conclusion, I must say that I for one represent a State to which Jerusalem is as important as Mecca and Medina. We know this from the pilgrims that flock into our country every year. His Majesty King Faisal, a man of few words, has said time and again that Islam will never allow things to go on as they have in Jerusalem. Islam may not be able now to do anything, but as long as Islam is alive in the hearts of 600 million people hope will never be extinguished that in the long run, even though there may be more suffering and tribulation, finally peace will indeed reign over the Holy Land of Palestine.

166. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The lack of seriousness and the ludicrous nature of Mr. Tekoah's propagandistic insinuations are so self-evident that there is no need to refute them. It is not without cause that Mr. Tekoah has become known in United Nations circles not so much as a permanent representative but as a permanent distorter of facts and truth. It was precisely him—the permanent distorter from Israel—whom Ambassador Malik had in mind in the statement from which Mr. Tekoah has quoted today. It was precisely the representative of Israel to whom Ambassador Malik was addressing himself when he explained to that representative that lies and slander have never yet brought anyone any credit.

167. Listening to Mr. Tekoah, we can only express surprise at the irresponsibility and the provocative manner with which the representative of Israel treats the Security Council, the opinion of its members and the opinion of States Members of the United Nations, and at his attitude to the solution of the problem of a settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. The statement by Mr. Tekoah, made in the form of a challenge, contains no sign of Israel's willingness to choose the path of co-operation with the Security Council and compliance with its decisions. We have not heard any statement from the Israeli representative to the effect that his Government is willing to implement the decisions of the Council on the question of Jerusalem, nor have we heard any clear statement from the Government of Israel on its willingness to effect a political settlement in the Middle East, based on the well-known resolution of the Security Council. On the contrary, all the

actions and statements by ruling circles in Israel, including the recent statement by the Prime Minister which Mr. Tekoah has quoted here today, show that the ruling circles of Israel are disregarding the Security Council resolutions calling for a peaceful settlement and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories, and are continuing to pursue a policy of expansion and annexation. What do the Israeli extremists hope to gain by obstructing a peaceful settlement in the Middle East? Time inexorably works against the aggressor. The main objective of the aggressor, the weakening of the Arab States, has not been and cannot be achieved. The voice of the representatives of the Arab States, ringing out in the Security Council yesterday and today, has again demonstrated that the Arab peoples are fully determined to continue the struggle for the complete liquidation of the consequences of Israel's aggression.

168. The Soviet Union and the other socialist States have given and will continue to give assistance to the Arab States in this struggle. The Viet-Nameese people have a wise proverb which the Israeli aggressors would do well to ponder. It says: "He who seizes the knife by the blade is bound to cut himself." It is time the Israeli leaders understood—as the whole course of events in the Middle East over the past two years has shown—that it is only by withdrawing their forces from all the occupied Arab territories, and by fully complying with the decisions of the Security Council, that peace and tranquillity can be established in that region. That is what the representative of Israel should have been thinking about, instead of engaging, here in the Security Council, in slanderous talk about the Soviet Union which strongly advocates a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, based on the Security Council decision of 22 November 1967.

169. As in the past, Mr. Tekoah has today again held forth on the claim that the Israeli aggressors have brought prosperity to the Arab population and Jerusalem. He cited some figures about compensation for people forcibly evicted from their homes. But, as the representative of the United States of America rightly recalled in his statement here, Israel is the occupier of the eastern part of Jerusalem, and as such—that is, as the occupier—it has no right whatever to introduce its methods in the occupied territories.

170. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Allow me, Mr. President, to touch on a different matter as we reach the end of our meeting today. I would be remiss in an elementary duty to myself if I failed to express my heartfelt thanks to the representatives, including those of four permanent members, who have been kind enough to refer at this meeting to the work I did during the month of June in fulfilment of my duties as President of the Council. I realize how much generosity, and therefore exaggeration, there is in these statements; but I cannot forget that if a person may be known by the opinion others hold of him, the representatives who have spoken of me today certainly honour me in granting me the invaluable gift of their appreciation for the work I have done with, at least, the greatest goodwill. Many thanks to them, and also to you, Mr. President.

171. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no other speakers on my list, and if no representative wishes to speak at this stage, I shall adjourn the meeting. As a result of consultations with the members of the Security

Council, the next meeting has been scheduled for tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.