

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1416<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 27 APRIL 1968

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1416) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560) . . . . .	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 SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 27 April 1968, at 10.30 a.m.

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

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1416)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560).

### ✓ Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

**Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The representatives of Jordan and Israel have asked to be allowed to participate, without vote, in the debate on the agenda item now before the Security Council.

2. In accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure and with the usual practice of the Council, I propose, if there are no objections, to invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table to participate, without vote, in the discussion of this item.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Council will now consider the item brought before the Council by the representative of Jordan in his letter of 25 April 1968 [S/8560].

4. Before I call on the first speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the Council members to the note by the Secretary-General on this item [S/8561].

5. The first speaker on the list is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

6. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): It has been less than four weeks since the Council met to consider an Israeli violation of the cease-fire resolution. Before that the Security Council had met repeatedly to consider various aspects of the Israeli full-scale surprise attack of 5 June 1967 on Arab countries. Today the Council has been summoned to a meeting in response to an urgent request from my Government to forestall a situation fraught with danger, which may have repercussions far beyond the immediate area. We have requested a meeting of the Council in the face of wide-scale preparations for an Israeli military parade, unprecedented in scale, to be held in defiance of the United Nations. Military parades have been held in Jerusalem year after year and we have repeatedly called the attention of the United Nations to the fact that they constituted a clear violation of the General Armistice Agreement.

7. The Mixed Armistice Commission upheld our view and its decision was endorsed by this Council. This year another parade is contemplated, a parade which is different in character. It is part of a vicious plan to establish non-existent rights in the Holy City and present the United Nations and the world with an accomplished fact.

8. This year my country, which has suffered so much from faits accomplis, has reason to be specially concerned about the Israeli plan to annex Jerusalem, of which the parade is only one visible aspect. We have reason to be concerned because previous Israeli incursions were not effectively checked, and we feel that the Security Council should not, in a matter of the utmost gravity as this, allow the Israelis to undermine the authority of this Organization.

9. On 4 July 1967, the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V), on Jerusalem, by a vote of 99 in favour, none against, and only Israel and the United States abstaining. That resolution expressed deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City. The General Assembly considered those measures invalid and called upon Israel to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. The Secretary-General was requested to report to the Assembly and the Security Council on the implementation of that resolution not later than one week after its adoption. The Israelis defied that resolution, and their action prompted the General Assembly to deplore, in a subsequent resolution [2254 (ES-V)] the

Israeli non-compliance with its first resolution. The General Assembly reiterated its call to Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem.

10. Following the adoption of that resolution, the Secretary-General sent a personal representative, Mr. Thalmann, to Jerusalem to obtain information on the situation. Mr. Thalmann visited the Holy City and reported on 12 September 1967 that the Israelis, including the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, had made clear that "Israel was taking every step to place under its sovereignty those parts of the city which were not controlled by Israel before June 1967" [S/8146, para. 33]. Furthermore, Mr. Thalmann said: "The Israeli authorities stated unequivocally that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable" [ibid., para. 35]. Mr. Thalmann added, referring to Israeli legislation:

"Under the Law and Administration Ordinance (Amendment No. 11) Law of 27 June 1967, it was provided that the law, jurisdiction and administration of the State should apply in any area of the State of Israel designated by the Government by order. Under this provision the Government issued an order dated 28 June 1967 which declared that a territory defined in an annex was an area in which the law, jurisdiction and administration of the State of Israel were in force. The area described in detail in the annex included the Old City, Sur Bahir, Sheikh Jarrah, the Kalandia airport, Mount Scopus and vicinity and Shufat." [ibid., para. 39.]

11. As we have learned to anticipate from the Israeli authorities, they were busy consolidating their gains by all means available to them. This fact was generally established in Mr. Thalmann's report. Mr. Thalmann was able to ascertain, for instance, that the Israelis had taken drastic measures to stop the free flow of information to the Arab inhabitants, thus forcing them to rely solely on the Israeli media of information. The two daily Arab newspapers which were published in Jerusalem have been completely silenced and have disappeared.

12. Freedom of information was not the only victim of the repressive Israeli measures, since those acts were followed by cruel acts against the human person and property. Mr. Thalmann's report made reference to memoranda, statements, resolutions and other communications submitted to the personal representative of the Secretary-General by Arab personalities, including many officials and recognized religious leaders. Those communications ranged from complaints regarding the desecration of Holy Places, oppressive economic measures, imposed Israeli cultural and educational systems, and application of repressive Israeli civil laws to the destruction of homes and Moslem and Christian Holy Places, the expulsion of thousands of people and the confiscation of private property.

13. In spite of all these Israeli atrocities and violations of international law, Mr. Thalmann stated that he was informed that the Arab population placed their trust in the United Nations and relied on the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in July 1967.

14. In a memorandum to Mr. Thalmann, dated 26 August 1967, the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Pauhi El-Khatib, his deputy and the members of the Municipal Council stated clearly that

"The Jews are beginning to unveil their projects for the construction of great buildings in the town and its surroundings to increase the number of the Jewish inhabitants to 500,000. The Arabs are afraid that these projects may be carried out at the expense of their properties and possessions by confiscation or under pressure. Likewise they fear that Jews may become the majority of inhabitants of Jerusalem, thus appropriating the city, of which the Arabs would retain only memories." [See S/8146, annex I, sect. B.]

15. Municipalities, chambers of commerce, lawyers, unions, leaders and people from all walks of life, from different cities and villages, submitted memoranda to the Military Governor of Jerusalem rejecting the measures taken to annex Jerusalem and reminding the authorities that the detachment of Jerusalem from the west bank, the displacement of its inhabitants, the confiscations and the looting of shops and property constituted serious violations of international principles and human values.

16. What results did these petitions and complaints by the representatives of the people accomplish? The Israeli reaction was very swift; the Israeli authorities intensified their acts of oppression. Imprisonment and banishment continued to be the daily practice of the Israelis. However, the Israelis have not succeeded, and will certainly not succeed, in breaking the will of the Arab people of Jerusalem and their determination to be free and not live in separation or isolation in their homeland.

17. The Arabs of Jerusalem, Christians and Moslems, will not leave their city, and there is no force on earth that can eradicate from their hearts the great love they have for their city and their country. Certainly this great faith they have in their country and their Holy City has not been shaken in the least by the successive Israeli acts of persecution and oppression. It was not shaken by closing the only two Arab newspapers; it was not shaken by imprisoning or banishing political leaders; it was not shaken by deporting all those who said "We cannot accept that Israel should place us under its sovereignty with a mere stroke of the pen"; it was not shaken by terrorizing the people in different criminal ways. The Israelis can inflict more physical suffering; but our people will remain true to their City, to their country and to their King.

18. The whole world now knows what happened to the Maghrabi Quarter in the Old City. It was completely bulldozed, and its 630 orphans and paupers were displaced. Three thousand more persons living near that Quarter were also forced to leave their homes. The Arabs have already been replaced by Jewish families and Jewish institutions. To limit the Arab population in Jerusalem to the minimum, the Israeli authorities refused to comply with Security Council resolution 237 (1967) which called upon Israel to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas."

19. What is more, according to *The Jerusalem Post* of 12 March, the Israeli Minister of Justice will soon submit a draft concerning the granting of Israeli citizenship to the Arabs of Jerusalem. Accordingly, those who refuse Israeli citizenship will find themselves foreigners in their own homes and will be expelled, and their property will be confiscated as the property of absentees. With that background, is it advisable for the Council to wait and not take any action?

20. Other measures were resorted to by the Israelis to make life more difficult for those who decided not to abandon their city under any form of pressure or force. The Israeli authorities resorted to direct confiscation and expropriation of Arab land.

21. On 11 January 1968, 848 acres of Arab land in the area adjacent to the Old City were expropriated to construct dwelling units for Jews only. The map I presented earlier to the Council shows the location of the land. The Israeli authorities have pursued their systematic attempts to change the status of Jerusalem. In the Old City itself, Jewish religious, social and settlement buildings are being constructed within the Western area of the Wailing Wall. Outside the Old City, a road 30 metres wide has been constructed to connect the northern part of Jerusalem at St. Hadria with Mount Scopus, passing through newly-planned Israeli settlement projects to be built on Arab property.

22. The construction of 1,000 settlement units in the area stretching from St. Hadria through the no-man's land and on to the northern part of Sheikh Jarrah fields has been scheduled for this month. Bidding for the construction of another 1,000 units in the Police College area at Sheikh Jarrah began at the end of March 1968.

23. The St. John Eye Hospital, the oldest and most reputed Arab eye institute, is to become a luxurious hotel following a recommendation taken by the Jerusalem Economic Conference and announced by Israeli tourist officials in *The Jerusalem Post* of 8 April 1968.

24. Much has been said by the Israelis about "our Jerusalem", "our city", "our progress" in Jerusalem. They speak of the city as if it were theirs and theirs alone and they resort to every conceivable means to give respectability and credibility to this false and unfounded contention. The Israelis have no valid claim to Jerusalem. As regards some of the religious shrines, I have had occasion recently to call the attention of the United Nations Security Council to an impartial report entitled "Report of the Commission appointed by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, with the approval of the Council of the League of Nations, to determine the rights and claims of Moslems and Jews in connexion with the Western or Wailing Wall at Jerusalem", which, at the request of my delegation [*see letter of 23 February 1968, S/8427 and Add.1*], was distributed as an official document.

25. That report embodies the findings and decisions of the Commission that was appointed by the United Kingdom to determine the rights and the claims of both the Moslems

and the Jews in connexion with the Wailing Wall and the adjacent area in Jerusalem. The Commission consisted of three jurists from Sweden, Switzerland and the Netherlands, namely, Eliel Löfgren, formerly Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs and member of the Upper Chamber of the Swedish Riksdag—he acted as Chairman; Charles Barde, who was Vice-President of the Court of Justice at Geneva and President of the Austro-Rumanian Mixed Arbitration Tribunal; and C. J. van Kempen, formerly Governor of the East Coast of Sumatra and member of the States-General of the Netherlands.

26. The Commission, which was approved by the League of Nations, held twenty-three meetings during which it heard arguments and engaged in collecting evidence. It heard fifty-two witnesses, twenty-two presented by the Jewish side and thirty by the Moslem side, and one British officer. It examined all reports, dispatches, memoranda and minutes relative to matters connected with the Wailing Wall. It heard arguments and counter-arguments of the lawyers for both sides. Aauni Bey Abdul Hadi of Palestine, the leading lawyer, together with eleven other lawyers, Moslems and Christians, appeared to present the Moslem case. They came not only from Palestine, but from India, Morocco, Algeria, Tripoli, Egypt, Syria, Trans-Jordan—as it was called at that time—Iraq, Iran, the Dutch East Indies and areas in Africa.

27. What were the findings of that Commission of jurists appointed by the United Kingdom with the approval of the League of Nations?

28. First, the Commission found that the ownership of the Wailing Wall as well as the possession of it and of those parts of its surroundings accrue to the Moslems and that the Wall itself, as an integral part of the Haram Esh-Sharif area, is Moslem property.

29. Secondly, the Commission found that at no stage of the investigation did the Jewish side make any claim of ownership either to the Wailing Wall or to the Maghrabi Quarter or to any part of the areas now subjected to the Israeli changes and aggression. The Commission stated that the Jewish side, when making its claim, expressly stated that they "do not claim any proprietary right to the Wall" [*ibid.*].

30. Thirdly, the Commission found that no matter how one looks at the Jewish claim, it does not exceed a claim for a privilege to visit the Wall and that this privilege has even resulted from Moslem and Arab tolerance.

31. Fourthly, the Commission found that even the pavement and the area coincident with it were Moslem property and constituted Moslem Waqf, or Moslem religious endowment, by Afdal, the son of Saladin, in 1193 A.D.

32. Fifthly, the Commission found that the buildings of the Maghrabi Quarter, which were recently bulldozed by the Israeli authorities—were put up in 1320 A.D. "to serve as lodgings to Moroccan pilgrims" and were also made a Moslem Waqf—religious endowment—by Abu Madian.

33. Sixthly, the Commission found that the Moslem pilgrims and Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem were always

alert to the Jewish attempt to exploit Arab tolerance in order to claim, at a later stage, the right to ownership; that in 1911, the guardian of the Abu Madian Waqf (Maghrabi Quarter) complained that the "Jews, contrary to usage, had placed chairs on the pavement, and he requested that 'in order to avoid a future claim of ownership' the present state of affairs should be stopped" [ibid./]. That was a complaint to the British Administration. The Arab side argued that after stools would come benches, then the benches would become fixtures and before long the Jews would have established a legal claim to the site. That was in 1911. The Arabs were aware of this vicious, sinister cupidity in 1911; they warned against it. Recognizing the merits of the Arab contention, the British Administrative Council decided that it was not permissible to place any article on the Waqf property that could "be considered as indications of ownership" [ibid./]. That was the British finding, which coincided with the findings of the Commission of jurists nineteen years later.

34. Seventhly, the Commission found that the British Government had stated to Parliament in the White Paper of November 1928 that the Western or Wailing Wall "is legally the absolute property of the Moslem community and the strip of pavement facing it is Waqf property, as is shown by documents preserved by the Guardian of the Waqf" [ibid./]. It is interesting to hear that the United Kingdom said this in 1928.

35. Things have not changed; the legal validity has not changed. All these facts about the legal situation in Jerusalem make it unmistakably clear that all the recent Israeli measures are, in fact, naked aggression, and make nonsense of the cynical Israeli allegations that these are simply administrative measures.

36. The Israeli bulldozing of Arab property in the Maghrabi Quarter defies Arab rights which had been adjudicated and affirmed by a competent body constituted with the approval of the League of Nations. It also makes a mockery of the two General Assembly resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] on Jerusalem which called upon Israel "to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem". It is also an encroachment on the second holiest place in Islam, the Aksa Mosque and the Haram Esh-Sharif, and a violation of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.<sup>1</sup> Article 53 of the Geneva Convention expressly prohibited 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. No military operations are taking place in Jerusalem now, but the Israelis are still destroying and bulldozing private property in the area adjacent to the Old City.

37. On 5 January 1968, I brought to your attention the fact that the Israeli authorities are embarking on a plan for changing the sacred character of the Moslem Holy Places,

<sup>1</sup> Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973).

religious buildings and religious sites in the Arab city of Jerusalem.

38. A new project for the Wailing Wall and the adjacent area is now in progress. It embodies the enlarging of the Western area of the Wall by four metres and the planting of trees at a width of 150 metres.

39. On 27 July 1967, only thirteen days after the adoption of the second General Assembly resolution, two members of the British Parliament, Ian Gilmore and Denis Walters, who with a party of their colleagues had visited the area in Jerusalem to investigate the situation, reported to *The Times* of London of the same date that "In Jerusalem we saw the rubble of Arab houses which have been demolished to make a large plaza and a car park in front of the Wailing Wall." The Israeli plans embody additional construction near the Wailing Wall.

40. As has been established in the report of the Commission of jurists to which I have referred, the Wailing Wall and the entire adjacent area are an integral part of the Haram Esh-Sharif, which has been clearly determined as Moslem property. The demolition of the Maghrabi Quarter is a thinly-veiled attempt to impair the sacred character of the area and to cast a shadow of doubt on the question of ownership and possession. It also offends the feelings of hundreds of millions of Moslems around the world and presents them with an open challenge and brazen defiance.

41. The recent illegal expropriation of 838 acres (3,345 *dunums*) of the area adjacent to the Old City of Jerusalem is but another sinister attempt aimed at the eventual eradication of Arab presence from the area. The leaders of Jerusalem have always been alert to twisted methods used by the Zionists to gradually change the *status quo* of the Wailing Wall and the adjacent area. This continued defiance of international law and of the General Assembly resolutions on Jerusalem, together with the arbitrary acts of the Israelis within the Arab City of Jerusalem, call for immediate action. Unless the continuing Israeli violations stop, they will constitute a permanent danger and a constant menace to peace.

42. The Israeli authorities are now contemplating holding a military parade on 2 May 1968 in Jerusalem. Mr. Kollek, an Israeli official, told the press that the parade will start on the Jerusalem-Ramallah road, some 300 metres north of Sheikh Jarrah, which is part of recently-occupied Arab territory, and the reviewing stand will be there. The parade will go past the foot of Mount Scopus, proceed through Wadi Egoz (Jhoz) to the Rockefeller Museum and turn west to Damascus Gate. By looking at the map attached to my letter of 18 April 1968 [S/8549] you will see that the route mentioned above, which is about five kilometres, is in the Old City of Jerusalem and in the other Arab territory occupied since 5 June 1967. Nearly half the route I have referred to is in recently occupied Arab Jerusalem. The procession will then continue beyond the demilitarized zone. This new act of provocation is part of the Israeli plan aimed at the complete annexation of Jerusalem in defiance of the United Nations resolutions and authority. According to Israeli authorities, this parade will be the biggest and longest in Israel's history. The Israelis intend to bring into

Jerusalem for this parade heavy military armament in excess of that allowed for in the Armistice Agreement. This was confirmed by the Israeli radio on 24 and 25 April 1968, which quoted Colonel Eliezar Imitar, the officer-in-charge of the military parade, as saying:

“The parade will include 360 military aircraft of all makes used by the Israeli Air Force. Among these will be Sky Hawk fighter-bombers, planes and Bell 205 helicopters bought lately from the United States.

“Infantry and armoured units will parade for 9 kilometres starting from Shuufat (an Arab occupied village) and ending in Tel-Biyout.

“The armoured units will include 400 pieces, including 190 tanks, and 2,000 soldiers and officers will take part in the infantry units.”

✓43. This provocative act constitutes a breach of the Armistice Agreement and a violation of Security Council resolution 162 (1961) of 11 April 1961, which endorsed the decision of the Mixed Armistice Commission of 20 March 1961 [see S/4776]. That decision condemned such Israeli acts and called upon the Israeli authorities to take the strongest measures to prevent the recurrence of such a breach of the Armistice Agreement. It called upon Israel to refrain in future from bringing into Jerusalem any equipment in excess of that allowed for under the terms of the Armistice Agreement. It may be recalled that only three members of the Security Council abstained from voting on that resolution—namely, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ceylon and the United Arab Republic—on the ground that the resolution was not strong enough. In doing so, they emphasized the need for a more effective resolution to prevent a recurrence of such Israeli violations. All other members voted for the resolution. We, too, were not happy with that resolution. We hope that the members who maintain that the resolution offered an adequate remedy will find it appropriate to take more effective measures now. As a first step the Security Council should affirm its resolution and call on Israel not to hold the military parade in Jerusalem.

44. We submitted a letter earlier to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General about the parade. We did not come to the Council on that same day or on the second or third day, for we hoped that the efforts of the Secretary-General would bring about results. It is not a pleasure for Jordan to come complaining to the Security Council. However, nothing happened other than the constructive efforts of the Secretary-General. He sent a note, which is incorporated in document S/8561 of 26 April 1968. Up to this moment, as far as I am aware, no answer has been given to that note. In paragraph 4 of that document the Secretary-General states: “No reply to this note has so far been received from the Government of Israel.” I should like to quote verbatim the Secretary-General’s note:

“The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the reported decision of the Israel authorities to hold a

parade in Jerusalem on 2 May 1968. From reports received the intended parade would appear to be of a military nature and much of it will take place on the east side of the armistice demarcation line and in part of what is known as the ‘Old City of Jerusalem’.

“The Secretary-General feels obliged to convey in this note the concern about these reports which he has already expressed orally in talks with the representative of Israel. The Secretary-General wishes to emphasize that the holding of a military parade in this area at the present time will almost surely cause an increase in tension in the Near East and could well have an adverse effect on the efforts now going forward to find a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area.

“The Secretary-General’s concern about the proposed military parade in that part of Jerusalem mentioned above also relates specifically to pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly [resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] and of the Security Council [resolution 162 (1961)], and to his position on the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan as stated in the introduction to his annual report, 16 June 1966-15 June 1967, paragraph 43.”

45. We did not come to this Council two days earlier, for we wanted every constructive effort to be given adequate time. It is not a pleasure for us to come to complain to the Security Council.

46. The Israeli parade further violates General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967, both of which called upon Israel “to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem”. Those are two General Assembly resolutions endorsed by fourteen out of fifteen members around this table. Those resolutions are intended to be reaffirmed and implemented.

47. The Israeli parade comes at a time when genuine efforts are being made to implement Security Council resolutions and bring peace to the area. Those efforts—and we are grateful to the Secretary-General for emphasizing this point—are, as my Government maintains, being obstructed by the Israeli authorities. The parade and other violations I mentioned earlier will certainly undermine those efforts and add to the gravity of the situation.

48. The Secretary-General rightly emphasized that the holding of a military parade in that area at the present time would almost surely cause an increase in tension in the Near East and could well have an adverse effect on the efforts now going forward to find a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area.

49. In Jerusalem, Arab lawyers, realizing that it was impossible to approach the Israeli authorities and obtain a positive reaction, addressed a petition to the United Nations concerning the prevention of such a huge contemplated parade passing through their city.

50. Moreover, on Thursday, 25 April, the day before yesterday, 300 representatives of Christian and Moslem

women in Jerusalem dressed in black and carrying placards, demonstrated in protest against the Israeli parade. When told to go home they shouted: "Arab Jerusalem is our home". The police then used force and began to tear the placards and banners from the women and forcibly pushed them away from the streets. They resisted, and the street became a scene of Israeli cruelty against helpless, defenceless Arab women. They had only the broken banner sticks to use for resisting that brutality. They faced Israeli rifle butts and clubs with their hands and broken placard sticks. The fighting spread to the sidewalks. They continued their resistance, shouting "Allahu akbar"—"God is greater". *The New York Times* commented on that yesterday that "Allahu akbar" was to the Arab what "We shall overcome" was to the American Negro protesters. Men on the streets at that time joined the women in shouting "Allahu akbar". They were also brutally attacked by the Israelis.

51. As a result of that Israeli brutality, the protesters could not reach the Israeli authorities to deliver a petition against the military parade. Eleven Christian and Moslem women leaders and two men, who were charged with encouraging the demonstrating women, were detained. While the demonstration was coming to an end, the Arab City of Jerusalem was engulfed with the roar of Israeli jets flashing by in practice for the contemplated parade.

52. It has been noted that the Israelis have bought large quantities of the well-known Arab head-dress—*kofiyah* and *ikal*—to be worn by Israeli civilians to deceive the world public into believing that the Arabs were participating in the parade and rejoicing. The Israeli plans have also provided for forcing Arab students to line up on both sides of the route, thus constituting a human shield and hostages against any Arab resistance.

53. In my opening remarks I have stated that the situation is fraught with danger and if we come before the Council today it is to request that the United Nations resolutions be implemented. Failure to take adequate steps to meet the Israeli defiance reflects on the effectiveness of the Security Council.

54. Let me reiterate that failure to take an adequate decision will affect the very existence of this body which is the principal organ of the United Nations responsible for peace and security. The League of Nations died because it was unable to carry out its decisions. The Security Council should live. The Security Council is duty bound to put an end to Israeli arrogance and acts of lawlessness. By an act of aggression the Holy City of Jerusalem was occupied. By an act of aggression the City of the Prince of Peace was annexed. By a contemplated act of defiance and provocation the authority of the United Nations is being undermined. The Security Council should not, by sheer inaction, encourage or be a party to these Israeli violations.

55. The present problem is a test of the effectiveness of the Security Council. Failure to take immediate action will shatter confidence in the United Nations and will dispel any remaining hope in its ability to maintain world peace. If no resolute action is taken to cope with the problem, the Security Council will in effect be proclaiming its impotence to the whole world. In effect, it will be admitting to small

countries, like Jordan, that there is in fact no guarantee in the United Nations against aggression, and that brute force seems to be the only way to restore a right; that only resistance, with more escalation and more suffering and more bloodshed and more war, will bring peace with justice.

56. In their consultations and in formulating a draft resolution, I ask and I appeal to all my colleagues around this table to ponder these points very carefully.

57. According to *The New York Times* of this morning, Mr. Dayan, the Defence Minister of Israel, warned Jordan that:

"Jordan may bring about a situation . . . in which the Jordan Valley will turn into a battlefield. There will not be room there for civilian life, for families, children, cattle and agricultural cultivation cannot go hand in hand with acts of war."

He warned Jordan against becoming "the sword of the Arab States". Jordan is the sword of its people; almost half of them are now victims of Israeli occupation, oppression and humiliation.

58. Whether there will be peace or war in the area lies in the hands of the Security Council to a very great extent.

59. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call on the representative of Israel.

60. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Thank you, Mr. President. Again we meet in the Security Council; this time at Jordan's initiative. Twenty years after Jordan had launched its war of aggression against Israel in defiance of the United Nations, five months after the Security Council had called for a just and lasting peace in the area, four weeks after the Security Council had decided that violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated, Jordan comes before this organ not to declare the end of war, not to embrace the cause of peace, not to renounce warfare by armed attack, raid and sabotage, but to blaspheme and mock and desecrate Jerusalem, the crown of the Jewish people, Jerusalem, the focus of universal spiritual veneration.

61. What is it that has aroused the displeasure of the Government of Jordan? What is it that Jordan objects to? The Government of Jordan finds it appropriate to come before the Security Council and complain about the celebration of Israel's independence, the reconstruction of synagogues and houses of learning destroyed by Jordanian vandalism in the Jewish quarter of Jerusalem, the measures taken to restore some semblance of life on the site of Nafi Ya'qub, in the north-eastern part of the Jerusalem area, a Jewish village razed to the ground by the Jordanians and turned into an Arab Legion camp. The Jordanian Government is grieved to see the Western Wall of King Solomon's Temple rise again in its tragic glory, freed at last from the slums, the dirt, the profanation which the Jordanians have heaped on it.

62. To Amman, Israel's independence is an object of vilification; Jerusalem's reconstruction, anathema. Amman



would have Israel in mourning rather than in celebration and Jerusalem in the state of destruction and humiliation in which Jordan has kept the eastern part of the city since its conquest in 1948, rather than in rebirth and restoration.

63. The world has not forgotten how Jordan, together with other Arab States, trampled the United Nations Charter and its resolutions, invaded Israel in 1948, and proclaimed: "This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres."

64. This is what actually took place wherever the Arab forces succeeded in retaining territory invaded by them. On the west bank, the Jordanian armies did not leave a single Jewish community intact. All Jewish villages in the areas occupied by Jordan were completely wiped out. Not a single Jew was left alive in the territories under Jordanian control. When, for instance, the village of Kefar 'Ezyon surrendered to the Jordanian Army, after having defended itself to the last round of ammunition, all but four of the 220 inhabitants were mercilessly butchered before the eyes of Jordanian officers. However, the worst fate was reserved for Jerusalem.

65. The Arab Legion besieged the city and launched an indiscriminate artillery bombardment sparing no residential quarter, disregarding completely the Holy Places. Jerusalem was cut off on all sides. Starvation, pestilence and thirst stalked the streets, and death dug daily new graves. The siege continued for weeks. The toll of death increased. Convoys with food supplies to the unfortunate inhabitants were ambushed. The Arabs did not take prisoners. All men and women were being massacred. Not even medical assistance was respected.

66. On 13 April 1948, for instance, a convoy of doctors, nurses and medical supplies to the Hadassah Medical Centre was ambushed and set afire. Seventy-seven eminent doctors and nurses were killed.

67. The Jews of Jerusalem looked in desperation toward the United Nations to stop the killing, to put an end to aggression. The Jews of Jerusalem looked expectantly toward the great Powers to relieve the city's agony. In vain. The aggression continued. The aggressor stayed on in the city. He stayed on for nineteen years.

68. Is all this forgotten already? The people of Israel have not forgotten.

69. This how Abdullah el-Tal, the Commander of the Jordanian invasion forces, describes the battle in his memoirs:

"... The operations of calculated destruction were set in motion... I knew that the Jewish Quarter was densely populated with Jews who caused their fighters a good deal of interference and difficulty... I embarked, therefore, on the shelling of the Quarter with mortars, creating harassment and destruction... Only four days after our entry into Jerusalem the Jewish Quarter had become their graveyard. Death and destruction reigned over it..."

"As the dawn of the Friday, 28 May 1948, was about to break, the Jewish Quarter emerged convulsed in a black cloud—a cloud of death and agony."

70. When the din of battle died down the invader was able to apply himself more thoroughly to the rape and ravage of the city. In the Jewish Quarter all but one of the thirty-five Jewish houses of worship that graced the Old City of Jerusalem were wantonly destroyed. The synagogues were razed or pillaged and stripped and their interiors used as hen-houses and stables. In the ancient historic Jewish graveyard on the Mount of Olives, tens of thousands of tombstones were torn up, broken into pieces or used as flagstones, steps and building materials in Jordanian military installations and civilian constructions, including latrines. Large areas of the cemetery were levelled and converted into parking places and petrol filling stations. These acts of desecration have been reported in a document submitted to the Security Council [*see S/8439 and Add.1 of 6 March 1968*].

71. Again the world stood by in silence. Nobody raised his voice. Where are the Security Council resolutions about the destruction of Jewry's Holy Places and religious sites in Jerusalem? Where are the Security Council resolutions condemning the desecration of the cemetery on the Mount of Olives? Where are the Security Council interventions about Jordan's refusal to allow free access to Holy Places and to the humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus, in accordance with the General Armistice Agreement? When had the Security Council called on the Jordanian invaders stationed on the Old City walls to desist from keeping Jerusalem's population under constant menace, from firing indiscriminately, from satisfying the lust for blood in the murder of children, innocent archaeologists, unsuspecting tourists? What action did the Security Council take last May when Jordan joined the conspiracy of the Arab States that closed the Strait of Tiran, amassed huge armies on Israel's borders and proclaimed that the time for Israel's annihilation had come?

72. Is all that already forgotten? The people of Israel have not forgotten.

73. Last June, when Jordan faced the choice between peace and war, it wilfully rejected peace and chose war. King Hussein described it as follows:

"On 5 June, after the fighting had already started, the Norwegian General of the United Nations, Odd Bull, handed me a communication from the Israel side to the effect... that if we would refrain from attacking we would escape the consequences that otherwise would be inevitable. By that time, however, we had no choice."

74. When the Jordanian Army opened its frontal attack against Israel, it was again Jerusalem that became the target of the principal onslaught. Jerusalem was again under Jordanian shell fire. Jordanian guns placed within the confines of the Holy Places, Jordanian machine-guns firing from the roof of the Omar Mosque opened up with a deadly barrage against the city, aiming to kill as many inhabitants as possible and destroy as much of the city's housing as could be attained.

75. The letter dated 19 April 1968 addressed by the Jordanian representative to the Secretary-General [S/8552], depicting damage to a number of churches on Mount Zion, astonishingly omits the simple but crucial fact that the damage was the result of Jordanian shelling in attacks in 1948 and 1967. The churches and the cemetery remained inaccessible and neglected because Jordanian aggression left the compound in a "no-man's land" between the Armistice Lines. Of course, truth matters little when the fantasies of hate reign supreme. Nor does the letter tell us how Jordanian fire was directed last June at the world-renowned Dormition Church on Mount Zion, causing grave damage to it.

76. Today, the invader of 1948, the aggressor of 1967, Jerusalem's destroyer and desecrator, comes to complain that the city is healing the wounds and removing the scars he has inflicted upon it. The reign of terror, profanation and ruin must be perpetuated, he suggests. The devastation of Jerusalem should, he tells us, remain a monument to the outrages of his conquest and rule.

77. He complains about an Israeli Independence Day parade. He, the aggressor, who for nineteen years has led the parade of peril and violence and demolition in Jerusalem, now turns his wrecking zeal against Israel's twentieth anniversary of regained freedom and sovereignty.

78. It is not the parade that Jordan opposes but the paraders. It is not the parade Jordan hates but what it stands for—Israel's existence, Israel's liberty, Israel's rout of Arab aggression. Had Jordan shed its destructive policy of belligerency, it would not have tried again, as in the past, to upset Israel's national holiday. Had the Jordanian Government abandoned irresponsible thought and action it would have been spared the illusion that it can dictate to Israel how to celebrate its holiday, a right enjoyed by all nations in the world, a right on which no nation would accept any outside interference.

79. What is perhaps most remarkable in Jordan's objections to the Israeli Independence Day parade is the claim that it would aggravate the situation in the area. Is not Jordan misjudging the credulity of the world? Does the Jordanian Government really believe that it is possible to accept that the situation is aggravated not by the continuation of war against Israel, not by the refusal to make peace with Israel, not by the persistence in active warfare by armed attack, terror and sabotage, not by official declarations that Israel must be exterminated, but by a one-time parade? Surely there must be a limit to the absurdities that the world would accept from Jordan.

80. The Jordanian representative has mentioned a demonstration a few days ago in Jerusalem by about fifty women, some of them, like Miss Saidi Nusseiba, sent especially for that purpose from the east bank by the Jordanian authorities. This reminds me of a story I once heard in the Soviet Union. Not much favourable news appears in the Soviet press about Israel, and a prominent part of such news are reports about the rise in apartment rents in Tel Aviv, strikes of postal workers and demonstrations of all kinds. One Soviet citizen said to another, "How bad the situation must be in Israel, with so many strikes and demonstrations".

"You fool," replied the other, "how good the situation is in Israel if people are free to strike and demonstrate there."

81. Could the Jews imprisoned today in Egyptian concentration camps hold a demonstration? Could the Jews enclosed in the Damascus ghetto, could the Jew of Baghdad, oppressed and discriminated against by new hitlerite laws, demonstrate? Has the Government represented by the Jordanian delegate left a single Jew alive in its territories who could demonstrate?

82. Must I recite again the long list of riots and demonstrations that have taken place in the cities of the west bank and eastern Jerusalem during Jordanian rule? Should I again tell the Council of the thousands of Arab citizens arrested by the Jordanian authorities in actions against demonstrators, of the scores of Arab inhabitants exiled as a result of those riots? Must I remind the Jordanian representative how forces of the Jordanian army, employing tanks and tear gas, had been used repeatedly to put down such demonstrations?

83. Let the Jordanian representative come to Jerusalem, as some of his compatriots are in fact doing, to see for himself which Jerusalem is more peaceful, the united city of today or the divided one under Jordanian occupation. Let him come and see for himself where there is more freedom and democracy: in Cairo, in Damascus, in Amman or in Jerusalem.

✓84. Jordan bases its claims on the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan. With what nostalgia the representative of Jordan dwelt on this Armistice as if its only purpose had been to prevent Israeli military parades in Jerusalem. He has conveniently left out the fact that the Armistice was a provisional agreement, valid as "a transition to permanent peace", that it was judged by the Security Council to be incompatible with belligerent rights, that his Government had flouted the Agreement for nineteen years by invoking the rights of war and tenaciously repudiating the central provisions of the Agreement, in particular articles I, III, VIII and XII. The 1949 Armistice Agreement,<sup>2</sup> which should have been succeeded in 1950 by a peace treaty, had become by 1967 a formula for belligerency, a cover for armed attacks and incursions, an alibi for refusal to make peace. It was finally destroyed by Jordan when on 5 June 1967 the Jordanian Government opened up its general military onslaught against Israel. The representative of Jordan now tries to use the Armistice ghost as a screen for further warfare and hostility against Israel.

85. However, it is not only to disturb Israel's independence festivities that the Armistice is brought out of the dusty closet. There is an aim even more sinister behind the Jordanian claims. The United Nations is now engaged in an effort to guide the nations of the Middle East forward toward a just and lasting peace. Instead of advancing in that direction the Government of Jordan asks for a return to the Armistice. It is support for the resuscitation of the Armistice that it seeks support which the General Assembly and the Security Council have consistently refused to grant since last June.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

86. The Armistice is no more because the Arabs have destroyed it. The relations between Israel and the Arab States are now founded upon and regulated by the cease-fire—a cease-fire established by the Security Council and consecrated in a series of Council resolutions. Under the cease-fire, Israel defence forces are stationed on the Suez Canal, guard the crossings on the Jordan River and patrol the line in the Golan heights. Within this area of cease-fire Israel forces are free to move, to act and to parade as they see fit. It may be in Jordan's interest to weaken and undermine the cease-fire structure. Indeed, this is precisely what it is trying to do by the armed attacks and raids perpetrated from Jordanian territory in violation of the cease-fire. This is precisely what it is striving to achieve by ignoring the cease-fire and suggesting the revival of the now moribund provisions of the Armistice. Israel is not prepared to aid it. Israel will not acquiesce in any attempt to cripple the cease-fire, whether by violations of the cease-fire line or by efforts to introduce qualifications and impediments which have never been part of the cease-fire. Military movements, of whatever kind, within the confines of the cease-fire are unrestricted and so they must remain, whether they please other parties to the cease-fire or not.

87. The Jordanian representative has tried to buttress his allegations by reference to General Assembly resolutions of 4 and 14 July 1967 [2253 ES-V] and 2254 (ES-V)]. Whatever one may think of those resolutions, and whether one had supported them or not, it is clear that they referred to the legislation adopted by Israel last June. They did not call for stagnation in Jerusalem. They were not aimed at the prevention of military marches in the City. They were not intended to paralyse construction in Jerusalem.

88. One of the pretexts for the Jordanian complaint is a concoction of unfounded allegations about housing development in Jerusalem. Most of the land involved in the reconstruction projects is not Arab—but Jewish-owned and public domain. No attempts by the representative of Jordan to distort this basic fact could succeed. The land records happen to be in Jerusalem, not in Amman. No mosque or church, no Holy Place would be affected. It is sufficient to look at the map to realize that all of the land in question situated outside the Jewish Quarter is empty. In the Jewish Quarter itself no home of any Arab inhabitant who has settled there in the last two decades is involved. The undertaking is one of normal urban development, of clearing ruins, restoring houses of worship and reconstructing slum areas. Many of these projects had been worked out not by us, but by the Mandatory Government before the Jordanian occupation of 1948. Had the attitude of the occupying Jordanian authorities toward the City of Jerusalem been different, they would have carried out these projects themselves. An old Latin proverb says, "*Facilius est destruere quam construere*"—"It is easier to pull down than to build up". Those who for years have wrecked and pulled down, let them at least not interfere with the work of rebuilding and creating.

89. Today the City of Jerusalem, divided for nineteen years as a result of Jordanian aggression, is united again. The walls, barbed-wired fences and mine-fields are no more. The inhabitants of Jerusalem no longer fear bombardment by Jordanian artillery or murderous fire from Jordanian

military positions on the ramparts of the Old City. The Holy Places are protected. Discrimination against Christian churches has been terminated. The Holy Sites desecrated by the Jordanians are being restored. The Jewish Quarter, nearly totally demolished by them, is being rebuilt. The City is peaceful and life normal. The Christian communities, joined by thousands of tourists from abroad, including visitors from the Arab States, celebrated recently the Easter festivals. The Moslem community celebrated the festival of Id el-Fitr and Id el-Adha in accordance with its own traditions. Close to 250,000 Jewish inhabitants and about 70,000 Arab citizens, this is the national character of Jerusalem; 250,000 Jews and 70,000 Arabs mingle together in ever-growing understanding and communion.

90. The representative of Jordan arrogates to himself the right to speak on behalf of Arab inhabitants of Eastern Jerusalem, Christians and Moslems alike—Eastern Jerusalem conquered by Jordan in defiance of the United Nations. I would respectfully suggest that he allow the inhabitants to speak for themselves. In fact, they did speak for themselves when, for instance, the Mayor, Council and citizens of Bethlehem petitioned the Israeli Government not to limit itself to the unification of the two parts of Jerusalem, but also to include the Town of Bethlehem in the united municipality. The inhabitants of Jerusalem have spoken for themselves in the public pronouncements of their leaders, such as the Custos of the Holy Land, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch, the Armenian Patriarch and others. For the first time in twenty years the world sees that the two peoples, Arabs and Jews, are at least capable of living side by side in peace and constructive endeavour. This is the situation that does not please the Jordanian Government. This is the situation that, in its view, must not continue. This is the situation which the Security Council is called upon to disapprove.

91. For three thousand years Jerusalem has been the focal point of Jewish history, civilization and religion. Even when the cohorts of Imperial Rome conquered Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple, Jerusalem remained Israel's eternal capital. It is the Bible that says:

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.

"Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I remember thee not, set not Jerusalem above my chiefest joy."

92. For two thousand years, every day, three times a day, Jews all over the world have prayed:

"And to Jerusalem, thy city, return in mercy, and dwell therein as thou hast spoken; rebuild it soon in our days as an everlasting building, and speedily set up therein the throne of David. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who rebuildest Jerusalem."

Every day, for two thousand years, three times a day, in all the corners of the world.

93. Jerusalem is too precious to all of us to wrong it. Jerusalem is too central and too significant a part of the

entire Jewish saga, it is too highly venerated by the world's three great religions for the Amman Government to play with it as if it were just another weapon in the campaign of hate and hostility against Israel on which Jordan subsists. Those with an understanding of history, those with a feeling for justice and a respect for equity, will know that the Jordanian complaint is but a malicious attempt to create new tension and misunderstanding.

94. If Jordan's belligerency, negativism and intransigence continue unchecked, there can be little prospect for peace in the area. Jordan seeks again encouragement to persist in its war against Israel. If Jordan finds such encouragement, it will, of course, draw the appropriate conclusions, and the Middle East will have to brace itself for more hostility and conflict. As on numerous occasions in the past, the present situation calls for a clear, unequivocal summons to disavow belligerency, to terminate warfare, to move onward to peace—the only hope for the nations of the Middle East.

95. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I do not wish to pursue most of what has been said here today. Much of what has been said, it seems to me, may not contribute to the progress we wish to see towards a settlement, a settlement on the basis of the unanimous decision reached in this Council last November.

96. Today, at this stage I wish to say two things only. First, my Government stands firmly by the statements we have made and the votes we have cast both in the Assembly and in this Council on the question of the future of Jerusalem. All that has since taken place has reinforced the views which we have publicly stated, clearly and repeatedly.

97. Secondly, with regard to the military parade, we apply only one practical test, the test stated by the Secretary-General in his report yesterday [S/8561]: whether this or

any other action will increase tension and have an adverse effect on the efforts now going forward to find a peaceful and permanent settlement. It is on that test that we shall greatly regret and deplore any action which is not directed to a reduction of tension and to positive effort towards carrying out the decisions and declared purposes of the United Nations.

98. It is our strong opinion that the authority of this Council should be consistently and insistently directed to furthering the settlement for which we have all voted, and equally towards the discouragement of every action, from whatever quarter, which might excite or provoke ill will or conflict. The influences working for pacification and for political settlement appear to make so far little progress, but certainly we rejoice that they persist. It is the clear duty of this Council to encourage and sustain those influences and those endeavours. It is our equal duty to make it absolutely clear that any action whatever which makes a peaceful settlement more difficult and which might lead to increased bitterness and bad feeling can meet in this Council only with discouragement and disapproval.

99. I greatly hope that even after the statements we have heard today, even now, we can turn from recrimination. I trust that from now on the whole weight of the Council will again be put to a renewed productive and constructive advance towards the settlement to which we are all publicly committed and which the peoples of the Middle East so desperately need.

100. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with the wishes expressed by the members of the Security Council, this meeting is now adjourned. The next meeting will take place at 3 o'clock this afternoon to continue discussion of this item.

*The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.*