



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1485th

MEETING: 3/4 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1485)	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-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 3 July 1969, at 4 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/1485)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

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

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have just received communications from the representatives of Afghanistan [S/9305], the Sudan [S/9304], Yemen [S/9306], Tunisia [S/9307] and Kuwait [S/9310] requesting permission to participate without right to vote in the Council's debate on the question before it. If I hear no objections, I shall invite them 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 address the Council, he will be invited to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. R. Pazhwak (Afghanistan), Mr. M. Fakhreddine (Sudan), Mr. M. S. Alattar (Yemen), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. S. Y. Shammas (Kuwait) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Afghanistan. I now invite him to take a place at the Council table, and I give him the floor.

4. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan): Mr. President and members of the Security Council, I wish to thank you for acceding to my request of this morning to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council on the issue before it. I should explain—because I owe the Council such an explanation—why I made that request at such a late stage.

5. I listened most carefully and closely to the statements made by members and non-members of the Council. Almost all the points that I wished to be brought to the attention of the Council were made by the participants in the discussion much more ably than I could have done, and I was satisfied to take note of those points. For example, the representative of the United Kingdom stated:

“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.

“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” [1483rd meeting, paras. 33 and 36].

6. I was satisfied to hear the representative of France refer to resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 as constituting the legal basis for the complaint before the Council and to hear him quote the relevant parts of that resolution as follows: “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—“urgently calls upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action”—of this kind [ibid., para. 43]. And I was also satisfied when he went on to say: “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. 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.” [Ibid., paras. 51 and 52.]

7. I felt satisfied when the representative of the Soviet Union stated: “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. . . . The Security Council, discharging its duty in conformity with the United Nations Charter, must take the necessary measures to ensure implementation of its decisions.” [Ibid., paras. 68 and 70.]

8. Then we heard the representative of the United States state:

“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. . . . 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.” [Ibid., para. 97.]

9. Then I listened to the statements by the representatives of the non-Arab, non-member countries of Indonesia and Malaysia [1484th meeting], who expressed the feelings not only of the many millions of Moslems whom they represent in the United Nations but of hundreds of millions of Moslems all over the world, including the people of Afghanistan. And what made me feel that it was my duty to request to be allowed to participate was the last statement of the representative of Israel, after he had heard the statements of the non-Arab Moslem countries which are not directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The answer of the representative of Israel, as a responsible spokesman of his Government to those statements was, in fact, in five words: “Jerusalem is Israel’s eternal capital” [1484th meeting, para. 243]. This is why I venture to take up the time of the Council at this meeting. I fully realize the importance of your duties and your responsibilities as members of the Security Council in matters dealing with the maintenance of peace and the prevention of situations that may disturb it. I realize that you have undertaken this responsibility as representatives of your own Governments

and also, in a sense, as representatives of those Member States that have selected you and thus have put their confidence in you.

10. I also realize how valuable the time of each member of the Council is and how important it is to the Council collectively to deal with the most important situations without any waste of time and still with all precision in the decisions required of highly responsible people who have so many considerations to keep in mind in connexion with all matters.

11. I have not requested the Council to allow me to appear before it at this meeting as an adviser. Nor am I in a position to advise any of the parties directly involved. I am here as a representative of a country believing in the fact that nothing could happen any more in any part of the world that would not affect all peoples and nations everywhere. I am here as a representative of a small country having no “lust or hate”—the words used by one of the speakers—or ambitions that could possibly be interpreted as against anyone. I represent a country that could not possibly think of fulfilling its own aspirations for peace, progress and happiness in any other condition than the condition of peace, understanding and co-operation among the peoples and nations of the world. Our position on the situation in the Middle East has been repeatedly stated in the United Nations. But since this is the first time I am making a statement on this issue in the Security Council, I should like to recall parts of statements I have made in the past on this problem, particularly at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly on 17 June and 5 July 1967. I have to recall these statements because they were made two years ago, at a time when emotions were very high. I want to remind you of these statements and I should like to draw your attention to the fact that even at the height of emotion there is no emotion involved in what I said two years ago.

12. This is the first statement:

“The situation in the Middle East, which is not confined to that area but represents a crisis of world proportions, must be of immediate concern to the United Nations because of the widely recognized and very direct and continuing responsibility of the United Nations in that area.”¹

The second statement is as follows:

“ . . . the major Powers . . . have special responsibilities and are in a position to influence such situations in the interest of peace. Those States which are not directly involved, and therefore can act objectively to influence a just peace, are likewise Members of this Assembly. Thus it is natural and proper that because of their shared membership in this world body, all parties should turn to the United Nations and should consider that it has an obligation to them to take action.”¹

Thirdly, I stated:

“It is evident that if this crisis is not brought to an end through the use of all the peaceful methods at the

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 1525th meeting, para. 8.

disposal of the international community, we shall all—every one of us—be confronted with very grave consequences.”²

13. I come now to the fourth statement. After having asked the permission of the body I was addressing to recall that there were certain obligations which affected us all, I said:

“... there is the obligation assumed by each Member under the Charter to ensure that international peace, security and justice shall not be endangered; and there is the responsibility placed upon each of us to conduct our affairs keeping always in view the impact of our deliberations on the effectiveness of the United Nations, the good name of this forum and the satisfactory progress of its proceedings; there is also the obligation shared by all Members to respect the decisions of this Organization.”³

The fifth statement, concerning the question of the Middle East conflict, was the following:

“The question before the Assembly has, with all its ramifications, never been a Council case or an Assembly case, but the problem of the United Nations as a whole.”⁴

Sixthly, I said:

“With virtual unanimity, Heads of State, Heads of Government, Foreign Ministers and Permanent Representatives have agreed that the crisis merits the attention of all Member States in every part of the world, and indeed requires the full participation of all Members in the earnest labours to achieve results. That wide agreement has shown that the Member States have risen to the challenge. They have agreed that the problem is no longer a limited confrontation of two parties, but an issue of regional dimensions which threatens to spread to other areas and other major political alignments. They have accurately taken the measure of this crisis.”⁵

14. I come now to the seventh statement:

“There has been a broad consensus that the effort to achieve final peace and final solutions to this problem can be hoped for only within the framework of the United Nations.

“Finally, there is virtual unanimity in upholding the principle that conquest of territory by war is inadmissible in our time and under the Charter. The affirmation of this principle was made in virtually all statements and—I should add with some emphasis—by none more emphatically than all of the big Powers, which bear the primary responsibility in the United Nations for the peace and security of the world. In this sense, virtually all speakers laid down the corollary that withdrawal of forces to their original position is expected.”⁶

² *Ibid.*, para. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, para. 14.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1549th meeting, para. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 11.

The eighth statement was:

“There was in addition a broad consensus that the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of States allow them a rightful freedom from threat of belligerency.”⁷

Ninthly, I mentioned that the General Assembly had adopted a resolution rejecting any measures to annex the Old City of Jerusalem.

15. In recalling those statements I have one point in mind, and that is that they were made two years ago. I hope that you will be good enough to understand exactly what I mean when I mention the time at which they were made and when I remind you of the atmosphere at that time, and of what the world expected to happen in the two years that have elapsed since then.

16. The five words I quoted from the statement of the representative of Israel, if taken seriously, mean much more. The meaning goes further than mere occupation of territory by military force. It proclaims “eternal” annexation. More than that, it takes the matter out of the Arab-Israeli conflict and extends it in an alarming way to all Moslems of the world and believers of all other faiths than Judaism. While it perpetuates a political war, it sounds a prelude to a religious war, which is far more dangerous. I should like to state, therefore, that if one day such a conflict takes place, history will mark last night’s meeting of the Security Council as the place where Israel made this proclamation.

17. However, the Middle East situation, including the situation in Jerusalem, remains basically and primarily a political situation to us. The Security Council also remains a political body of the United Nations. Fully recognizing the place of the Holy City in the hearts and minds of millions of people, and particularly in the minds and hearts of my own people, the Afghan people, I should like to emphasize the fact that every inch of a nation’s territory is sacred.

18. From the political and legal points of view, we base ourselves, before anything else, on the principles of international law, as they should be interpreted in our time, the law under which international order should be observed. In accordance with this conviction, we cannot allow ourselves to accept the occupation or acquisition of territory by military force, whether it is a sacred city or any other territory that does not have such holy shrines.

19. In the fifth emergency special session convened to deal with the situation in the Middle East, and in the regular sessions of the General Assembly that followed it, and also in all the meetings of the Security Council and everywhere else that this situation has been discussed, no one has ever had the courage to approve of the principle of the acquisition of occupied territories by military force. I do not think that anyone can do so now. I should like to challenge anybody to say that he approves of this principle and this conception. Even at this series of meetings of the Security Council, if there is agreement on anything it is

⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 13.

agreement—and a unanimous one—that such a conception should be rejected.

20. I must make it clear that I am not here to defend the Arabs. Afghanistan is not an Arab country. I should like you, Mr. President, and everybody else present, to know that this is a matter in which the direct interests of my own country and countries like mine—I mean the small countries, which make up the majority of the Members of the United Nations, and also the majority of the nations of the world—are involved. As a small country, we are not immune to the forces of occupation. In a world so insecure, we have to be constantly conscious of all that can take place. How can any small country in the world allow such a conception to rule the behaviour of nations in relation with other nations?

21. As far as Afghanistan is concerned, I have a little more to say. No nation in the world has suffered more from war than we have in our history, so we know what war is. We have suffered from occupation, so we know what the occupation of one's territory means. We have suffered from annexation of our territory by force, so we know what annexation is. When we speak about this principle, we do not intend it to apply, as it would seem to, only to the situation created by the Arab-Israeli conflict. We shall express the same views, the same fears and the same feelings if at any time an Arab country occupied the territory of another Arab country and claimed its right of conquest in the acquisition of the territory of the defeated. That would also be the case if such action were taken by one Moslem country with regard to another Moslem country; let me put it this way: if it were taken by any nation with regard to any other nation whatsoever.

22. Before concluding, I wish to give expression to our profound concern at the situation, and particularly at the recess—for most unfortunate but understandable reasons—in the exertion of positive efforts by the Secretary-General and his representative, Mr. Jarring. Also, we are discouraged, if not disappointed, at the relaxation of negotiations by the four permanent members of the Security Council for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict.

23. To conclude, I should like to appeal to the members of the Council, particularly the permanent members, which by having a privileged position have a primary responsibility in the solution of problems that threaten peace and security, to enhance their efforts. This appeal, of course, goes also to the Secretary-General, who has never hesitated to do his best to bring about all that can be brought about in the interest of peace.

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

25. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to speak again. You may recall, Sir, that last night I asked your aides and members of the Secretariat to grant me a few minutes to make a short statement about a question that was not germane to the

item before the Council. And although it might have appeared to some to be out of context or perhaps out of order, it had such a bearing on the rights of the representatives of sovereign States that I thought it was my duty to take up a few minutes of the Council's time last night, with your permission, Mr. President.

26. But all of a sudden the atmosphere was electrified: "Baroody is going to make another speech; perhaps he is going to make us stay here until midnight". I made it clear that I wanted five minutes, and none other than our gracious Secretary-General, who met me after the meeting had been adjourned, can attest to the fact that my statement would not have taken more than five or at most seven minutes. I read it to him in the antechamber. But I had never thought that my good friend the representative of the United States would use his axe so skilfully against what I had it in mind to say. All of a sudden, instead of my being given those five minutes, the meeting was abruptly adjourned. I went to the United States representative while the consecutive interpretation was being given and asked him if he would extend me the courtesy of modifying his motion for adjournment. He refused, and I do not blame him. But that is why it will take me more than five minutes today.

27. Arab States have no mass media of information like the Zionists nor have they excelled in ways and means of wielding world influence or exerting pressure on other States. If we are still in the United Nations, and now I am speaking particularly of Saudi Arabia, it is because we hope to make our opinions heard through this Organization. All small States, I believe, have the same hope. I bear no grudge against my friend from the United States.

28. Now I come to the reason why I wanted to speak last night.

29. A flagrant breach of the code of ethics has occurred in the United Nations Headquarters in connexion with the unwarranted interference of a foreign correspondent in publicly confronting members of the Office of Public Information of the United Nations Secretariat with questions calculated to criticize overtly and by implication the representative of a sovereign State of this Organization. In the press briefing of the Office of Public Information held on 1 July 1969 on the third floor of the Secretariat building at United Nations Headquarters, that correspondent, in the presence of many of his colleagues, asked Mr. William Powell of the Secretariat to request Mr. Nosek, the Under-Secretary-General, or the Controller of the United Nations "to give an estimate in overtime costs, paper etc. involved in the statement of Mr. Baroody of Saudi Arabia before the Security Council yesterday... Mr. Powell said that on several occasions Mr. Nosek had told correspondents the formula of how many dollars a page reproduction of speeches costs. He would get the formula and correspondents could apply it to the number of pages in the verbatim record for any speech". I have quoted from the press briefing of the Office of Public Information. Advisedly, Mr. Powell said "for any speech". He did not say "Baroody's speech". I must say that Mr. Powell acted correctly and in the best tradition of an international servant of the Organization. But who is this

correspondent, you may be wondering, and why did he single out the representative of Saudi Arabia in connexion with the cost of speeches that that representative has made in the Security Council? There has been a whispering campaign against the representative of Saudi Arabia, to the effect that he takes the floor quite often and is embarrassing because he tells the truth as it should be told, not embellishing it with all those antiquated diplomatic phrases, that were used a century and a half ago in the Congress of Vienna, where diplomats said things that they did not mean and meant things that they did not say.

30. I am the representative of a small State and I stand on my rights. I challenge any representative of any State to take issue with me as to how I should speak and for how long.

31. Who is that correspondent? What is his name? He is none other than a certain Mr. Leichter, of the German Press Agency. I feel sorry for him. I did not know him before they pointed him out to me today. He is older than I am. He must have a grudge against the Arabs, anyway, and that is why I feel sorry for him. We bear no grudge towards anyone, no malice towards our fellow human beings; that is in the best tradition of Arabism. But out of all the correspondents, he is the one who is deeply concerned about how much it costs the United Nations to listen to the Saudi Arabian speeches in the United Nations—the correspondent of West Germany. If he had asked for an estimate in dollars of the cost of any speech without mentioning a particular representative, that would have been understandable and quite permissible. But again, who is this Mr. Leichter? Is he a Nazi? Oh, no, I doubt it. Is he a Zionist? I have a suspicion that he is. But anyway, whatever the persuasion to which he belongs, I think he should have observed the unwritten code of ethics that regulates the conduct of United Nations correspondents. Why is he interested in the expenses entailed in speeches of Member States? West Germany is not a Member of the Organization. I do not think that prosperous West Germany is counting the dollars that it would have to pay were it one day to seek admission to the United Nations. I doubt that that is the reason. Did Mr. Leichter pose such a mischievous question because I have revealed that West Germany, under great pressure from a certain big Power, surreptitiously sold arms to Israel? Is it for this reason that Mr. Leichter has seen fit to raise the inappropriate question of the cost to the Organization when the Saudi Arabian representative takes the floor on this important question of Jerusalem? This is a very subtle and dangerous approach which abuses the freedom of the press. This is licence. It is just like pornography masquerading as art—smut, incestuous pictures that are called art.

32. I have been involved in this question of freedom of information. It was my privilege to be a member of the Committee of Fifteen⁸ which voted by secret ballot, at the Palais de Chaillot, to rewrite the draft convention on freedom of information that had already been worked out by none other than several friends of mine under the chairmanship of General Rómulo of the Philippines in Geneva three years previously. If, by appointing

⁸ Committee on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information.

Mr. Leichter to this post at the United Nations, West Germany saw fit to mollify Zionists who have persistently accused the whole German people of alleged collective guilt during the Nazi era, that is their own business. However, on account of the pervasive influence which Zionists exercise over large segments of the press in the Western world, the United Nations, including the Security Council, can ill afford to accept this kind of subtle practice that may constitute a precedent for other correspondents to wave aside the unwritten code of ethics.

33. Who has pyramided the cost of the General Assembly and Security Council meetings? It has been the Zionists, who have brought pressure to bear on the world community ever since the inception of the Organization, thereby creating an insurmountable problem that has necessitated the holding of hundreds of meetings of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

34. Therefore, the Security Council may well be advised to find out, through the channels available to the Secretary-General, whether or not persons like Mr. Leichter are, under the guise of freedom of information, abusing their privileges as United Nations correspondents. Respect for freedom of information was never meant to confer upon any person the licence for wanton behaviour.

35. Now, I would like to address a few words to our suave friend and colleague Ambassador Yost who, last night, by resorting to the provisional rules of procedure, successfully manoeuvred to prevent the representative of Saudi Arabia from making a statement, which he perforce had to delay until today's meeting. What a waste of the Security Council's time. Overnight my five-minute statement has been compounded tenfold. Our mild-mannered friend, Ambassador Yost, noted for his succinct and well-trimmed statements in the Council, may not personally relish what he considers to be the prolix and discursive interventions of the Saudi Arabian representative. In a friendly manner, other colleagues have suggested that I should speak more succinctly, like the representatives of the great Powers. The great Powers do not have to be prolix and discursive. They act; they do not have to speak much. The Security Council and the United Nations as a whole are just a window dressing for them.

36. My good friend, Mr. Yost, like every one of us, is entitled to his style. "*Le style, c'est l'homme*", said Buffon over 200 years ago—I think it was in 1753—before the *Académie française*. He was a member of the *Académie française*. Ambassador Yost may have been tired last night and under constant tension. That is not unusual for us who live and labour in this hectic city. But sometimes I envy my good friend, Ambassador Yost: he only has to walk across the street to go to his office, and it is only ten minutes to his abode at the Waldorf Astoria. Many of us, whether we are ambassadors or counsellors or secretaries, have to live far from the centre of town because the rents are too high there. It takes us half an hour sometimes to get here because of the snarled traffic, and an hour, sometimes, from Queens. Mr. Yost is privileged. We do not have that privilege. We do not complain. We complained at one time that this was the wrong place for the United Nations Headquarters, but we have to bear our cross. Each one of us has his mission and his problems, like Mr. Yost.

37. Mr. Yost probably did not approve of my figuratively exhibiting in the Council some of the shocking skeletons I produced from the musty historical closets of the deceitful days of Lake Success in 1947 and thereafter regarding the Palestine question, including Jerusalem. If the historical facts I have adduced, and with God's help will continue to adduce in the future, are not relished by some of my friends around this table, I feel sorry for them. The truth hurts. But I ask them: What about the indigenous people of Palestine, who daily are being massacred and subjected to all sorts of indignities because the Zionists, who still wield tremendous influence, especially in certain Western countries, are drunk with power and do not heed the counsel that is being given to them by some of their best friends?

38. In August 1968, the Council met on a European issue. Our colleagues from the Soviet Union and Bulgaria spoke for hours, and on more than two or three occasions we stayed until after midnight listening to the debates. The then representative of the United States and the representatives of other Western Powers who were sitting in the Council did not take exception to the length of the speeches or the lateness of the hour; nobody asked for the early adjournment of the meetings. Is it because the issue was European? Yes, it is because the issue was European that the representatives of the Western Powers sat patiently, "sweating it out", to use an American idiom.

39. Jerusalem is not a European city, and Israel has repeatedly stated that Jerusalem is not negotiable; and we were advised by our Western friends that this question should not have been submitted by Jordan for the consideration of the Council. Jerusalem is not a European city. Do you hear that? But a European issue is very important. I have been here long enough to know what has taken place. I can cite other occasions. You may recall, my dear Ambassador Yost, and I am not saying this derisively, because I have always held you in high esteem—he is not listening—that other representatives have spoken for many hours, much longer than was ever taken by the Saudi Arabian representative on the Palestine question, which affects his country and the whole region—nay, the whole Moslem world. You may not have been in the Council at that time, my dear friend, but on several occasions our erstwhile colleague Mr. Krishna Menon of India spoke for several hours, and tea was served to him in the Council chamber. My good and illustrious friend Sir Zafrullah Khan, in 1947 and for many years thereafter, addressed himself to the Kashmir question and made lengthy speeches in the Council. The representatives of the Western Powers sat patiently, like Egypt's proverbial sphynx, listening, listening, listening—I do not know how attentively, but listening.

40. Have you forgotten, you representatives of Western countries—and I should like to address my good friend, Lord Caradon, too—that your countries and Saudi Arabia enjoy very good economic relations? And you, my dear friend, Ambassador Yost, you had always given us the genuine impression that you genuinely understood the predicament in which the Arabs find themselves in the Middle East. I sometimes wonder what is happening to cause some of our best friends to treat us so abruptly. Maybe it is because we are weak.

41. Now I want to tackle this gentleman on my right. It is high time the Council realized that Israel has not budged from the position it took when in the Knesset it enacted legislation to merge Jerusalem with Israel. I think that, if you should respect Mr. Tekoah for anything, it is for his blunt statement—and I am paraphrasing what he said—that Jerusalem is no longer negotiable. The Council is busying itself with resolutions, but it does not act. Israel says, "Jerusalem is not negotiable."

42. The Arabs have always treated the Jews with exemplary chivalry throughout their long history. The Jews were expelled from Europe, by the European countries represented at this table. The Jews were expelled from England in 1290, from France in 1394, from Austria in 1490, from Spain in 1492, from most of Germany in 1519 and from Russia—that is, Czarist Russia—in 1727. Why? Those were the Middle Ages. The Christians were intolerant to one another; so why should they not be intolerant to the Jews? Those were the Dark Ages, the ages of European intolerance. When in Spain Arab culture flourished the Jews were respected all over the land.

43. Hitler was indeed a godsend to Zionism. I do not know why they complain. Russia seems to like its citizens regardless of their religion, and I think the majority of Russian Jews are loyal Soviet citizens. They have made their mark in the Soviet hierarchy. Why are the Jews now clamouring and using all kinds of pressure on the Soviet Union? They want the Soviet Union to expel the Jews—and the Soviet Union does not want to expel the Jews who are loyal citizens—so that they may replenish Israel with more immigrants, expand all over the Middle East and enslave it economically. If they can wield their influence and exert their efforts in such a great country as the United States, my good colleague from the Soviet Union should not belittle what they could still do inside his country.

44. I will read from a book by Sumner Welles, a former Secretary of State of this host country. I quote from his book entitled *We Need Not Fail*, published in Boston in 1948; Mr. Welles wrote:

"By direct order of the White House every form of pressure, direct and indirect, was brought to bear by American officials upon those countries outside the Moslem world"—that is significant, "outside the Moslem world"—"that were . . . either uncertain or opposed to partition"—the partition of Palestine. "Representatives or intermediaries were employed by the White House to make sure that the necessary majority would at length be secured."⁹

I am not going to encumber the Council with more quotations about what took place: the pressure that was brought to bear through cardinals and prelates in Latin America, the pressure that was brought to bear on Asian countries that were in dire need of economic aid in the wake of the Second World War. They were threatened with the cutting off of their aid. You wonder how Israel succeeded in being created. It was by pressure, and in one of the countries that emerged as the greatest military Power after the Second World War.

⁹ Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1948, p. 63.

45. I was introduced to Bernard Baruch in this country. He gave me and others to understand that he was opposed to Zionism, but they played on his sentiments. I may be allowed to read a very short excerpt from a book entitled *Trial and Error* by none other than the first President of Israel, Mr. Chaim Weizmann, published by Harper and Brothers in 1949, in which he states: "Bernard Baruch, who at one time was opposed to Zionism, was pressurized by Mr. Chaim Weizmann and others." In his book Mr. Weizmann refers to Bernard Baruch as being very "helpful to us in many respects, and used his influence freely in our favour." Mr. Baruch was considered to be the best friend of successive Presidents of the United States, seven of them during his lifetime. That is what the Arabs are contending with: pressure from within the Western States. Gentlemen, how can we expect you to render justice unto the indigenous people of Palestine or to preserve the integrity of the Holy City of Jerusalem?

46. I should like to quote a few other excerpts from that very well-written analytical book by Barnet Litvinoff,¹⁰ for the benefit of our colleague from Israel, if he has not already read it. I tried to buy a few copies to give to friends. I went to several book shops and they told me there was not a single copy. Sometimes I wonder whether the Zionists in the United States have bought out the book. This is what Barnet Litvinoff said:

"Israel fell within no natural grouping of peoples, no regional grouping of States, no economic union, no historical association. It would have been an embarrassment to the great Powers if she had died, but it was an embarrassment to them also that she lived. . . . Israel was the world's problem child, to be visited regularly, frequently flattered, but not accepted as normal."

47. We are dealing with an abnormal State. How can it be normal when it is surrounded by hostile peoples, when the whole Moslem world is now conscious of the fact that it may lose Jerusalem, at least for the time being? And if it is one day recovered, who has the assurance that Jerusalem will not have been razed and become a dream of the past?

48. Mr. Litvinoff also says in his book: "The Israelis could eat because the Jews of the world poured their funds into Israel." In our tradition we would never let a stranger in our midst go hungry, whether he be Jew or Gentile. But who is feeding the aggressor and where do the bulk of the funds come from, except from Western countries, and mainly from our friends, the people of the United States, whether Jews or Christians?

49. Mr. Eban came from South Africa. I have been told that Mr. Tekoah hails from Shanghai. Others came from Russia. Other Zionists hailed from Poland. Very few came from France or the United States; the Jews are happy there. But Barnet Litvinoff talks to us again:

"South African Jews mourned the death of Dr. Verwoerd, the apostle of *apartheid*, as though they had forgotten their own previous history and had not themselves suffered the penalties of segregation."

¹⁰ Barnet Litvinoff, *A Peculiar People* (New York, Weybright and Talley, 1969).

50. It is appropriate, so that we may understand the ethos of the Zionists, to burden you with another quotation from Barnet Litvinoff, since his book is not available. He says:

"The Arab-Israeli war of 1967 brought even the most fiercely internationalists into a sudden awareness of themselves as Jews, to the point of willingness by some to intervene voluntarily in the Middle East where they defied the law to keep out of the Far East. The point has been noted in America."

I wonder to what extent it "has been noted in America."

51. In conclusion, I want to reaffirm before the Council that if the United Nations does not act with dispatch and procrastinates, as it has done for the last 20 years, there is no assurance that there will not be a world conflict.

52. Asia is a dormant giant. We would like to see that giant, when it awakes, develop in an orderly fashion. But colonialism by proxy and under various guises, whether it be in the Far East or in the Middle East, does not augur well for humanity. The Western countries, whether they are in Europe or in the new hemisphere, must realize that you can kill a person but you cannot tread wantonly on the dignity of peoples. The Palestinian people—and forget that they are Arabs—have awakened. They are now a ferment in the whole Middle East, a ferment that may cause a lot of suffering to the Arabs themselves and ultimately to the Jews, which would be deplorable.

53. But there is no escaping the fact that all the might of States cannot crush a people. We have witnessed this on the other side of Asia in regard to a people who have no sophisticated weapons, who have only the will to fight in order to preserve their integrity as a people. This should serve as a lesson to us, no matter from what continent we hail, that our only hope is through the United Nations; not in an academic manner, but in such a way that we may turn a new page in implementing our decisions, rather than adopting resolutions which seem to be only an exercise in futility. If the big Powers mean what they say about wanting to bring peace to the Middle East, it behoves them to keep silent and to act before it is too late.

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

55. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*translated from French*): In bringing the question of Jerusalem before the Security Council, the Government of Jordan has in fact raised a basic problem of international law, or a problem of law purely and simply—namely, can force and the policy of fait accompli properly constitute the basis of relations between States and between human beings. At the same time, the representative of Jordan has raised a question as to the *raison d'être* of the United Nations which, under the terms of its Charter, is the guarantor of the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of justice and international law. For what, in fact, is the situation? The Arab city of Jerusalem is under military occupation. Furthermore, despite resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of

the General Assembly and resolution 252 (1968) of the Security Council, the occupation system is being perfected and, under the very eyes of the international community, it is gradually being transformed into a system of annexation. Thus, the situation is perfectly simple. It is exceptionally clear and, were it not for a premeditated attempt to distract the attention of the members of the Security Council and the world public, it would not call for speeches but for determined, clear-cut and effective action to restore the law.

56. So far as speeches are concerned, no member of this Council has ever spared any efforts in denouncing the flagrant violation by Israel of international law and the Security Council decisions. But as for action, there has been none, or at least not yet. Indeed, we already have grounds to fear that the well-known saying that the road to hell is paved with good intentions now applies to the way this important body of the United Nations is, more or less consciously, allowing matters to go. The decisions which the Council takes from time to time on dangerous situations soon afterwards seem like expressions of a momentary impulse and not of a determined will to rectify the course of events and restore law. For, whenever the Council has to take decisions, on Rhodesia, Namibia or the Middle East, it gives the impression of lacking sufficient conviction to ensure compliance with them, as the letter of the Charter empowers it to do and the spirit of the Charter indeed requires it to do.

57. It remains to be hoped that with regard to Jerusalem the Council will go beyond academic condemnations and see to it that all measures tending to change the legal status of Jerusalem—and this is certainly the case with the measures which are the subject of the Jordanian complaint—are not only declared null and void in law, but are annulled and redressed in fact. Nearly a thousand million Moslems expect the Council to assume its responsibilities, and not give the unbridled fanaticism of a few people time to provoke the religious feelings of many hundreds of millions of human beings. They expect the four great Powers, by virtue of the special responsibilities conferred on them by the Charter, to discharge their duties toward international morality and all States Members of the United Nations. We—all of us who are States Members of the United Nations—have, in signing the Charter, agreed to grant to them and recognize their pre-eminent role in the maintenance of international peace and security. We feel today that we are being deceived to a certain extent, since the legal obligations of the parties concerned, although honoured in words and by good intentions, are nevertheless forgotten as soon as it comes to putting them in practice. Those who proclaim themselves to be the defenders of freedom and peace should no longer, under the pressure of interest groups whose power is deplorable in its scope, call the occupation of Jerusalem “unification beneficial to the entire city”. Let them call the occupation “occupation”; let them denounce it unequivocally and, above all, take action to restore the law in order to remain true to their own moral image of themselves and—what matters more from our standpoint—to the obligations which they have assumed under the terms of the Charter.

58. The members of the Council will therefore understand why I shall not dwell too long on the arguments of a

technical nature advanced here by the representative of Israel. There are two basic reasons which prompt me not to abuse your attention by consideration of a false problem whose nature in any case is, I am sure, quite clear to you. The first reason is that, in the history of occupation throughout the ages, other occupiers of baneful memory have produced the same arguments about unification, social and economic integration, and the happiness of the victims, in order to justify and perpetuate their annexations by force and violence. A certain modesty bids us leave it to those who have expounded at length to you the secrets of their organizing and modernizing genius, as applied in Jerusalem for the supreme objective of its advancement, to reflect themselves on the moral disaster to which the arrogance of force has led them. Nevertheless, we cannot conceal our astonishment at the scant attention which the representative of Israel seems to pay to history or, for that matter, to the present. He seems to have forgotten that Nazi Germany, too, reached hitherto unknown heights in the field of technical and scientific progress. But at what price? The representative of Israel knows very well. He seems to have overlooked the current events which we Africans, and the world with us, have been living through for eight years, for he apparently forgets the incredible economic power which racist South Africa has in fact built up. But at what price? At the price, we are obliged to recall, of the enslavement of 12 million human beings.

59. My second reason for not dwelling on this line of argument is our love of reason and justice, and of an international order based on these two standards. This compelling reason alone makes it incumbent upon my country not to remain silent in the face of the Israeli authorities' defiance of the Council, the United Nations and world public opinion. To remain silent today would prevent us from conferring the moral weight and due sense of responsibility on our voice and judgement tomorrow, when faced with events that are tragic for world peace.

60. These are the reasons which have led us to take part in this debate and to bring it to the main point at issue which, for us, is respect for the Charter of the United Nations, the denunciation of annexation and right of conquest, and the determination of the international community not only to deplore injustice, but to fight it and prevent it.

61. We are aware that a carefully preserved myth has been to some extent instrumental in presenting Israel as a country in a constant state of self-defence. Israel has used this myth to perpetrate successfully acts of aggression against its neighbours and to put into practice the expansionist plans worked out and executed by the master minds of Zionism. Today, this myth is disappearing, and what has recently occurred in Jerusalem is the best illustration of the true face of the State of Israel. In the case of Jerusalem, the narrowest religious fanaticism goes hand in hand with the most arrogant racial fanaticism. As a result of the impunity guaranteed by the prejudice in its favour, Israel, as the Jordanian representative has clearly explained, has not only undertaken the final annexation of the Arab quarter of Jerusalem, but has also deliberately prejudiced the peaceful and harmonious coexistence of religions which made that place a source of light and inspiration for hundreds of millions of human beings living in every continent and belonging to all races and political systems.

62. The laws promulgated by Tel Aviv to regulate the life and administrative and social organization of the Arab city reaffirm, by a further upsurge of racism, the tendencies already displayed by the Israelis in the rest of occupied Palestine. They can be summed up as follows: the superiority of the chosen people, the superiority of its faith over that of others, and the right it assumes of doing whatever seems likely to promote that faith at the expense of everything else, including the social, economic, cultural and political rights of peoples, in other words at the expense of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

63. The Council is aware that the situation in Jerusalem has aroused not only the Arab countries, but all Moslem peoples and all who are attached to the great human values. We believe that the Council should face up to the situation energetically and realistically. The facts are plain. Moreover, the representatives of Israel are not concealing them. In their eyes, the only right is the right of conquest and the Security Council is nothing more than a body designed to produce such texts as will meet the requirements of easily satisfied consciences. For example, this morning the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel reiterated the Israeli position in a formula which is both simple and clearcut. He said: "Whatever the decision of the Security Council, Israel will not give up Jerusalem, which will remain a unified city." This statement is an open defiance of the Security Council and the United Nations. The Council must take up the challenge which in fact sums up the entire Israeli philosophy on the problem of the Middle East as a whole, and the solution of the problem may depend on the Council's action today because if the Council showed its determination, Israel would then understand that the right of conquest and the policy of the fait accompli are unacceptable.

64. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I invite the representative of the Sudan to take a place at the Council table, and I give him the floor.

65. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): Mr. President, I am grateful to you and to the members of the Security Council for affording me this opportunity of addressing the Council on the question of Jerusalem. I do not come before this Council as the representative of a member state of the Arab League although the history and culture of my people have been part of the history and culture of the Arabs, and the destiny of my country will remain indissolubly with the destiny of the Arab world. Nor do I come before you as the representative of a State in which the majority of the population is Moslem to protest in the name of Islam against the Israeli occupation of Moslem Jerusalem and the wanton desecration of Moslem shrines. I have not come here as the representative of an Arab country or of a Moslem State. I come before the Council as the representative of a nation, of a people whose voice will not be still in the face of the persistent expansionism of Israel, its occupation of the Arab lands and its ruthless oppression of the Arab people in Jerusalem and out of Jerusalem, wherever the armies of Israel hold sway in the occupied Arab lands.

66. I come to protest and to plead, to protest in the name of the Government of the Sudan that Israel should be

permitted by the Security Council to continue its wanton defiance of the decisions of the Council and to plead in the name of the people of the Sudan with all the members of the Council as men of conscience to try to see that the judgement they have passed, the decision that they took on 21 May 1968 [*resolution 252 (1968)*], is not made void by the actions that Israel is taking day after day to perpetuate its occupation. Israel has been allowed to defy this Organization for too long; there must be a limit. At some time a halt must be called.

67. To the Arabs, to the Palestinians especially, this pleading may well sound like a cry in the wilderness, for was not Israel conceived and did it not come into being as a result of the disregard for the rights of the people of Palestine to their homeland? The chronicle of the tragedy of Palestine has often been recounted, but it bears repetition. Let us remind ourselves of the rape of Palestine and the dispersal of the Palestinians. At the time of the Balfour Declaration on 2 November 1917 there were 57,000 Jews in Palestine, many of whom regarded themselves as Arabs, though of the Jewish faith. In 1922 there were 84,000 Jews in Palestine. They owned only 2.5 per cent of the land. Yet when Israel came into being it took by force land which was in excess of the area assigned to the Jewish State by the United Nations by 36 per cent. More than half of the Palestine refugees came from the areas that Israel had taken by force. This is the injustice that the Palestinians will never forget as long as there are Palestinians on the face of this earth; and there are Palestinians, in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister of Israel would prefer to ignore their existence.

68. The Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, with the disregard for the truth that has become the distinguishing characteristic of Israeli leaders, was reported the other day to have denied that there was such an entity as Palestine. "Where are the Palestinians?" she asked. The answer is not far to seek or hard to find. The Palestinians fill the refugee camps, living in misery and deprivation—but now with hope, since they are now fighting back. The Palestinians are scattered throughout the Arab world, living as brothers and compatriots in the host countries. But in the depths of their souls there is yearning, yearning for their return to Palestine. Many Palestinians are now living outside the Arab countries. But whether they are in camps in Arab countries or outside them, there is one burning, persistent idea that unites them all: the idea of their return.

69. Mrs. Meir and the Israeli leaders must know and fear the relentless and driving force of this idea which, in the case of the Palestinians, is not based on myth or legend but is part of the living and bitter memory of two generations. The legend of the return of the Jews to Israel, unlike the return of the Palestinians, goes back, of course, as we all know, to time immemorial and lends itself, as we all know, to many inspirational, if fictitious, additions. However, if we leave the realm of myths, we shall find that present-day Jews cannot make a reasonable claim to any racial continuity with the ancient Hebrews and the Judeans, no reasonable claim that would endow them with a title to the land of Palestine. It is, of course, true that many of the ancient Judeans remained on the land; they remained and became Hellenized, they became Christians, some were converted to Islam. Those who went into the Diaspora

eventually became indistinguishable from the members of the various communities amongst which they lived. This is such a self-evident truth that one wonders why it has often been denied. It is very rarely that a normal person can distinguish a Jew by merely looking at him. Those who claim the ability to do so resort to esoteric criteria that do not really merit serious consideration. One may claim that facts are immutable and obstinate, as we all have done; but if the mind is fed on legend it ceases to be receptive and becomes impervious to truth. Such a mind Tolstoy likens to a grain-bin with a hole in its bottom: you keep pouring grain into it but the grain falls through. The grain-bin has a hole and will not hold any grain. So is the mind that is blinded by myth and legend. Thus many Jews persist in perpetuating the legend of their return to Israel and of their right to return. The facts do not substantiate their case. Yet this belief forms the mainstay of the Zionist polemic, advanced so often in resonant tones with the admonishing finger pointing at those who dare to doubt, and in the tones of awe-inspiring prophecy. This is what legend feeds upon: the quivering voice, the wordy words, the rhetorical questions, are the substance of the spurious claims of Israel to Jerusalem.

70. Let us discard the mythology for a while and face the facts of the situation now before us. The Council, Mr. President, is primarily and properly concerned with the rights—the political rights, the human rights—of the people of Jerusalem. The Government of Israel and its spokesmen have sought to treat this issue as if it were one of purely religious significance, as if it had nothing to do with the title of the Arabs to Jerusalem. Thus, a few months after the Israeli conquest, namely in the month of October 1967, the Israeli Government started to put into effect plans for what they called the reconstruction of the city. In January 1968, *The New York Times* correspondent in Jerusalem reported that the Israeli Government “expropriated 838 acres of the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem, essentially to ensure Jewish settlement in the Old City”. After mentioning that the dispossessed Arab inhabitants would be compensated, he went on to say, “Israeli leaders have always considered the settlement of their people on a controversial land the surest means of ensuring retention of the area”. Yet, while appropriating the land, the Israeli Government spokesman was at pains to emphasize that “neither Church nor Moslem religious property was involved in the action”. This is from *The New York Times* of 12 January 1968. It was then that the pattern was set for disregarding the essential injustice of dispossessing people of their property under the guise of “town-planning” and “slum-clearance” and emphasizing that religious sites were not involved—as if the interest of the Arab inhabitants and of the world in Jerusalem need only be concerned with the preservation of religious sites and access to religious shrines. Article 2 of Israel’s Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law, annexed to the Secretary-General’s report of 11 April 1969 [S/9149], reaffirms this point of view.

71. The razing of Arab homes, as again reported in *The New York Times*, this time of 16 June 1969, is explained by the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs as follows: “The eviction and demolition orders followed a finding by Jerusalem engineers that the buildings were a danger to

public safety.” Again it is reported that compensations were offered and accepted by the former Arab inhabitants, except for an isolated troublesome case. Yet one wonders why the first foreign newsmen to reach this area of demolition were forcibly removed by military policemen, as reported in *The New York Times*. One wonders indeed why Mr. Kolleck, the Israeli Mayor of Jerusalem, as reported this time in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 1 July 1969, described the seizure of the Arab houses in Jerusalem as “an unattractive feature”. How could they be an unattractive feature, if that seizure had followed a finding by the Jerusalem engineers that the buildings were a danger to public safety? If it was an act of slum clearance that the authorities had undertaken with full compensation, there should have been no need for the Mayor to apologize for this example of Israeli care and beneficence, no need for the Mayor to describe this act as “an unattractive feature”.

72. There is no doubt that this unattractive action by the Israeli authorities was in violation of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, which resolution, after having deplored the failure of Israel to comply with General Assembly resolutions on Jerusalem, explicitly stated that the Council considered all legislature and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel—including expropriation of land and properties therein—which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem as invalid.

73. The Secretary-General, who was asked by the Security Council to report on the implementation of that resolution calling upon Israel to rescind measures already taken and to desist from taking any further action which tended to change the status of Jerusalem, reported that he had been denied any means of obtaining first-hand information. The reply to his request for information on the steps taken on the implementation of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) was couched, as we see from the report, in such off-hand and negative terms as to indicate the utter futility of any further pursuit of his quest for information.

74. The culmination of these acts of defiance was the transfer of the Israeli police headquarters from Tel Aviv to East Jerusalem. This act is described in *The New York Times* of 2 July as “the boldest move so far in the two-year effort by Israeli officials to solidify their administrative annexation of the Arab sector”. The transfer of the police headquarters to East Jerusalem, according to press reports, is expected to be followed by arrangements to transfer the Ministry of Justice and the Supreme Court, thus progressively and systematically achieving the execution of the Israeli plan of total annexation.

75. Meanwhile, the Government of Israel had proclaimed laws and administrative ordinances designed to legalize and regularize its annexation of Jerusalem. Those Israeli laws were so adequately dealt with by Mr. El-Farra of Jordan in his statement before the Council on 30 June 1969 [1482nd meeting] that there is no need for me to make reference to them in detail. I should only wish to emphasize the conviction of my delegation that such laws and regulations cannot be recognized by the United Nations as valid, and that any claims arising from their application cannot be entertained. One is gratified indeed to note that this is an opinion with which almost all those who have spoken in this debate concurred.

76. On the other hand, one has also heard in this debate various expressions of deprecation of the resort to violence by the Palestinians. One has repeatedly heard that violence would lead to reprisal from the Israeli Government, and that reprisal would breed more violence, so that the atmosphere would be completely unsuitable for the efforts directed towards the achievement of a peaceful solution. That argument would have been more convincing if it were to demonstrate that the parties to the dispute were all willing to seek a peaceful solution and abide by their obligations in this regard.

77. The Israeli protestations of peace are so profuse and so frequent, so hedged in with reservations, as to be devoid of any content. Indeed, it is quite futile to consider Israeli peace pronouncements as bearing any reference to their real intentions. It was not an Israeli publicist who first discovered the value of double-talk, the hoax of proclaiming peaceful intentions while pursuing aggressive policies; but Israel has certainly learned the lesson well.

“It is only recently”—says Foreign Minister Abba Eban—“that we have noticed a tendency to regard our country’s territorial configuration as a lonely and supreme criterion, ignoring the parallel problems of its human composition, its spiritual ethos, its Jewish singularity and its poignant but undying passion for peace . . .”.

That is “Ebanese” for saying “we want peace just as everybody else, but we have to expand a little to be able to make it stick”. It is the same sentiment as expressed by Mr. Moshe Dayan in terms more in keeping with the forthright image of the Minister of Defence, when he said on 27 June 1969, addressing a meeting of industrialists in Jerusalem:

“We are not talking of minor rectifications of the border, but of major ones. . . . This is our homeland, and if I say homeland I mean also Nablus and Jericho.”

Mr. Dayan was also reported to have spoken of retaining half the Sinai Peninsula. As for the Golan Heights, he said that it was no longer negotiable. “We consider it as part of Israel, like the Jezreel Valley or the Galilee”—no longer negotiable.

78. If Jerusalem is not negotiable, if the Golan Heights are not negotiable, and if Nablus and Jericho and half the Sinai Peninsula are to be considered part of the Israeli homeland, what are the Arabs to do? What are the Palestinians to do? They are asked to pursue a policy of peace. They are asked, and indeed they have done so, to come with their complaint to the Security Council as guardian of peace. This they have done. They have done it in relation to the whole area of the conflict and specifically in relation to Jerusalem. These overtures of peace, this readiness to make peace, Israel has repudiated and rejected. Let us not forget that it was after the Arab Governments had declared their acceptance of the Security Council resolution calling for withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Arab territories that the Defence Minister of Israel declared most of those territories to be part of the Israeli homeland. The Secretary-General of the United Nations was brusquely told, in

response to his request for compliance with Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968: “the matter remains as set forth in the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs on 10 July 1967”. [See S/9149, para. 3.] That was the reply by the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General. Yet some voices are raised in this Council, not in support of its resolutions; some voices are raised, not to deprecate the erosion of the authority of the United Nations, not to call for measures that would make Israel comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, but in lamentation that there is so much violence in the Holy Land.

79. Israeli leaders have repeatedly said that they plan for a long stay in the occupied Arab territories and in Jerusalem indefinitely. The *fedayeen* cannot be blamed for making it plain to them that the land belongs to the people of Palestine.

80. The Foreign Minister of Israel, in an article published in *The Jerusalem Post* of 9 June 1969, thought it prudent to dismiss an essay entitled “Colonization at its Height” that appeared in *Ha’aretz* of 3 June 1969 as evidencing shallow pseudo-intellectualism, but it is interesting to recall in this connexion the reference made by the representative of Iraq [1484th meeting] to Israel’s dreams of glory and colonial ambition, what the representative of Iraq referred to as the “Zionist’s burden”. It is interesting because Mr. Eban states that that article hinted that Israel’s manifest destiny may be at hand while its belated part of the white man’s burden remains to be fulfilled under the guise of restoring Zion. The violence of the *fedayeen* must warn at least such extremist Israelis dreaming of their white man’s burden that their particular brand of the white man’s burden would not be easy to bear.

81. The term “city of peace”, a favourite expression in the Council, is already beginning to sound like a mockery as the persistent provocation of the occupation authorities continues to intensify the mistrust and fear and the violence. The Israelis must surely know that the Arab people, the Palestinians, cannot be subjected to the wilful repression of Israel indefinitely and without any hope of reprieve simply because it is in the interest of Israel’s security to hold on to the land it has occupied. The Israeli Government must surely be aware that immense pressures are building throughout the Arab world for the complete relinquishment of the peace effort. The Security Council, in order to forestall the deterioration of the situation, must find a way to ensure the implementation of its resolutions. Otherwise the peace effort will lead nowhere.

82. There must be a more effective way besides addressing appeals and exhortations to the Security Council to shoulder its primary responsibility, the preservation of world peace. I remember the last time I spoke before the Council, on 18 June 1969, addressing to it yet another appeal to act in Southern Rhodesia for the achievement of peace and justice [1478th meeting]. I remember that as I spoke on that occasion I watched the hardened and set expressions of those who knew what they were doing and could not be persuaded to do otherwise. Is one doomed always to meet with such adamant resistance? Is there no hope for justice in this world?

83. Mr. Abba Eban wrote in the article I just quoted: "History works not in logic or precision but in irony. It was Israel's very stability that brought about the destruction of the Middle Eastern security system." If history works in irony, the over-extended borders of Israel may yet represent for it the greatest danger it has ever encountered.

84. One might ask here why this quest for peace in the Middle East has been so unrewarding. May it be that even those of us who are genuinely searching for a peaceful solution are looking for it in the wrong place? It is our conviction that, whatever the outcome of this debate, whatever action the Security Council may decide to take on this issue, it would not by such action alone achieve peace in the Middle East. Peace will not reign in the Middle East even if the Arab nations decide to negotiate its terms with Israel. There will not be peace in the Middle East even if Israel were to decide to relinquish its hold on Jerusalem, withdraw from Sinai and abandon the Golan heights. There will not be peace in the Middle East even if the Arabs decide to take Israel unto their bosom, to end their trade boycott and to allow Israeli shipping freely to ply the waterways. There will not be peace with the Arabs as long as there is no peace in Palestine, as long as peace is not made with the Palestinians. If peace is not made with the Palestinians, we should all know that they will not lay down their arms.

85. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now invite the representative of Morocco to take a place at the Council table and I call on him to speak.

86. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): At its meeting yesterday [1484th meeting] the Council was kind enough to give my delegation sufficient time to set forth its views on the question before it. Yesterday, I felt satisfied that I had said everything that my Government had to say on the subject. I am taking the floor once again today merely to exercise my right of reply to the statement made by the representative of Israel at the end of yesterday's meeting when he attacked my country and myself in abusive terms.

87. I believe that there is no greater moral satisfaction than to express the views of one's country on a problem when they coincide with one's personal convictions and moral views. I did this yesterday with fervour, enthusiasm and a sense of responsibility. I am aware that the right of reply gives those who have recourse to the rules of procedure an opportunity of reverting to the substance of a problem. I can assure you, Mr. President, that I have no intention of using it for this purpose, nor do I wish to take the floor in order to reply to personal abuse. Wisdom is always of permanent value, irrespective of its source, but aspersions have force only when they come from those who have the moral authority to cast aspersions. I believe that the person responsible for the abuse addressed to me does not deserve a reply from me.

88. In replying, I would have preferred to take up the points raised yesterday by Mr. Tekoah in a different order: however, yesterday, for once, he used a subtle rhetorical device, developing his remarks about the Moroccan delegation in a kind of *crescendo* as he went on, and I should like to reply along the same lines, but using a different tone.

89. He began by saying that the previous day he had listened to a number of Arab delegations and that yesterday the chorus had been joined also by Morocco. I am gratified to have had the opportunity of appearing on a list of speakers which, compared with all the other Council debates, was unusually long, and also before and after a number of distinguished persons representing very important States. Today, I am particularly pleased to take the floor at a meeting where the representative of Afghanistan not only brought to bear the traditional authority of his country's views, but also his own personal authority as former President of the General Assembly.

90. However, although I did join the chorus of Arab delegations, the representative of Israel could have spared himself this reply today. So many delegations have taken the floor on the problem, and other delegations from other continents have joined in defending the legitimacy of our argument regarding the Holy Places in Jerusalem, that his Government should have learned an important and logical lesson from the fact that a great many delegations representing 700 million Moslems in every continent throughout the world have today denounced its violations of international law and warned it of the consequences of this course of action. While many Arabs have taken the floor today, the representative of Israel unfortunately stands alone; there is no chorus on his side; he only has for him the cohorts of General Dayan's troops who invade Arab territory and undermine the spiritual values of Jerusalem. I am therefore happy to have joined the chorus, and I note that he is alone, this time more than ever, in the Council.

91. Mr. Tekoah also said:

"... the representative of Morocco has also come before the Security Council to distort history, to deliver himself of anti-Jewish epithets and personal aspersions, and to tell us that we Jews have no right to live in liberty in our own homeland" [1484th meeting, para. 231].

I shall not retrace the course of history and remind him that first of all there is no anti-Jewish tradition in Morocco. For a very long time, the Moroccan land has been a place of asylum where not only Jews as such, but the Jewish religion as a spiritual force, have found paternal protection and a legitimate place by the side of the Moslem religion, since they derive from the same source, the Kaaba, from which the word went forth to the shores of the Atlantic in the Judaic as well as the Moslem revelation. That tradition has been respected to this day. There are more synagogues in my country than mosques in the rest of the non-Moslem world. But, as soon as the hand of Israel was placed upon Jerusalem, the destruction of mosques began, and I am not optimistic about Israel's intentions with regard to those which remain.

92. When I took the floor yesterday, I did not point out that the Israelis had also destroyed the Moroccan Quarter built with the religious donations made for centuries by old Moroccan families to pilgrims from Mecca. I deliberately refrained from mentioning the material interests of my country in order to stress the contribution which a Moslem country like my own made to safeguard and protect the

Holy Places. Neither do I think that there were any personal attacks against Jews. At yesterday's meeting, I mentioned the names of three Jews: Mr. Tekoah, Mrs. Golda Meir and Mr. Abba Eban, and I only mentioned those names in order to stress their very recent origin in Palestine and to ask them whether they have any greater right than some Palestinians who have been in Jerusalem for 1,500 years. I do not think that references to these rights can be construed as anti-Jewish abuse. I also mentioned Mr. Rafael and Mr. Eban and said that in other circumstances, at a time when Israel still had some compunction about camouflaging its policies, talented representatives came before the Council to convey, more or less ably—and sheltering behind a screen of rhetoric—the intentions which have been very clumsily conveyed by Mr. Tekoah. I do not believe that by failing to extend this same compliment to Mr. Tekoah, I was involving myself in a personal attack.

93. The representative of Israel finally said, with regard to the statements by Arab delegations: "The one who surpassed all in this arrogance was the representative of Morocco". I welcome the superlative used in my regard and find that Mr. Tekoah has either lost his level-headedness or that my arguments were particularly cogent, and I can assure him that in future I shall try to surpass myself. But if he wishes to talk about arrogance, I can refer him to all the statements made by Morocco during the 13 years that we have been Members of the United Nations, as well as to the statements made by Moroccan delegations at international conferences. Unfortunately, here as elsewhere, we have had regrettable confrontations with very many countries, and on occasion, painful controversies with some representatives, when we defended the direct interests of our country or joined with other delegations in defending general principles of law and respect for the principles of the Charter. And I challenge Mr. Tekoah to find in any right of reply exercised after an intervention by the delegation of Morocco any statement by any representative with whom we were not in agreement to the effect that we were arrogant in our statements or replies. This is the first time that the term arrogance has been used with regard to a delegation which, despite its standpoint, has traditionally conducted itself with courtesy, frankness and authority and has brought those qualities to bear in every debate. I therefore challenge the representative of Israel to find a single reply accusing us of arrogance since we have been members of international organizations.

94. I used the term arrogance at the beginning of my statement; I see that when I used it at the beginning of yesterday's meeting as one gives a blank cheque, he countersigned it later. The delegation of Israel often resorts to a certain kind of tactic: when it has exhausted its arguments on a specific topic and sees that the Council is not following its digressions, it immediately launches into accusations of anti-Semitism, historical in nature, on the part of the Arab countries. Unfortunately, Mr. Tekoah chose a poor example yesterday when he said that "in Morocco . . . Jews have lived for centuries in misery and persecution" [*ibid.*, *para. 232*]. Without going very far back into history, I should like to remind him that when the Arabs left Spain—and it was not as conquerors—350,000 Spanish Jews—and it was not the tradition of certain Jewish communities to follow the vanquished—

crossed the Straits of Gibraltar of their own free will and settled in Morocco where they have remained to this day. There, they were given not only protection, but also Moroccan nationality of which they could take full advantage, in complete equality with other Moroccan citizens up to the present time. Some of them became ministers, scholars and high public officials. On the other hand, I do not believe that Israel offers much hope to any Palestinian Arab of participating in the administration of Jerusalem or Palestine at any level whatsoever. I could remind Mr. Tekoah that at the time when the whole of Europe was under the yoke of nazism and when hundreds of thousands of Jews were leaving Europe to the satisfaction of many European leaders, the doors of my country were open to them. I remember that when I was a child in 1941, four schools were closed in my native town so that the families of Polish Jews could live in them. Many of them are still in Morocco today. I should also like to say that the ruler of Morocco, who did not enjoy all sovereign privileges at that time, had refused to receive the Armistice Commission and had also declined to sign legislation submitted to him by the Vichy Authorities containing discriminatory provisions against Moroccan Jews. The sovereign of Morocco said: "These Jews are of Moroccan nationality, and no authority other than Morocco has the right to legislate in any manner regarding their fate".

95. At the time, Jewish authorities much more important than Mr. Tekoah paid tribute publicly to the sovereign of my country and today I can assure him that young Israelites who have not left Morocco, but are staying there and building their future with confidence and developing their interests peacefully, have much more confidence in the future of Morocco than in the future of Israel.

96. Finally, the representative of Israel accused the representative of Morocco of arrogating to itself the right to speak on behalf of Christianity, and he mentioned a number of eminent Church leaders to whom I certainly made no reference in my statement yesterday. He stated that I had mentioned the names of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Patriarch of the Church of Ethiopia, and Catholic and Protestant theologians. At no time—and the record of yesterday's meeting will bear me out—did I mention names. It is true that I referred to certain statements by the Cardinal of São Paulo, and notwithstanding the respect I feel for the Cardinal and his authority, since Mr. Tekoah had himself referred to statements by certain Christian leaders in support of certain of his arguments, I had the right to refer to those statements in order to place them in their proper context and prevent hasty conclusions being drawn from the statements which certainly do not have the meaning Mr. Tekoah has tried to attribute to them. In any case, as far as the Patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church is concerned, I believe that the authorities who are qualified to speak on behalf of the Orthodox Church have brought certain statements to the notice of the members of the Council in which their point of view on Jerusalem is clearly set forth. I am sure that when Mr. Tekoah has studied these statements, he will refrain from rushing to draw conclusions from statements by the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church, in the way he did yesterday.

97. In conclusion, I would not wish to leave the accusation of anti-Semitism levelled against me personally without a reply. In fact, I assume full responsibility for what I said about Zionism. The language I speak is rich enough for me to use still more violent terms with regard to Zionism. However, in my delegation there is a tradition of choosing the most moderate terms, despite the richness of the vocabulary at its disposal, even when condemning vigorously. I condemned Zionism in those terms, and I challenge Mr. Tekoah to point to anything I may have said, here or elsewhere, which could be construed as anti-Jewish. Once more, we are confronted by a strategy worked out by the Israeli delegation which is aware that anti-Semitism throughout the world is its sole asset. Thus, when tolerance prevails in the United Nations, they revive, provoke and create in some countries with Jewish colonies conditions which, if the authorities are unable to control the population, can legitimately give rise on occasion to difficulties which can be exploited afterwards.

98. I believe that the wisdom of Morocco has always prevented Israel from using this strategem and it never had an opportunity of doing so. Certainly, some Israelites have left Morocco; some did so before my country became independent and we bear no responsibility for that. Two reasons may be adduced in the case of those who left afterwards: as Moroccan nationals, the Jews of Morocco have the right, like any other Moroccan, with their passport, to take a plane and to go where they wish. This is what many have done. Others perhaps went to Israel out of enthusiasm. We did not try to suppress this enthusiasm. Some young people of about 20 years of age were fired by a new idea and a new adventure; we allowed them to go to Israel. However, I can assure Mr. Tekoah that today in a number of Moroccan consulates in Europe there are many files on Moroccan Jews who have left Morocco in various circumstances and who are now in Europe applying to return to Morocco. Some of their applications state that they were treated like labourers by the Zionists in Israel and like a sub-proletariat by the Zionists cosmopolitans who have settled in Israel. My country is considering these files with due care, but I must say here and now that those who were permitted in a moment of youthful enthusiasm to place the energy of their youth at another country's service may not return in the weakness of old age to the country they left when it needed the strength of all its children.

99. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you once more for allowing me to make this rectification.

100. Mr. Tekoah said yesterday what he thought about me. If he would like to know today what I think of him, I would simply say: nothing.

101. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Jordan.

102. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Mr. President, allow me at the very outset to fulfil a pleasant duty, that of associating my delegation with the many tributes paid to your predecessor, my colleague and good friend, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay, for his ideal performance during the deliberations of the Council last month. It also gives me

great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for this month. I am sure that under your wise and able leadership our deliberations will come to a successful conclusion.

103. I did not finish my statement last night because Mr. Tekoah had referred to certain questions and I thought that the best way to rebutt his allegations would be to submit pictures and those pictures were not available last night. Now they are before you and I do not need to dwell on proving the falsehood of many of the allegations made by Mr. Tekoah. He said last night that no mosques had been destroyed by Israeli bulldozers. The pictures you have here belie Mr. Tekoah's falsehoods. Four pictures are attached to document S/9289 of 30 June 1969. The first, which was taken in October 1968, shows the mosque. The second picture shows the bulldozers coming near the mosque. The third picture shows that neither the mosque nor the other houses of the Moroccan Quarter, just referred to by Ambassador Benhima, are there. These pictures are evidence of how much weight should be given to the allegations of Mr. Tekoah, who is an architect when it comes to distortion, fabrication, deceit and misrepresentation.

104. There are other pictures, attached to document S/9303 of 2 July 1969. Here again you find on Arab land—every inch of it is Arab—very many high buildings (I said scores of them) rising up within the Holy City of Jerusalem.

105. I know that the hour is late, Mr. President, and I know that it is your intention to conclude our deliberations tonight. I know that we should be very brief because it has been a long day with many hours of work, and I know that many members would like to see this unpleasant debate come to an end. But certain points have to be answered for the record, certain issues cannot be left unanswered. Mr. Tekoah said, in reply to the Soviet Union representative:

“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?” [*1483rd meeting, para. 106.*]

It has been the practice of Israel to present the conflict as one between the Israelis and the Arab States, ignoring the fact that there is something called the Palestinian people. It is the people of Palestine that the Israelis chased away, and not foreign troops in Palestine. It is the Israelis who came with their arms, terror and Nazi-like tactics to erect a racist and colonialist State at the expense of the people of Palestine.

106. Mr. Tekoah said last night that we keep calling Israel colonialist, that we keep saying that Israel's practices are colonial practices. Yes, we do, we do say that. But we do not stand alone in stating this fact. This has become common knowledge. Pick up any objective material, and you will find that this is the conclusion reached by every objective writer. Here I have a book by a well-known historian published just a few weeks ago. This is the most

recent book of Arnold Toynbee, the British historian, and it is entitled *Experiences*.¹¹ He has something to say about what the Israelis are doing in the Land of Peace; what they did to the people of Palestine, what they are planning for them in the future, what they are doing right now; on page 266 we read:

“The moral wrong and economic calamity that has been inflicted on African populations in South Africa, Rhodesia and temporarily in Kenya by West European settlers has been inflicted by East European settlers, the Zionist Jews, on the Palestinian Arabs. A majority of these Arabs whose homes lie on the Israeli side of the 1949 armistice lines have been evicted and robbed. In 1968, the Arab inhabitants of the territory between the 1949 and the 1967 armistice lines were in danger of suffering the same outrageous ill-treatment.”

He went on:

“Israeli colonialism since the establishment of the State of Israel is one of the two blackest cases in the whole history of colonialism in the modern age; and its blackness is thrown into relief by its date. The East European Zionists have been practising colonialism in Palestine in the extreme form of evicting and robbing the native Arab inhabitants at the very time when the West European peoples have been renouncing their temporary rule over non-European peoples.”

107. That is not the Arabs calling Israeli practices colonial practices: that is a well-known British historian doing so. It is not we who compare the practices of Israel with those of Ian Smith and South Africa. This has become a matter of general knowledge in the world of today.

108. Mr. Tekoah spoke about recognized borders. I need not dwell on that, because my colleague and friend Mr. Fakhreddine Mohamed of the Sudan just mentioned that the Israelis say Jerusalem is not negotiable. Mr. Eban said this morning that, whatever you do here in the Council, they will never give up Jerusalem. He challenged the Council this morning. Even before it takes a decision, he issues that warning to the Security Council. As for the Golan heights, and other areas too, they are not negotiable. I need not dwell on this. It has been discussed very ably by my colleague from the Sudan.

109. Mr. Tekoah spoke about my complaint, terming it frivolous, and he kept repeating this. But I ask: does any of us here know of any other complaint in the history of the Security Council that received the full and unanimous support of all members of the Security Council around this table during their interventions, as well as the support of the world at large? It is the privilege of Mr. Tekoah to keep distorting and fabricating, but the stand which I hope will be taken by the Security Council will be the answer to those distortions.

110. Mr. Tekoah referred to certain figures in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, saying that in 1844, 7,190 Jews were in Jerusalem. I looked this up this morning. I went to the library to find those figures. I looked in the encyclopaedia.

¹¹ New York, Oxford University Press, 1969.

The figures given by Mr. Tekoah have no foundation. Did this surprise me? No: I was expecting this. It is the God-given gift of Mr. Tekoah to waste the time of the Council and to keep citing figures that are either non-existent or unauthentic. But even if we assume for the sake of argument that in 1844 there were 7,190 Jews—and according to him there were even more Arabs than Jews—in Jerusalem, how does it come about that today there is a majority of Jews in Jerusalem and a minority of Arabs? And how does it come about that, according to him, there are today one-fifth of a million Jews in Jerusalem, when only 60,000 had remained there? Was it a result of natural growth? Was it lack of birth control? It does not seem so, because, even according to the statistics, this figure could not be valid. No, the answer is very simple: it is the illegal immigration; it is those immigrants who came to the Holy City, who displaced the inhabitants of the Holy City, who took over and are now on the go, continuing to displace, to bulldoze, to destroy and to expand.

111. This is an important point in Mr. Tekoah's speech last night: the question of the capital. Mr. Tekoah said:

“After the Arab conquest of Jerusalem in 635 and during the relatively brief period of Arab rule, Jerusalem remained neglected . . . 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.” [1483rd meeting, para. 118.]

This statement showed a complete ignorance of Islam. Yes, Jerusalem was never made a capital, either a Moslem or an Arab capital. Neither was Mecca. One may wonder why. This was very ably explained last year by our colleague, Mr. Shahi of Pakistan. He answered the question. He asked what it indicated, and then he said it indicated that in Islam, Mecca is so holy that it is improper to convert it into a seat of temporal power. The Arab and other Islamic peoples show the same veneration for Jerusalem. Then Mr. Shahi reminded us that it was a veneration which had been expressed by a respected religious leader of the United States, Cardinal Cushing, the Archbishop of Boston. Writing in *The Pilot* of July 1967 he stated, regarding the holy places in Jerusalem: “There should be no place here for either politics or power, for violence or for strife, for destruction or for death; it should be a place of peace”.

112. Last night, Mr. Tekoah reiterated that the people are happy, that they are getting more pay, and that there is nothing to worry about. As my final point I want to cite a single example. The Israelis tried an experiment: they went to a sheik—the head of a Bedouin tribe—in the desert. They gave him a few camels; I do not know how many. They found some work for the children of that Bedouin. After a while they wanted to find out whether that experiment had worked, and he was asked whether or not he was happy, having the extra income and the extra camels. And that Bedouin, an illiterate, a man living in a tent, had the following to say, and this is to be found in *The Jerusalem Post*, a semi-official newspaper, not in some other source. This comes from the edition of Monday, 16 June 1969, and appears on page 10. In response to the question as to whether he was happy, the Bedouin said: “Do you want me

to tell you the truth? I hate you. Yes, I know, before you came I was much worse off. Now I have a herd of camels; I live in a real hut instead of a *husha*, and all my sons are working and earning good money. I admit this, we have never been so well off before, but we hate you all the same. We would rather be oppressed by our own people than live under you, the conquerors." No one likes a conqueror nor a colonizer, nor any form of foreign domination. People like freedom, freedom even with poverty.

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

114. Mr. ALATTAR (Yemen) (*translated from French*): First of all, Mr. President, may I thank you and the members of the Council for allowing me to speak in the debate on Jerusalem, which appears on the agenda at the request of Jordan.

115. Jerusalem is a holy place for three religions. Consequently my country attaches great importance to it, and my Government hopes that the Council will take all necessary and appropriate action to ensure that the character of this holy place is respected. Arab Jerusalem must not lose its status. It would be an injustice in the annals of history for a country to defy all the nations of the world and to apply its laws as a conqueror, without regard for the resolutions adopted by an absolute majority in the Security Council and at the special session of the General Assembly. My delegation is firmly convinced that Arab Jerusalem, where the Holy Places of the Christian, Jewish and Moslem religions are situated, will be delivered from this military domination. But the Security Council must act as quickly as possible.

116. Although Jerusalem is the main subject of your deliberations, my delegation feels that sight should not be lost of the real problem, namely, the military occupation of Palestinian land by the Zionist State and the armed conquest of the other Arab territories. It is in this context and in this context only that we must consider the action which the Zionist State continues to take in Jerusalem despite the resolutions of the Council and those of the General Assembly. The Zionist State persists in defying the international community, copying what other colonialist, imperialist and racist States have done elsewhere.

117. The political, economic and social aspects which enable us to analyse the phenomenon of Zionism should at least be emphasized, if we cannot discuss them in depth. I do not intend to dwell on the history of the Zionist question here, nor analyse the racist ideology of Zionism, as our delegation already dealt with these problems at the 205th meeting of the First Committee, on 20 November 1948, at the first part of the third session. Suffice it to say that the Palestinian people have been deprived of the simple right of enjoying their own land, the land of their ancestors, as a result of Machiavellian manoeuvres, conceived and implemented by Zionism, materially, politically and morally supported by world imperialism.

118. There is no doubt that the Zionist State is a colonial phenomenon, although traditional colonialism has been

wiped out elsewhere. Its success in the Middle East so far can only be explained by its association with the imperialist countries. I will quote as evidence only the statements made by Weizmann and Ben-Gurion, which provide further proof, if this is necessary.

119. The State of Israel is the culmination of Palestine's colonization by the Zionist organization, to the detriment of the Arab people; and it is the beachhead of world imperialism. We are aware of the vicissitudes that led to this colonization and we know how Palestinian nationalist movements of 1936 had to be crushed in order to enable that colonization to develop.

120. Moreover, ever since its creation, the Zionist State has been the watchdog of imperialist interests in the region, and that is why the leaders of the State have not denied their expansionist designs for settling several million Jewish emigrants. The historical development of the national liberation movements of dominated peoples has forced colonialism to evacuate the Middle Eastern countries. Nevertheless, in view of their enormous strategic and economic interests, the imperialist countries have left a kind of sword of Damocles hanging over the area. The truth is that nothing can legitimize or justify the creation of Israel on Palestinian territory, any more than the evolution of the Jewish home into a Jewish State can be justified, except by applying colonialist logic.

121. Is it not incredible that this people, formerly the victims of Nazi persecutions, should have reached the point where they use almost identical repressive measures against the Palestinian people? Is it not equally shocking and repugnant to see how a colonialist and racist legislation is implemented? We would quote, as examples, the Law of Return, the Absentees' Property Law, the administrative and police measures adopted by the military or civil authorities against the Arabs. Are the last expulsions of Arabs from their homes in Jerusalem not a further example? Here we have the living picture of a colonial community.

122. Moreover, through emergency legislation and unspeakable methods and provocations, the Zionist State has got rid of one and a half million Palestinians who subsist only through United Nations charity.

123. Obviously there can be no colonial State without economic penetration and long-term economic objectives. We would like to give some thought to the second aspect.

124. However, before we do so, we should like to ask what the economic significance of the State of Israel is. The Zionist leaders speak proudly of "Israeli miracles". What is so surprising about such miracles when one has millions of dollars available every year with no ties attached? The sum of the contributions, subsidies and taxes paid by the entire world Jewish community is beyond comparison with the total given to any other country, if the *per capita* factor is taken into account. The United States alone sends millions of dollars annually, not only through foundations but also through other "charitable" organizations. Has it not been recognized as legal, or almost so, in the United States, for Jews to have the right to tax exemption on the money sent

to Israel? And what we see in the United States is just a typical example; we find the same principles in force, with many different variations, in other countries. This direct financing factor, together with the exploitation of "confiscated" land or land "uncultivated because of absenteeism", constitutes an economic potential which the State of Israel has used effectively to achieve a high growth rate. Added to these factors are those of technical advancement and the high level of skills, which initially cost the Zionist State nothing. Indeed, the technicians who came to Palestine were trained free of charge by European or other States. When you know how much it costs to train specialists, you really cannot be surprised at the progress achieved by Israel. Furthermore, the time factor is by no means negligible. A developing country would have to wait two or three school generations to obtain productive results.

125. The Zionist State has consequently benefited from extremely important specific factors, which enable it to make the most of the situation from the economic point of view. Most countries, given the same advantages as Israel, would also have been capable of achieving "a miracle". I can give you figures to support my argument. I wish simply to place Israeli achievements in their proper context and to stress this fact which may do something to offset the effects of Israel's vast and clamorous propaganda campaign. Many leaders of the Zionist State do nothing to hide their long-term economic objectives, namely, to make Israel an instrument for penetrating into the developing countries of Africa and Asia. This is the main imperialist danger of the Zionist State. What Mr. Eban calls the "open frontier" is, first and foremost, the conquest of Middle East markets in order to secure the raw materials needed by Israeli industry, and particularly as an outlet for its own manufactures.

126. The Zionist State cannot, after all, live indefinitely on subsidies paid by the world Jewish community. If Israel is to draw upon its own resources to survive, the ideal market would be the Middle East market, and subsequently this could be extended to Asia and Africa, thereby preventing the Middle Eastern countries from becoming industrialized. What we are saying here can be proved by the 19 years of Israel's history and particularly by the economic crisis which Israel underwent before the events of June 1967; whence the vital need for the Zionist State to mobilize the sympathy of the world Jewish community through the well-organized conjuring up of the danger of Israel's destruction. In fact, they are maintaining a political and military state of mind which is always profitable, if I may say so. The conferences organized by Jewish millionaires serve only one purpose, that is to fulfil the Zionist dream of making the Zionist State the middleman of world capitalism, the more so because the output potential of the "dominated" Palestinians costs less than in the industrialized countries. The project for making Haifa a free industrial zone is only the first step towards achieving this objective. Already in Africa, the number of Israeli firms serving as figureheads for United States companies is increasing each year.

127. Do you now find that, in the light of this analysis, the Zionist State appears more or less as a new form of colonial State? What are, in fact, the fundamental differ-

ences between this social kind of production and that of the exploiting systems of imperialism? The Zionist State is as dangerous economically as the régimes of Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal, just to mention the dregs of a colonial system rejected in abhorrence by the people of the Third World. The countries which have had to fight against this system of exploitation cannot allow themselves to condemn those who fight for its eradication in their own countries. Today Palestine is the outpost for trying out a system that is as treacherous and dangerous as that of the colonial era. By this we mean the Zionist system. It is by no means foolish to believe that, if the Zionist leaders succeed in the Middle East, other countries will follow, and become victims in their turn. This may be an apocalyptic view of the problem, but it would be the logical conclusion.

128. Nor is it an exaggeration to say that the Zionist State is racist. To begin with, Zionism presents itself as a means of fighting against assimilation. It creates an extremely serious moral and political problem for Jews throughout the world, to the extent that many of them are torn in their convictions between the communities in which they live and the Zionist State. In a way, a Jew has two nationalities, but he is above all constrained socially, morally or economically to be a tool of Zionism. Believe me, enormous courage is needed to resist such pressures. Fortunately there are many such brave men and there will be more and more of them. As an example I would like to quote the letter published in *Le Monde* of 9 October 1967 from Mrs. Jacqueline Hadamard, a teacher, in reply to Baron Rothschild, who was calling for a "solidarity tax for Israel". She said: "No, I owe no tax for solidarity. My solidarity is with the oppressed, the persecuted, the Israeli victims, the countless Arab victims, as with the Vietnamese victims, the Negroes who are the victims of racism in South Africa, and in general, all victims of racism."

129. But Mr. Rothschild's letter calls for a further comment: has it never occurred to him that the pro-Semite, who considers that he belongs to a chosen people, is just as racist as the anti-Semite? I would add that his attitude, far from serving the Israeli people and Jews throughout the world, only provide ammunition for anti-Semitism. He therefore bears a grave responsibility. A Father of the Church, Father Paul Gauthier, who lived through the Palestinian tragedy, wrote: "Is not Jewish racism a source of other anti-Semitic racism? To want to save all Jews, and no one but Jews, is the result of the same kind of calculation as the desire to kill all Jews. The idea is turned around but the reasoning is the same. There is no race superior or inferior to other races."

130. To make such a claim is already to be racist, whether consciously or unconsciously, and nazism used such language like this first against the Jews, the Poles, the citizens of the Soviet Union, the Czechs and countless others! The Whites of South Africa and Rhodesia are proud to make it. To claim next to be seeking "racial purity" or to speak of the "chosen people", "superiority" or "technological capacity", proves that the speaker already has a racist opinion. And yet the press of the Zionist State publishes such declarations and opinions. I can quote several examples to the representative of the Zionist State and I am

at your disposal to give you a list of them. This brings to mind some evil memories: did not the former colonialists use similar language about the military capacity of the Algerian, the Moroccan, the Viet-Nameese and others, who proved these embittered colonialists wrong?

131. Those who are known as "territorialists" in Israel, who wish to rid the country of its Arab inhabitants, and the political territorialists who are said to be content to dominate the Arabs from a position of strength because they have to deal with the new industrial expansion of cheap labour—provide further examples of Zionist racism. Other dreams of mystical and religious grandeur show through in articles published periodically, and these are sometimes even directed against the Levantine Jews who come from North Africa and the Middle East. And they say that the Arabs are racist! From this rostrum, we should like to say frankly and honestly that the Arabs do not have to pay for the faults of the European world. We are aware of the atrocities of the Nazi concentration camps and we condemn them and the reason for their existence. But we cannot accept that it is for us to make amends for the horrors of mankind by making Palestinian Arabs the victims of countless injustices, among others the confiscation of their national territory, in the name of legitimate and necessary redress for which they are in no way responsible.

132. Certain aspects of the June events were positive, if only because they confirmed the existence of Palestinian resistance. Not so long ago the Zionist State denied, in all seriousness, the existence of Palestinian resistance and was content to call the members of the resistance "terrorists"! Every day that passes shows that the resistance movements are a reality; and we would like to salute them here and assure them of our full support, because a people fighting untiringly to recover its national land deserves the admiration of everyone. This is true not only of our Palestinian brothers, but also of our black brothers in Southern Rhodesia, in the territories under Portuguese domination in South Africa and in Asia.

133. The awakening of the Palestinian people is a historic fact. The Palestinian people is in a position to wage a popular struggle based on the specific conditions it considers appropriate for asserting its national rights. The awakening of the peoples of the Orient is a further result of the June war.

134. We have always used the term "Zionist" deliberately to distinguish it from the word "Jew" or "Jewish". We believe that the leaders of the Palestinian resistance movements are aware of their duties and responsibilities. Recent statements make provision for a Palestinian State in which Jews and Arabs, Christians and Moslems would form a single State, without racial or religious discrimination. In this context peace could become a reality in this holy land and Jerusalem could recover its cultural and religious effulgence.

135. Finally, with your permission, I shall reply to two comments made by the representative of the Zionist State. In the first instance, speaking as some directors of colonialist enterprises used to do, he pointed out that the Arab workers and employees now earned better salaries and

their standard of living was improving. It is true, Mr. Tekoah, that other countries have tried to form a third force, in the hope that they might be able to play an important political role for future collaboration, and they have done so by holding out the lure of higher wages and better living conditions. This, however, as you know, has resulted in a piteous failure, and you may be sure that in Palestine there can be no collaboration with the Zionists.

136. As to the second comment, Mr. Tekoah, referring to the United Arab Republic, spoke of Yemen and the bombing of Yemeni villages. First of all, these are events which concern two sister nations and our brothers in the United Arab Republic came to the help of the young republic, for which we are grateful to them. We do not deny the existence of opposition, conflicting interests at times and even mistakes on both sides. You seem to believe, Mr. Tekoah, in the old policy of "divide and rule"; but the time when that policy was in vogue is long past. Now, people draw the obvious conclusions from the lessons of history and of our people. With your permission, Mr. Tekoah, I would point out that our relations are as good as they possibly can be with our brothers of the United Arab Republic and indeed with all the other Arab countries, and we are united in supporting the Palestinian people.

137. In conclusion, my delegation fervently hopes that the Security Council will live up to its responsibilities so that a so-called nation does not defy the whole world.

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

139. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I want to assure you, Mr. President, and through you the members of the Council, that it was not without great hesitation that I asked for the floor. I know that the hour is late. I know that we have taxed the patience of all of you. I know that we have been telling our tale in detail.

140. What comes to my mind, to diverge a little bit from the world of politics, is one of the greatest poems ever written, entitled "The Legend of the Great Inquisitor" which is to be found in the novel *The Brothers Karamazov* by the great Russian novelist Dostoevsky. In it, Ivan, the author of the poem, speaks to his brother Alyosha; and it was late at night, and night lends itself to profound talk but to few people. He speaks to his brother before telling him his poem. He was revolting against the injustices of mankind, and Dostoevsky in a way represented to a very large extent the guilty conscience of mankind. So Ivan says to his brother Alyosha: "People understand others who suffer from hunger, but they do not understand that people can suffer for an idea". Then he goes on to relate *The Legend of the Great Inquisitor*, how Christ appeared to the Great Inquisitor and was put in gaol. And ever since mankind has suffered from truth being put in gaol.

141. If, therefore, tonight, we come to plead as defeated, we also come to plead as people who suffer for an idea.

142. After having listened to Mr. Tekoah yesterday, I read and reread very carefully his statement and mine. In the beginning of his statement he referred to the Arab speakers and to their speeches as an "orgy of enmity and abuse" [1484th meeting, para. 229]. These are strong words, "orgy of enmity and abuse". I assure the Council, most sincerely, that I carefully went over what I had said, as it was reproduced in the verbatim record of the Council's meeting, and I listed the persons, the authorities and the sacred names whom I had quoted. And "persons" are to be distinguished from "the sacred names". They were: Yigal Allon; Mrs. Meir; the records of the Security Council concerning the cease-fire resolutions; the interpretations as found in the Security Council records; Pascal, the great French thinker and mathematician; Menachim Begin; Abba Eban; The Gospel; St. Paul; the Prophet Isaiah, and Professor Ya'cov Talmon. Now, let us leave aside the sacred names, the Gospel, the Prophet Isaiah, St. Paul and Pascal; I am sure they are much beyond the understanding of Mr. Tekoah. But if he has found hatred in the others, as quoted by me, specifically Allon, Mrs. Meir and company, it certainly is not my fault. That is what is to be found in their own words. But I certainly advise Mr. Tekoah to read in full the letter of Professor Ya'cov Talmon which I quoted. I quoted only two paragraphs from it as it contains fourteen pages published in Hebrew, in a journal called *Ma'arif*, dated 6 May 1969.

143. My second point is that the United Nations—and here we have to give some recognition to the fact that the Arab problem has brought many contributions to United Nations jurisdiction—is faced now with a totally new dictionary, coming out of Israel, a vocabulary concerning the occupied territories. First they were referred to as "occupied", then "administered", then "liberated", then "annexed". Then, with regard to Jerusalem there is another vocabulary. Mr. Tekoah yesterday spoke of "unified, happy Jerusalem". Teddy Kollek spoke of Jerusalem being "remarried". Mr. Abba Eban at one time spoke of Israel having been without a head and having found its head in Jerusalem. It is rather strange that Israel should have looked for an Arab head. Then Mr. Eban used another simile. Speaking about Judaism, Christianity and Islam, he brought in the analogy of the mother and the child. In this connexion, such slogans, if they go beyond the level of slogans, are really void of any meaning. To speak of a mother and a child is certainly a nice image, or of a unified city or a remarried city. But pushed beyond the level of slogans such images are bound to lead us, I am afraid, to the threshold of radical confrontations, if not radical opposition, which might prove particularly unfavourable and perhaps even disastrous to the basic tenets of Zionism.

144. Concerning what Mr. Tekoah referred to as the eternal connexion between Judaism and the City of Jerusalem, I only have to say that for any student of even elementary history it is a very well-known fact that such a connexion has undergone a most radical disconnexion and that unless and until God Almighty, through a supernatural initiative, demands and re-establishes such a connexion, the temporal return of the Jews by force is, to say the least, an injustice of the greatest magnitude and a shallow dream. A little while ago my colleague from Jordan referred to the illegality of people of the Jewish faith coming into

Palestine. In fact, if you read the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel you will find something amazing, to say the least. Listen to this sentence: "Pioneers, *ma'pilim* and defenders", and then there is a foot-note to explain that *ma'pilim* is a Hebrew word meaning immigrants coming to Eretz-Israel in defiance of restrictive legislation. This is in the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel.

145. My third and most important point is this: in his interpretation yesterday, commenting upon my remarks concerning the cease-fire, Mr. Tekoah said—I will leave aside the vindictive language; I concede to him that I cannot use that language—that Syria, "contrary to its international obligations . . . has today repudiated even the concept of the cease-fire line under which it affixed its signature in 1967" [ibid., para. 230].

146. This is a very important legal and juridical problem, for in his interpretation yesterday, with an arrogance which made it self-defeating, Mr. Tekoah attempted to make the Council accept as an international concept what the Council itself denounced as a fraud. Indeed he tried to make the Council believe that Syria and other Arab countries victims of Israel's aggression had accepted the concept of a cease-fire line by accepting the Security Council resolutions on the cease-fire adopted on 9 and 12 June 1967 [235 (1967) and 236 (1967)]. The records of the Security Council show that we accepted both resolutions on the cease-fire in their real meaning, indeed, as interpreted by a very distinguished member of the Security Council, Lord Caradon. I will again use his own words:

"It is well, I think, to refer back to the actual words of the agreement reached by General Bull. I refer to the record of yesterday's meeting; the actual words of General Bull were: '(1). I proposed a cease-fire together with no further movement of troops to be effective at 1630 hours GMT, 10 June.' That is the proposal which he made to both parties, and it was accepted by both parties.

"I am very glad that I can confirm that . . ." [1357th meeting, paras. 204 and 205.]

In other words, he was confirming what had previously been stated:

"There is the cease-fire order which means that troops should stay where they are and that any movement, north, south, east or west, except such movement as to return from the scene of battle to one's own home ground, is a violation of the cease-fire". [Ibid., para. 177.]

147. This concept of the cease-fire, affirmed by one member of the Council, was not opposed, as the records of the Security Council show, by any other member of the Council, which means that the Council approved this interpretation. Mr. Tekoah wants to lead the Council to believe what his Tel Aviv authorities proclaim, that by accepting the cease-fire we accepted what was never meant by the Security Council. In short and most categorically, the meaning he puts into the cease-fire resolution constitutes an utter fraud diametrically opposed and contrary to

what the Security Council adopted as the cease-fire resolution.

148. What looms behind this fraudulent interpretation of Mr. Tekoah's? Two things: First, the cease-fire lines are simply the new frontiers of Israel, something which we most categorically and firmly deny to him and to his authorities in Tel Aviv. Israel unilaterally denounced the General Armistice Agreements, whereas international jurisdiction as represented by the United Nations still recognizes the Armistice Agreements as valid. Secondly, there are the deeds, and I need not again repeat all the statements about the Golan Heights, Jerusalem unified, Sharm Esh-Sheikh and so on.

149. But one important point is that the Jewish Agency Treasurer—the Jewish Agency, according to the status law of Israel, being an integral part of the Government of Israel, charged with colonization and settlement—this year published a new budget for 1969-1970, in which appear the following:

“(1) The Emergency Fund, now entering its third year, which is expected to bring in \$330,000,000;

“(2) The anticipated growth in immigration, and more extensive absorption activities which are to include services to immigrants of limited means who have come here over the past few years”.

Then appropriations are given in detail, including the following:

“Immigration and absorption	681,190,000
“Settlement Department	145,860,000
“Youth Immigration	21,476,500”

These figures all indicate sums in Israeli pounds, and they are to be found in *The Israel Digest* of 7 April 1969. This money is collected in the United States and is tax-deductible, classified as going for charity but going, instead, to settle the occupied territories of the Arab countries—Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Syria. This is what lies behind Mr. Tekoah's interpretation of the cease-fire lines.

150. Now, in concluding, I beg to apologize once more. I said that our march has been a lonely, dreary and painful march through the night of the years. My generation and generations to come have suffered from problems which we did not create, and to express those sufferings I could not find better words than a few verses of the illustrious President of Senegal, in a poem of his called *Joal*:

[*The speaker continued in French.*]

“Joal!

“Je me rappelle.

“... ”

“Je me rappelle les festins funèbres fumant du sang des troupes égorées

“Du bruit des querelles, des rhapsodies des griots.

“... ”

“Je me rappelle, je me rappelle . . .

“Ma tête rythmant

“Quelle marche lasse le long des jours d'Europe où parfois

“Apparaît un jazz orphelin qui sanglote sanglote sanglote.”

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

152. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq): Allow me first to apologize for asking for the floor at this late hour. Last night the representative of Israel accused Iraq of joining a chorus, a chorus in an orgy of abuse. But if we refer to his statement, we find that he was actually singing solo, and with all his notes off key.

153. I shall try to be very brief. I am not going to abuse your indulgence or tax the patience of the members of the Council. I will try to rebut the insinuations of the representative of Israel in what has become his standard practice. I am going to quote one sentence of his reference to Iraq. He said: “This is the State that has the audacity to speak of justice, of human rights, of spiritual values.” [*1484th meeting, para. 234.*] Now, in passing, if the choice of words is indicative of the character of the speaker, then the frequent use of the word “audacity” and similar words by the representative of Israel should give us food for thought.

154. Mr. Tekoah questioned our qualifications to speak of human rights. I should like to remind him that Iraq served twice on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Its contribution is there for the record, it is there for everyone to see. For his information, lest he has forgotten, only a month ago Iraq obtained the endorsement of the world Organization when, for the third time, Iraq was elected to serve a term on the Commission on Human Rights by a majority of 24 votes out of 27. These are the qualifications of Iraq to speak of human rights.

155. He also referred to the hangings of spies who were found, after due process of law, guilty of espionage for Israel. He chose to refer to those spies of the Jewish faith only. The Israelis never tire of disowning their spies and agents. I could quote several instances where they disowned them first and then, later on, acknowledged them, and with pride. Here I have a book called *Our Man in Damascus: the Story of Eli Cohn, Israel's Greatest Spy*, written by E. Ben-Hanan.¹² For the information of the members of the Council, Eli Cohn was a spy who was caught in Syria, tried and found guilty, and hanged in 1965. Israel was vehement in disclaiming any connexion with Eli Cohn, only to come out two years later and acknowledge his services

¹² New York, Crown, 1969.

with pride. It is very telling that the last pages of the book, particularly the last two pages, show pictures of the Israeli onslaught on Syria with the caption "Vengeance came two years later".

156. The Israeli representative never tires of accusing nearly every country of the whole world of persecuting and maltreating the Jews, all through the years, all through the centuries, and all through history. Iraq, in his view, is no exception. But I am going to put a question to Mr. Tekoah: What does he think of Jews persecuting and terrorizing other Jews? I should like to quote a few paragraphs of an article that appeared in an Israeli paper called *Haolam Hazeh* in Tel Aviv on 27 April 1966. The title of the article is: "This could happen only in Israel", and it reads as follows:

"This could happen only in Israel. Last week *Haolam Hazeh* published the scoop of the year. . . . It was the story of the explosives that were thrown some 15 years ago into the synagogues and other Jewish centers of Baghdad with a view to spurring the Jews of Iraq onto a hasty *aliya* to Israel. These things were known before but to a few people who guarded them as a terrible secret; they have been made public now for the first time, officially and responsibly.

"If these things had happened in another country it would have aroused a powerful public reaction, the papers vying with each other in their loud demands for a special investigation. The politicians during whose tenure of office those things have happened—headed by David Ben-Gurion—would have informed the public about it, with a view to determining the responsibility for the order (to throw the explosives). . . . In short, a clear light would have been thrown upon one of the most important chapters in the history of the country. . . . With us, however, 'there was neither voice nor hearing', as though a rock was thrown into a swamp and sank into it. No official or non-official reaction, and no press discussion, as though the incident were of lesser importance than the rise in the price of eggs or the resignation of an assistant secretary of the Jewish Agency."

157. I am sorry to have taken your time; the hour is late. I see that a draft resolution is being circulated, and I am quite certain that the Council is anxious to conclude its discussion tonight. But allow me, if not to read a whole article, at least to read two paragraphs of a recent report, recent, at least, in so far as the events in Iraq are concerned. It was published in the *Sunday Times* of London on 9 February, and speaks about the Jews in Iraq. The reporter is Geoffrey Sumner. It reads as follows:

"Mr. Elias Abdou, a watchmaker of Rashid Street, Baghdad, and one of Iraq's remaining 2,700 Jews, told me yesterday: 'You know, we Iraqis have a saying that, once a man has drunk from the river Tigris, he will never want to leave Baghdad. That is why I do not want to go to Israel.'"

The reporter goes on to say:

"Mr. Abdou had clearly not been rehearsed in any of his lines; he assumed at first that I had come to buy a

watch. When I explained that I wanted to talk to him about his life as a Jew, he gave a perfectly natural smile, said the Arabic word of welcome, drew me up a chair and called out to a Muslim street waiter to bring bottles of lemonade."

Towards the end of the article, the reporter states:

"The Chief Rabbi of Baghdad met foreign correspondents in his office last week to repeat the statement he made over Baghdad Radio at the time of the executions, saying that the Jews were treated well.

"The white-bearded rabbi wearing a white robe, a red tarboosh with a beige scarf wound round it, and tinted glasses against the television lights, was ill and had his secretary read his statement for him in Arabic.

"I have been in the service of the Jewish community for not less than 65 years," it said. 'As you can see, I am 93 years old and have lived through years of development, witnessing all the successive Governments of Iraq. At all these times, I have been treated properly, especially under the revolutionary régime.'

"The Chief Rabbi said that the Jewish community had complete religious freedom. The civil law, covering Jewish marriages, deaths and similar matters had been drafted in accordance with the Jewish community's wishes.

"All available evidence suggests that the rabbi has not been making his statements under threat. Anyone who tries to obtain an appointment with him soon becomes aware that even for a man of 93, he displays an exceptionally cantankerous independence."

158. Before I conclude by thanking you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for bearing with me, I should like to put one question to the Israeli representative. He always maintains that Israel is the protector of Jews all over the world; he maintains that Israel protects them against the persecution and maltreatment by the Gentiles. I therefore wish to ask him the following question: who is going to protect the Jews from the terror of other Jews?

159. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, may I begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Council for this month. Senegal and Pakistan are bound together by the bonds of African-Asian solidarity. We have both emerged from a similar colonial background, and we have embarked on the same enterprise of recovering our heritage in its fullness and of strengthening world peace on the basis of justice. I have known you, Sir, personally and shared with you many experiences since last year. May I assure you of the profound esteem of my delegation for your experience, your integrity and your judgement. If the Security Council is able to act unanimously tonight on the grave question before it, it will be due mainly to your decisive leadership. It is also my pleasant duty to convey my respect and appreciation to the retiring President, Ambassador Solano López of Paraguay. The courtesy, exemplary rectitude and skill which he showed in presiding over our deliberations last month have been justly lauded by all our colleagues.

160. We are nearing the end of a memorable debate in the Security Council. The debate has been suffused with an emotion which commands the deepest respect of mankind. It is not an emotion of hate; it is an emotion born of man's holy allegiances and his concern for his dignity. Many a statement heard here this week would find a ready echo in the heart and mind of the Pakistan delegation. Since the problem before us has been fully discussed in its depth and dimensions, I think a recapitulation might now be useful. In my intervention in this debate I shall try as best I can to indicate the recent background of the problem and the position which has emerged before the Security Council.

161. This is the third time in two years that the United Nations has become actively concerned with the situation in Jerusalem. Israel's occupation of the Holy City in the war of June 1967 and its declared intention of annexing it gravely perturbed the hundreds of millions of Moslems and Christians throughout the world. Even the more enlightened followers of the great religion of Judaism were not unmoved by the trauma and anguish of their Moslem and Christian fellow men. As a result an overwhelming majority of the Member States voted for resolution 2253 (ES-V), adopted at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly on the initiative of Pakistan. Israel ignored that unanimous resolution. Consequently the General Assembly by its resolution 2254 (ES-V), deplored Israel's failure to implement the earlier resolution and reiterated its call to Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from any measures designed to change the status of Jerusalem. It is noteworthy that the sponsors of this resolution—Afghanistan, Guinea, Iran, Mali, Pakistan, Somalia and Turkey—were all non-Arab States.

162. Even the second resolution, backed as it was by the moral authority of 100 Member States, did not act as a restraint on Israel's conduct with regard to Jerusalem. The Secretary-General sent his Personal Representative, Mr. Ernesto A. Thalmann, to obtain information on the situation. The report submitted by the Secretary-General on 12 September 1967 indicated that:

"The Israeli authorities stated unequivocally that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable.

". . .

"The Personal Representative was told that the Arabs recognized a military occupation régime as such and were ready to co-operate with such a régime in dealing with current questions of administration and public welfare. However, they 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. It was claimed that the right of self-determination, in accordance with the United Nations

Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had therefore been violated.

"In conclusion, it was pointed out that the Arab population places its trust in the United Nations and relies on the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly." [S/8146, paras. 35, 131-135.]

163. The total disregard by Israel of the resolutions of the General Assembly eventually led to the consideration of the situation by the Security Council. The Council held a full debate in April and May 1968 on the situation with respect to Jerusalem and adopted resolution 252 (1968) on 21 May 1968, in which it stated that it:

"*Considers* 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".

The Council urgently called upon Israel:

"to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem".

Also in that resolution the Council deplored "the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolutions" on the subject adopted on 4 and 14 July 1967, namely, resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V). The Secretary-General was asked to report to the Council on the implementation of that Security Council resolution.

164. The Secretary-General made a report to the Council on 11 April 1969 [S/9149]. This report, which contains Israel's letter of 25 March addressed to the Secretary-General, is the clearest indication of Israel's total defiance of the Security Council resolution. Indeed, even if we were to leave aside all the facts pointed out by the representative of Jordan, the more important of which have not been contested by Israel, the Secretary-General's report and the unchallenged evidence published in the world press lead us to the following conclusions.

165. First, Israel has completely disregarded resolution 252 (1968) and has refused to rescind the legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by it to change the legal status of Jerusalem.

166. Second, far from desisting from such measures and actions, it has enacted additional legislation in the form of the so-called "Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law", which seeks further to consolidate Israel's annexation of the Old City. Israel has also enlarged the area of annexation and incorporated in it sizable portions of the environs of the city.

167. Third, Israel has persisted in evicting Arab families and demolishing their houses and has even seized property belonging to Moslem religious trusts.

168. Fourth, the population of the Old City remains resentful of, and unreconciled to, Israel's occupation.

169. In this connexion I must refer to the statements made by the representative of Israel during the current debate. The more significant aspect of those statements is not what the representative of Israel said but what he carefully omitted to say. He has not cared to give any explanation whether Israel has shown any regard for the Security Council resolution. He has not chosen to give even a hint that in future Israel will at least try to abide by its terms. Even while the Security Council is deliberating on the situation in Jerusalem, evidence is accumulating that Israel is taking every conceivable measure to consolidate its occupation of the city, to change its historic character, to efface its personality and to present to the world a fait accompli.

170. It is natural that a consensus should have developed in the Council in the consideration of this situation. The elements of the consensus are apparent from the statements made by members of the Council. It is not possible for me to quote from all those statements. Therefore I will refer only to those made by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States.

171. Mr. Bérard quoted from the statement he had made when the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968); referring to the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the city, he had said then:

"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.]

Mr. Bérard added:

"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 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

"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." [1483rd meeting, paras. 51 and 52.]

172. The representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, stated:

"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.

"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." [Ibid., paras. 33 and 39.]

173. Mr. Yost, referring to Jerusalem's unique international standing, said:

"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." [Ibid., para. 97.]

174. Mr. Zakharov of the Soviet Union summed up the whole position in the following words:

"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." [Ibid., para. 58.]

175. I have taken the liberty of quoting at some length from the statements made by four permanent members, not only because of their intrinsic weight and striking clarity, but also because the statements are made at a time when the four Powers have been making efforts to formulate just proposals in order to bring peace to the Middle East. It is clear from their pronouncements that, first, Israel has exceeded its rights as a temporary occupying Power in the City of Jerusalem and has transgressed the rules which govern military occupation under international law; and second, by its attempt to annex the Holy City, Israel is clearly foreclosing a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict.

176. There is no dissent from these conclusions in the statements made by our other colleagues. We have to join these with the conclusions which inescapably flow from the statements made before the Security Council by member States which are not parties immediately concerned but which strongly feel that the present situation in Jerusalem vitally affects their deepest interests. That this situation touches, indeed, assaults, the most cherished sensibilities of millions of peoples around the globe is a political fact of paramount importance. Its importance cannot but submerge calculations of transient expediencies. The Council cannot fail to pay full attention to the statements made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic and Yemen.

177. Let me also refer here to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Turkey two days ago. He said:

"The Middle East issue is a conflict which has several aspects, one of the most important of which is certainly the status of the City of Jerusalem, with which all the three major religions are directly and closely connected."

Referring to the measures taken by Israel to annex the City, he added:

“Turkey does not and will never approve of these and other similar measures which are certain to render more difficult the peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict. We hope and believe that the Security Council will re-examine at this time the situation in detail and take all the measures it will deem necessary for the amelioration of the situation. Indeed, we call upon the Council to do so.”

May I also refer here to the resolution of the International Islamic Conference held in Kuala Lumpur, which has been quoted by the representative of Malaysia at the 1484th meeting and which was adopted by the religious and intellectual leaders of a score of countries of Asia and Africa.

178. I have not so far referred to the firm convictions of the Government of Pakistan with regard to the situation in Jerusalem. These convictions were fully expressed at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly in 1967, and I had the honour to set them forth again during the debate in the Security Council in 1968. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in his statement before the General Assembly on 4 October 1968,¹³ warned that no one should make a mistake about the depth of our feelings on the question of Jerusalem.

179. President Yahya Khan said on 30 May: “The restoration of Jerusalem is a matter of profound concern to us—indeed, to the whole Moslem world.” The President of Pakistan has naturally referred to the feelings of his country and the Islamic world. As regards the feelings of the Christian countries, they are no less unmistakable.

180. All these statements serve to supplement the elements of the consensus which I outlined earlier. A remarkably wide spectrum of countries has made it clear to the Security Council that Israel’s actions in the city are offensive and inimical to the universal religious interest and that the question of the status of Jerusalem is an issue which transcends the claims and counter-claims of the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

181. In the view of the Pakistan delegation any decision that the Council may take must be a firm vindication of the principle of the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition by war. It is this principle, and this principle alone, that will constitute the difference between a plan for peace in the Middle East and a formula of capitulation. If we deviate from this principle, we not only aggravate the situation in the area: we help to convert it into an arena of perpetual conflict. More than that, we tear away the very heart of the Charter of the United Nations.

182. The Security Council will recall that resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 emphasized this principle. Resolution 252 (1968) reaffirmed it. In so far as the City of Jerusalem is concerned, resolution 252 (1968)

clearly and categorically rules out its annexation by Israel. It is maintained that Jerusalem is one of the principal subjects to be dealt with within the framework of resolution 242 (1967). If so, any recommendation relating to Jerusalem rules out its annexation by Israel. It is maintained that Jerusalem is one of the principal subjects to be dealt with within the framework of resolution 242 (1967). If so, any recommendation relating to Jerusalem within the ambit of that resolution must be governed by the provisions of resolution 252 (1968).

183. It would be a travesty of the Charter of the United Nations, a betrayal of its basic principles, if, under the guise of the rectification of boundaries, or on the pretext of making them secure, any proposal were made which sought to condone or legitimize Israel’s incorporation of the city of Jerusalem into its territory. No one, we believe, will be deluded by Israel’s talk of the unification of Jerusalem. Any recommendation in contravention of the principle of the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition by force with respect to Jerusalem will not only generate a hostility that will last for generations, but will inflict a permanent injury on the sensibilities of the peoples of the entire Islamic world. Let there be no mistake about it. Such a recommendation will not only deepen the sense of outrage suffered by 600 million Moslems because of the events of June 1967, but will also inevitably alienate their sympathies from its proponents. And from a purely pragmatic point of view, any such proposal will be politically not viable.

184. Let me also invite the attention of the members of the Security Council to a central provision of the Charter of the United Nations, namely, Article 24. Paragraph 1 of that Article reads as follows:

“In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.”

I would emphasize the words “the Security Council acts on their behalf”. Therefore, the four permanent members of the Security Council have to safeguard the interest of all Members of the United Nations in the city of Jerusalem. We confidently expect that the deep concern that has been voiced by the delegations which have participated in this debate and in those of the General Assembly over the annexationist designs of Israel will be fully respected by the four Powers in any recommendations that they may make to the parties for establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

185. We now come to the question: what must the Security Council do to convince Israel that the United Nations cannot allow it to foreclose a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem and to disregard the sentiments of the majority of mankind? Israel’s continued defiance has left no option to the Security Council except to go further than the call embodied in resolution 252 (1968). As a result of the consultations held among members of the Security Council under your auspices, Mr. President, I have the honour to present the following draft resolution in the

¹³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1681st meeting.

names of the delegations of Senegal, Zambia and Pakistan, which they believe will command a unanimous vote:

"The Security Council,

"Recalling its resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 and the earlier General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967, respectively concerning measures and actions by Israel affecting the status of the City of Jerusalem,

"Having heard the statements of the parties concerned on the question,

"Noting that since the adoption of the above-mentioned resolutions Israel has taken further measures tending to change the status of the City of Jerusalem,

"Reaffirming the established principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible,

"1. Reaffirms its resolution 252 (1968);

"2. Deplores the failure of Israel to show any regard for the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council mentioned above;

"3. Censures in the strongest terms all measures taken to change the status of the City of Jerusalem;

"4. Confirms that all legislative and administrative measures and actions by Israel which purport to alter the status of Jerusalem, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, are invalid and cannot change that status;

"5. Urgently calls once more upon Israel to rescind forthwith all measures taken by it which may tend to change the status of the City of Jerusalem, and in future to refrain from all actions likely to have such an effect;

"6. Requests Israel to inform the Security Council without any further delay of its intentions with regard to the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution;

"7. Determines that, in the event of a negative response or no response from Israel, the Security Council shall reconvene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter;

"8. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution."

The draft resolution that I have just read out is self-explanatory and it has been circulated as document S/9311, in English and French as the original text. I shall therefore not explain its provisions. It is our belief that unanimity in the decision to be taken by the Security Council will lend unique authority to it. ✓

186. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Pakistan for the sentiments he has

expressed about my country and myself. Senegal and Pakistan have enjoyed good relations of all kinds since my country became independent. As for you personally, Ambassador Shahi, I have known you for two years, we have worked side by side for nearly two years, and I know your perspicacity and talent.

187. Now, in my capacity as the representative of SENEGAL, I should like to make a statement here on the opinion of my Government on the problem before us today. As you know, numerous resolutions have been adopted both by the General Assembly and the Security Council, calling upon Israel to desist from changing the status of the Old City of Jerusalem until a solution can be found to the problem of the Middle East as a whole.

188. The problem of Jerusalem cannot be settled by administrative or social measures alone, even if these actions are presented as necessary or likely to bring prosperity to the indigenous populations. This problem is of a religious, legal and political nature. Jerusalem, the Old Holy City, is the seat of the world's three great religions. The Geneva Convention of 1949 likewise defines the position the occupier must adopt vis-à-vis the persons and property of the occupied country or region. Finally, we all know that efforts are being exerted at present to settle the conflict in the Middle East as a whole in order that all parties concerned may live decently and in full security in their respective countries.

189. Last year, on 21 May 1968, the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968) in which it expressly requested Israel to rescind the legislative and administrative measures that country had already taken, and to desist from any action tending to incorporate the Holy City into the State of Israel. Unfortunately, it appears that the authorities of Israel are using delaying tactics and do not, in fact, intend to comply with the provisions of the said resolution. I shall quote only a few passages from an article which recently appeared in *The New York Times*:

"In ignoring the rights of long-time Arab residents of the city and in refusing to recognize that others have an attachment for Jerusalem that is equal to their own, the Israelis are sowing the seeds of perpetual conflict. There is little hope for Big Four efforts to promote peace in the Middle East or any other effort, unless Israel modifies its current policy of annexation. If the United States is to play an effective role in promoting a Middle East settlement, this country must make clear its commitment to a settlement of the Jerusalem question that recognizes the rights of the Arabs and the interests of the world community in this age-old city of contention."

190. I must remind you here that my country, in its concern for legality, has always respected and continues to respect the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947. We made a formal commitment to do so in joining the United Nations. We think that all Member States, whether large or small, have a moral obligation to abide by the decisions of our Organization and that annexation of the territory of one country by another is unacceptable to us. We can only deplore most vigorously the action of the

Government of Israel, at the very time when consultations between Governments were in progress with a view to finding a solution to the distressing problem of the Middle East. All violence must cease, all weapons must be silenced, so that the tension in the Middle East can die down and the parties can be reconciled and devote themselves in peace and dignity to the harmonious economic development of their respective countries.

191. Speaking as PRESIDENT, I would inform the members that we will now pass on to the draft resolution that has just been submitted by the representative of Pakistan and distributed in all the working languages in document S/9311. I should like to point out that the original languages of this text are English and French. Moreover, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should read as follows in French:¹⁴

“Confirme que toutes les mesures et dispositions législatives et administratives prises par Israël qui ont pour effet d’altérer le statut de Jérusalem, y compris l’expropriation de terres et de biens immobiliers, sont non valides et ne peuvent modifier ce statut.”

I would ask the Council if it has any objection to the draft resolution being put to the vote.

192. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): I have no objection to the draft resolution being put to the vote. However, I do wish to draw attention to the Spanish version of the text. In the first and third preambular paragraphs, and in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 the word “status” in the original English and “statut” in the original French has been translated by the word “condición”, which appears in the corresponding paragraphs of the Spanish text. In my opinion, that is not the best translation. The appropriate word is “estatuto” which in itself implies the essentially legal concept that the word “condición” lacks. Precisely because “estatuto” reflects the existence of a legal basis, it is unnecessary to repeat the qualifying adjective “jurídico” as in resolution 252 (1968), since the word “estatuto” includes this concept. I do not presume to be expert in any language, and therefore I refer to precedents. The word “status” in the original English has already been translated by the word “estatuto” in resolution 252 (1968), and the subject of this debate is non-compliance with that resolution.

193. I therefore request that the Secretariat take note of this comment and make the necessary changes.¹⁴

194. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 5 of draft resolution S/9311. In accordance with rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, unless the co-sponsors object, I shall put paragraph 5 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union

¹⁴ The complete text of the draft resolution was subsequently reissued to incorporate the change mentioned by the speaker.

of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

195. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution [S/9311] as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*¹⁵

196. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for the floor in order to explain his vote after the vote.

197. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, the position of the Soviet Union on the question of Jerusalem has already been set forth in full in the Soviet delegation's statement on 1 July [1483rd meeting]. The Soviet Union has considered and continues to consider that Israel must immediately cease its illegal action and arbitrary conduct in Jerusalem; it must withdraw its armed forces from all the occupied territories, including the Arab part of Jerusalem. Once again we consider it our duty to stress that the situation in Jerusalem, as well as in the Middle East area as a whole, makes it imperative to liquidate the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States as soon as possible and to achieve a peaceful political settlement based on the well-known Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. This is the clear and firm position of the Soviet Union.

198. The Soviet delegation voted for the draft resolution on the grounds that, basically, it reflects the outrage and indignation of the States and peoples of the various regions of the world at Israel's continuing aggression, the atrocities it has committed against the Arab population of Jerusalem, and its cynical refusal to comply with previous decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The resolution just adopted censures in the strongest terms all measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem which the Israeli aggressors occupied in the course of their treacherous attack on the Arab States in June 1967. The Soviet delegation regards this condemnation pronounced by the Security Council as a serious warning to the ruling circles of Israel that they will be responsible for the consequences of continuing their aggressive policy.

199. The obviousness of the illegality of Israel's actions is confirmed, in particular, by the fact that all members of the Council have voted unanimously for the resolution as a whole. As I see it, this gives the resolution we have just adopted particular significance. If Israel is once again unwilling to heed the will and demands of the peoples, and

¹⁵ See resolution 267 (1969).

this unanimous decision by the Security Council, the Council will once again have to hold an urgent meeting to consider further action to be taken regarding Israel.

200. The Soviet delegation considers it essential to emphasize that, in the resolution just adopted, the Security Council has totally and fully rejected the fruitless attempts by the representative of Israel to provide a basis for the legality of Israel's actions in Jerusalem by claiming that the occupation of that city has brought some kind of alleged "benefits" to the Arab population. The Security Council, having once again confirmed the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by military conquest, has thereby made it clear that nothing can justify the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem and other seizures of Arab territories. This is an absolutely categorical and firm warning by the Security Council to those extremist circles in Israel which are dreaming of territorial expansion, the seizure of Arab lands, and new adventures. In the light of all these facts, Mr. President, the Soviet Union considered it possible to support this decision of the Security Council.

201. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of the United States has asked to speak in explanation of his vote, and I now call on him.

✓ 202. Mr. YOST (United States of America): The United States voted for the resolution just adopted by the Council because it is consonant with our position on Jerusalem as described in my statement to the Council on 1 July [1483rd meeting].

203. In the separate vote taken on paragraph 5, the United States abstained because the language of that paragraph, by describing the actions which Israel has taken as measures "which may tend to change the status of the City of Jerusalem", and calling on Israel to rescind them, is inconsistent with the clear language of the preceding paragraph of the resolution, which confirms that the measures in question cannot change the status of the city. Moreover, we do not consider this suggestion practical and believe it is likely to place the Security Council in an invidious position in the future.

204. In supporting the resolution, my Government wishes to make clear that it does not consider itself committed to any specific course of action during any future Council consideration of this issue. We continue to believe that Jerusalem cannot be dealt with on a piecemeal basis. We rededicate ourselves to a determined effort to help bring about agreement on a just and lasting peace in the area, in the context of which Jerusalem should not again become a bone of contention among religions and nations, but an example of unity.

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

206. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, the Security Council's deliberations on Jordan's complaint against Jerusalem's integrity, happiness and prosperity have come to an end. The representatives of Jordan and other Arab countries have turned this debate into a bacchanalia of belligerence and abuse. It was venomous; it will remain futile.

207. I have already drawn the Security Council's attention to the fact that the Arab States which joined in this exercise of enmity have by their repudiation of the United Nations Charter in relation to Israel, by their rejection of the Security Council peace and cease-fire resolutions, by their oppression of Jewish communities and other minorities, by their active pursuance of warfare against Israel, deprived themselves of the right to invoke the tenets of law, justice and human rights.

208. Could this have been illustrated more clearly than in today's appearances by Arab representatives, for instance that of the representative of Sudan? How does Sudan dare to come to the Security Council and speak of law and human rights? Its attitude towards Israel is well known; it was reiterated by Sudan's military leader, General al-Numeyri, as recently as 2 June 1969, when he declared: "The régime will work for the strengthening of the Arab nation, with the purpose of putting an end to Israel's existence." And this was confirmed today by the Sudanese representative in this Council. This posture in itself is sufficient to disqualify Sudan completely in any Security Council debate, particularly one concerning Israel.

209. However, Sudan's criminality is not confined to Israel. The following are excerpts from an appeal addressed on 9 April 1969 by the Southern Sudan Liberation Movement to the Zimbabwe African People's Union of Rhodesia, the South West African Peoples Organization, the Mozambique Liberation Front, the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, and the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde:

"Our people, the Africans of the Southern Sudan, have been constantly subjected to aggression and attempts at enslavement by the Arab Northern Sudanese for over 143 years. Our desire and struggle is for political independence for our country, the South Sudan.

"You have to know about the current butchery of the Southern Sudanese Africans by the Northern Sudan Arab troops. There are at least 1,000 Arab soldiers in each of the three provinces of the Southern Sudan. These troops are heavily equipped with tanks, planes, and other weapons of human destruction. Wherever these troops went they left a trail of death behind them: village men, women, and children have been and are being massacred in cold blood.

"... Arabs of the Sudan believe that they have the mission of civilizing the African, just as the white colonialists believed in the 19th century and which many believe today. Arabs believe that their language and religion are superior and should be imposed if necessary by force of arms and they are doing it today in the South Sudan."

The New York Times of 15 April 1968, in a lengthy report under the title "Arab-Dominated Government Slowly Subduing Tribesmen", estimates the number of South Sudanese killed by Government troops at half a million. How are the people of Israel, how is the world at large, to judge the advice and admonition of such States as Sudan, Iraq, Syria and Algeria? What are we to think of such counsel? Is the

complete absence of any moral or legal weight behind it to be balanced by the dubious weight of numbers? What are Israel and the world to think of a resolution adopted at the instigation of such States?

210. The proponents of the complaint before the Council could have found no more convincing a manner to underscore the nature of this debate and its outcome than by allowing Pakistan to present the resolution now adopted. Could there be a situation that evokes less respect than Pakistan's donning the mask of law and justice? Has not Pakistan's outstanding contribution to international life since its independence been war against a neighbouring country, occupation of foreign territory, persecution and exile of millions of human beings? Here is what the representative of India had to say about Pakistan in the General Assembly on 4 October 1968:

"Pakistan is in the habit of preaching to others what it does not practise itself. The condition of the minorities in Pakistan, particularly that of Hindus, is one of abject misery and terror. There is no security for their life or their property in Pakistan. And, of course, they do not have any fundamental rights to speak of."¹⁶

What value should be attached to a resolution born of such parents?

211. Mr. President, the representative of Jordan found it appropriate to distribute this morning, in document S/9303, photographs of new housing in Jerusalem. Nothing could illustrate more tellingly the frivolous nature of Jordan's complaint than these pictures of new buildings that will house both Jews and Arabs, buildings constructed, incidentally, on land owned privately by Jews. Jordan destroyed Jerusalem; Israel is rebuilding it. We are proud of it, and shall not be deterred in our work. Indeed it is not the welfare of Jerusalem's Arab community that motivated the Jordanian complaint, but plain, unadulterated hostility towards Israel. It was not love of Jerusalem that guided the Government, but hatred of Jordan. It was not the spirit of peace, which is Jerusalem's, that inspired Jordan, but the spirit of another city—Khartoum, in the Sudan—where the infamous decision was adopted by the Arab States: no peace, no negotiations, no agreement with Israel.

212. However, it is not only Jordan's motivation in submitting its complaint that must be condemned and rejected, but also Jordan's very right to intervene in the life of Jerusalem. Jordan's connexion with Jerusalem has been brief but tragic. It originated in aggression; it came of defiance of the United Nations; it lasted through 19 years of continued breach of international law, violation of human rights, desecration of Holy Places, and wanton destruction. No State in the entire world ever recognized Jordan's right to Jerusalem. Surely the expulsion of the Jordanian aggressor from Jerusalem could not have suddenly bestowed on Jordan rights which it had never possessed. Thus the view expressed by the United States representative—that the eastern part of the united City of Jerusalem constitutes occupied territory—is unacceptable to my Government.

¹⁶ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 1682nd meeting, para. 186.

213. We hope that the Government of Jordan will realize that the road it has followed by its complaint to the Security Council does not lead to any solution. We hope it will understand that, just as military warfare against Israel has brought no benefit to the people and Government of Jordan, so will political warfare against Israel prove fruitless.

214. This is not the way to deal with a people which has remained in the throes of war for 20 years, and this is not the manner for settling a conflict with a nation that has been through 4,000 years of trial, tribulation, persecution, resistance and tenacity. Just as we hope that Jordan will comprehend that military or political harassment will not sway Israel, we trust that it is evident that resolutions of the kind adopted at the present meeting cannot affect Jerusalem's life. Life cannot stop in Jerusalem. Life will not stop in Jerusalem. It will continue as it has during the last two years since Jerusalem's rebirth and reunion, for this is the will of the people and this is the historic destiny of the city. Hatred will not arrest its growth. Belligerence will not undermine its happiness and prosperity. As the prophet Isaiah said: "Jerusalem she shall be built, built for the glory of all who venerate her, for the bliss of all who inhabit her".

215. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

216. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): After the adoption of the Security Council resolution on the attack against Lebanon last December, Mr. Tekoah disqualified the Council. He said the Council was not qualified to make such a decision, because the Council was bankrupt. He then disqualified religious leaders and secular leaders and many others. During this debate he disqualified almost every single member who spoke on the question. In his last intervention he disqualified Sudan, Pakistan and the United States. I think those three Member States of the United Nations are in good company, because they were all disqualified by Mr. Tekoah.

217. Mr. Tekoah is the one who has the power to qualify or disqualify at will any member speaking on this question. What disturbs and should disturb the Council are the other utterances of Mr. Tekoah. His answer to the unanimous will of the Security Council, the highest organ of the United Nations, is "Your resolution is instigated by the non-member States who spoke here." I think it should be underlined that this comes from Israel, a Member State that owes its very existence to this body. It comes from Israel, which is the child of the United Nations. It comes from a Member which defies the very will of its mother, the United Nations. I think this provides some food for thought for every member around this table. I think it makes it imperative that the Council here and now start pondering what action should be taken against defiant Israel. This contempt, this arrogance, this deceit, this conceit, which is blinding the mind of Mr. Tekoah should urge the members during the remaining part of the current month to ponder what action should be taken by the Security Council against defiant Israel.

218. I know of no other alternative at present but to begin very seriously thinking of invoking Article 41 of the

Charter, the Article that calls for total or partial interruption of economic, diplomatic and other relations. In particular, we should not shield or accommodate Israeli aggression by sending Phantom jets or napalm or any destructive weapons to Israel. It is those weapons which create this intoxication, this arrogance. The Council, entrusted with maintaining peace, should see to it that the continuing aggression of Israel is brought to an end. It is the duty of the Council to begin now considering what measures should be taken against Israel. Sanctions now are the only remaining alternative, particularly in view of the fact that the Council has time and again warned Israel that more effective measures will be taken to put an end to its arrogance.

219. Not only has Mr. Tekoah just stated that this action is instigated by States other than members of the Council, but he has the audacity to ask the Council, immediately after its unanimous decision, "What value should be attached to a resolution born of such parents?" Those are his words. He asks what value should be given to the will of the United Nations, the will of the Security Council, reflecting world public opinion. The Council has once again pronounced its decision concerning the Holy City of Jerusalem. It has merely expressed the will of the international community. It has, above all, endorsed the rule of law and rejected the rule of the jungle adopted by the Israelis. It has emphasized once more the well-known international principle that any territorial acquisition by war is inadmissible and that measures taken by the occupying Power to change the status of Jerusalem are null and void and have no legal validity. The Council has called for specific steps, enumerated in the resolution which was read out by one of the sponsors. I need not repeat these steps enumerated in the resolution. Members of the Security Council, as well as other Governments which through their delegations participated in the Council's deliberations, were prompted by international principles, by a sense of duty and love for justice, to take their stand and pronounce their judgement. Above all, they are apprehensive about what the illegal Israeli measures will bring to the city of peace and its people.

220. My delegation is indeed thankful to all the colleagues around this table who, with courage and determination, stood for justice. We are also grateful to those delegations, non-members of the Security Council, which, in the exercise of specific duties, participated in our deliberations—namely, the delegations of Malaysia, Indonesia and Afghanistan. We are grateful to the delegations of Greece, Turkey and Bulgaria, and to their Governments, for the statements they issued in support of the just cause of Jordan. We are grateful to those who have participated in conferences and who have supported genuinely and sincerely and with conviction, the just cause of Jordan. Our complaint is just and therefore, I submit, the result could not have been otherwise.

221. The presence of the honourable elected Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Rouhi el-Khatib, who was with us during the consideration of the question of Jerusalem—Jerusalem, which is close to his heart—has not only allowed valuable and factual information to be submitted to the Council, but has also reminded us all of the serenity of our Holy City.

Mr. Rouhi el-Khatib will be going back to Jordan. Although in exile from his beloved city, Jerusalem, he will be going with new will and determination, with a genuine feeling that the whole world rejects all Israeli actions and holds the Israeli authorities responsible for the arbitrary Israeli measures. He will assure the people of Jerusalem of the determination of the Security Council in the event of a negative response or no response from the Israelis, to reconvene without any further delay in order to consider further action—I take it, to consider invoking Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. He will tell the people that neither Israeli bluff nor Israeli deceit, neither Israeli threats nor Israeli blackmail, helped the Israelis in the Security Council, and that Israeli expropriation, confiscation, arbitrary arrest and deportation reinforced the unanimous will of the Security Council to condemn the Israeli illegal measures and to warn that such measures should come to an end. This is the felicitous aspect of today's conclusion of our deliberations and the adoption of the resolution.

222. We are very happy to see that nobody around this table was misled by the Israeli-fabricated allegations, the last one of which was the claim that the buildings were being built on Jewish land. This is false and distorted; there is not an iota of truth in it. The lands are our Arab lands, owned by Arabs. If it is the desire of the Council, the records are available for the Council to see. But it is all right for Mr. Tekoah to come at the very last minute of the very last meeting on this question and indulge in more falsehoods and more misrepresentations. We are happy that no member around this table was misled by these distortions or by the Israeli smokescreen or by the Israeli diversionary tactics.

223. Every member voted for the resolution and thus condemned Israel, and by so doing served notice on Mr. Tekoah that his distortions did not mislead anybody. Today, Israel, more than ever before, stands alone. Would the Israeli leaders say now, after this unanimous resolution, that every Member State is out of step but Israel? Apparently, this is the contention that Mr. Tekoah wishes to convey to the Council. One wonders: Will the positive or the negative and aggressive nature of Israel appear after this resolution? Will they again call this a Gentile decision or will they see it as a Charter decision, a decision dictated by the values of the United Nations? Or would they wreck what the United Nations is building? The answer to these questions will determine whether the Israelis are for peace in the Middle East.

224. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table, and I call on him to speak.

225. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): The representative of Israel was absent from this chamber while the representative of Morocco was speaking this afternoon, at least towards the end of his speech. That is probably why he is so full of pride that he could take on all comers. Instead of being full of pride, I think the representative of Israel should pause and reflect a little on the resolution that has just been adopted by the Security Council. The representative of Israel should feel disconsolate rather than proud

—disconsolate because the resolution that the Council had just adopted has emphasized the isolation of Israel; it has deplored and rejected and repudiated Israel's actions.

226. I have not been here for very long, but I do remember a time when the voice of Israel was mute in these halls. I remember when it was very rare for an Israeli representative to rise to exercise his right of reply when Israeli crimes and violations were denounced in the United Nations. Least of all did I hear—and I am referring to a time about two years ago—the voice of the Israeli representatives being raised against the great Powers.

227. But now all this has changed. The voice is never still and they have perfected a device. It is the “how-dare-you” approach. It is directed mostly towards the Soviet Union, mostly towards the socialist countries, but directed always against any delegation, any Member State which criticizes Israel. The Arab countries are, of course, a particularly favourite target of the “how-dare-you” approach: How dare the Arab countries say anything about Israel? How dare the Arab countries speak about the oppression of minorities? Indeed, how dare the Sudan—he just said it—speak about Israeli oppression?

228. The representative of Israel lamented the fact that Sudanese troops were equipped with modern weapons, while he arrogated to the usurping Israelis the right to use weapons against villages, to use napalm against villages. He would say that this would be permissible because it would be in the interest of the security of Israel. But he would deny any security measures, no matter how lenient, no matter how humane, to anybody else. He would certainly deny the right to use any weapons against those in the Sudan who are working against the unity of the country. In the Sudan those who are working against the unity of our country have often been found equipped with Israeli weapons.

229. One could speak for a long time about the Israeli iniquities, but I should like to emphasize that Israel, which was a creature of the great Powers, should have some shame and should not speak against the great Powers in that strident voice that it has now adopted. It is, again, a matter of extreme amazement to my delegation that a State which predicates its whole claim to existence on racial exclusiveness should speak about the Arab Sudanese and the Southern Sudanese and say that the Arab Sudanese are trying to impose their will on the Southern Sudanese. The Israelis should not dare to point the finger of accusation in the direction of the Sudan. The Sudan has harboured a mixture of many ethnic strains, so much so that it is nonsense to speak of the conflict in the Sudan as being of a racial character.

230. We have had our share of troubles, because after we became independent it was important for us to forge the unity of the country. It was important that we should not allow those who did not like the Sudan to be independent to have their way. One of those who does not like to see an independent Sudan, who does not like to see an anti-imperialist Sudan, is the State of Israel. Who are Israel's friends in this world? If Israel were truly to identify its friends, it would have to count first and foremost amongst them the Republic of South Africa, a country which stands condemned, like Israel, before the whole world.

231. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Syria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table, and I call on him to speak.

232. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): It is already midnight and we are entering into the Fourth of July holiday. The resolution just adopted unanimously states the following in paragraph 6:

“Requests Israel to inform the Security Council without any further delay of its intentions with regard to the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution.”

We have heard a partial answer from the representative of Israel, but greater authorities in Israel had already given a full and complete answer. In *The Christian Science Monitor* of 13 June 1969, we are informed as follows:

“At a Tel Aviv news conference June 2, Defence Minister Moshe Dayan told this reporter that the total number of houses destroyed is a ‘security matter’ but that ‘the figure is about 250’.

“Last October, Israeli Minister of Construction, Mordechai Bentov, said 1,000 Israeli families would be installed in new settlements inside East Jerusalem's walled portion.

“He said the units would include 2,500 schools, houses, and commercial centres. Families, he added, would begin moving in September, 1969.”

Thus, the full and complete answer has been already given to the Security Council and we know what will happen in September of this year. Therefore to recall paragraph 6 of this resolution is very pertinent.

233. The representative of Israel goes on speaking about human rights unashamedly. There is another report from the same newspaper, *The Christian Science Monitor*, of 24 May 1969, which states:

“There is not a single person on the west bank, contends one cultured, Western-educated Palestinian woman in Nablus, who does not have a family member, a relative or at least a friend in prison or deported to East Jordan. People can be arrested anytime, day or night. They are held for months without ever appearing in court or charges being brought against them. This is happening all the time. An Israeli lawyer, Mrs. Felicia Langer agrees. She has been repeatedly threatened by fellow Israelis and warned by military security authorities because she defends accused Arabs . . . and other Arab internees in court”.

234. Finally, the representative of Israel again quoted Isaiah, but he did not quote the full text which is as follows:

“Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel but not of me; and that cover with a

covering, but not of my spirit, that they may add sin to sin:

"2. That walk to go down into Egypt, and have not asked at my mouth; to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt!

"3. Therefore shall the strength of Pharaoh be your shame, and the trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion."

235. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The representative of Israel has again referred to Pakistan in abusive terms. He has certainly been true to form. It is amusing that he quotes Indian charges against Pakistan. I recall that last year he did not spare India when India supported a Security Council resolution not to his liking.

236. At the conclusion of a fruitful debate, I feel that there are better things for me to do than to engage in argument with the representative of Israel. I have no appetite for his accents of anger and disdain. He is entitled to his consolation. I derive mine from contributing my little to the work of the Security Council. What value can be attached to a resolution moved by Pakistan here? I suggest that he ponder the unanimous vote.

237. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now invite the representative of Saudi Arabia, the last speaker on my list, to take a place at the Council table, and I call on him to speak.

238. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Allow me, first of all, to extend my whole-hearted congratulations, it being the Fourth of July, to my colleague, Ambassador Yost, and to the Government of the United States and the American people on the occasion of their national holiday. That is why I shall be very brief. Since there will be no fireworks at night, they should perhaps celebrate tomorrow with their children and grandchildren and not feel too tired.

239. However, I always feel constrained to correct certain distortions by Mr. Tekoah. Israelis used to speak of the Jewish history in Palestine as far back as King David, King Solomon and the establishment, for a short while, of Judea and Israel. Today he said that Jewish history goes back in Palestine 4,000 years. I must remind him that Moses lived 3,300 years ago and he was an Egyptian. Anyway, the Jews were not known as Jews until Jacob moved from Ur of the Chaldees. That is the important thing. Forget about when Moses flourished. The fourth son of Jacob was called Judah. But we may get lost in the forests of history late at night, and perhaps my memory may be getting a little fuzzy with regard to accurate dates.

240. However, I must say that it was indeed foolish of Mr. Tekoah to criticize not only the 15 members of the Council who voted for the resolution but also all of us who

asked to participate in the debate. I believe that to use that yardstick, many Zionists and Jews in this country do not think that the United States should have been involved in the Far East.

241. I quoted something today from Mr. Litvinoff. Mr. Tekoah should have ruled out the right of the United States representative to be with us. He has criticized the Soviet Union time and again; there it has no right to sit as a judge. My friend from Pakistan and my colleague from the Sudan and other colleagues, each one of them answered for himself. Of course, out of courtesy to you, Mr. President, he did not say anything about Senegal. But are we to find fault with every person or people? There is no perfection. Every one has some fault. If we were to find fault with each one of you gentlemen and with us who spoke, he would reduce the matter to the concept that we have no right to participate because of our faults as peoples, if not as individuals. He would be left alone to talk with God because he considers the Jewish people the Chosen People of God, and all of us subordinate to that people. I think he went a little bit too far, and it is becoming childish. We have tried to tell you time and again that we have no rancour or malice against the Jews, and you come with your sonorous voice, using certain words that really wound. But we have got so used to those words that I believe if you continue using them they will wound you, in the long run; and I will feel pity for you because we do not want you, as a human being, to be wounded.

242. On this Fourth of July you got a nice gift from our friend from the United States. He abstained. What more do you want? Nobody around the table abstained but the representative of the United States. What better gift on the Fourth of July do you want? We hope that the indigenous people of Palestine and the people of Jerusalem, after you come to your senses in Israel, will celebrate their own fourth of July.

243. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I see that the representative of the United Kingdom wishes to speak, and I now call on him.

244. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Before we disperse, I would merely say that I, with many others I am sure, greatly regret that we have had to listen to so much bitterness tonight, and I would not wish to add to it in any way. But reference has recently been made to the ill-omened date of the Fourth of July. That was the date, as everyone knows, when certain British subjects in this country, having become emotional and having, I regret to say, resorted to violence, were so unwise as to renounce the wise and beneficial rule of His Britannic Majesty King George III. All I can say is that I hope that tomorrow the inhabitants of this country will spend the day sadly reflecting on their historic error.

The meeting rose at 12.15 a.m., on Friday, 4 July 1969.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Находите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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