

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1423rd MEETING: 7 MAY 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1423)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146)	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 TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 7 May 1968, at 3 p.m.

President: Lord CARADON
(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1423)

1. Adoption of agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision previously taken by the Council, I shall now invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take seats at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it. I call on the representative of Jordan.

3. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Let me say at the very outset that although you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council were patient enough to let the Israeli

representative lecture you about philosophy, religion and statistics and on what amounts to a concept of co-sovereignty, which the Israeli representative tried to establish for every Member State where people of the Jewish faith live, you have certainly not heard Mr. Tekoah touch on the basic issue before the Council—that is, the United Nations resolutions relating to Jerusalem. I hope that at this stage of the debate this issue will be the one guiding our deliberations.

4. On 26 August 1967, in a memorandum to Mr. Thalmann, the personal representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. El-Khatib, the Mayor of Jerusalem, together with other members of the Municipal Council, warned that the Israeli Jews were beginning to unveil their projects for the construction of buildings and dwellings in Jerusalem to make room for 500,000 Jewish people at the expense of the Arab inhabitants and their property. This would involve illegally expropriating more parts of the city, of which the Municipal Council said, "the Arabs would retain only memories" [see S/8146, annex 1, sect. B].

5. Last Friday, 3 May 1968, at the 1421st meeting, the Mayor presented to the Security Council documents to show that the Arab apprehensions were well founded. He put before you maps, projects and an expropriation order showing that Israeli measures would seriously change the status of the Holy City.

6. In his statement the Israeli representative admitted that the Israeli authorities were carrying out three projects in Jerusalem. However, he painted a rosy picture of what good these projects would bring. Let us examine every one of these serious Israeli violations of the Assembly resolutions.

7. The first, according to the statement of Mr. Tekoah, is a plan to develop the areas of the Jewish quarter from its western edge to the Western Wall. He said that the Maghrabi quarter, adjacent to the Wall, is included in this Jewish project. The Council has before it the findings of the special tribunal formed by the United Kingdom with the approval of the League of Nations to determine property rights for the Wailing Wall and the adjacent area. I need not emphasize that the tribunal found that both the Wailing Wall and the adjacent area are 100 per cent Moslem property. The Israeli authorities resorted to monstrous attempts to take over this Arab property. They incorporated a small area adjacent to the Maghrabi quarter, owned by the Jews, and then proceeded to execute a large plan covering the two areas, claiming that the area for the project is owned by Arabs and Jews alike.

8. Mr. Tekoah referred to the plan recommended by Brown Engineering International. I need not emphasize that the Brown plan does not cover the Maghrabi quarter. The reason why the Maghrabi quarter was included in the Israeli plan is obvious and needs no explanation. It embodies another sinister attempt to convert what is Arab, as the Mayor has told you, into Jewish and Israeli property. What is more, the Maghrabi quarter is Waqf, that is, Moslem religious endowment, and its destruction offers a glaring example of vicious violations of Waqf rights. In order to justify this illegal appropriation of the Maghrabi quarter, Mr. Tekoah told the Council: "All inhabitants affected by this project have been provided with alternative housing by the Israeli authorities." [1421st meeting, para. 152.]

9. He failed to tell the Council, however, that only some of those evicted inhabitants were given shelter, and that this shelter, it should be known, consists of the dwellings of Arabs expelled by Israel after the June conflict and forced to cross to the east bank of the Jordan. This is designed to make it difficult, if not impossible, for those expelled by Israel to return in accordance with Security Council resolution 237 (1967), adopted unanimously by this Council. We know that at a later stage the new residents will face the same Israeli economic and political pressure and will have to leave in order to make room for new Jewish immigrants, and we all know that Israeli expansion works by stages.

10. Mr. Tekoah claimed on 27 April 1968, at the 1416th meeting, that in the Jewish quarter itself no home of any Arab inhabitant who has settled there in the last two decades is involved. This is completely false. It is belied by the facts. In the first place, over 80 per cent of the property in this so-called Jewish quarter is Arab-owned. It is mostly Waqf. Scores of Arab families were affected by this arbitrary measure. They were living in that area, where they had occupied their own houses for generations. Among those residents were people belonging to the family of the late Osman Taha Ennamari and the Assali, Kotob, Ja'ouni families and others. These are among the oldest Arab families of Jerusalem. They have been there from time immemorial. Is it fair or decent for the Israeli representative to ignore these facts and openly to say that no Arab was affected by this new Israeli act of aggression?

11. Now let us take the second Israeli project. This involves 3,345 *dunums*, 91 per cent of which are owned by Arab individuals, Moslem family Waqf, and Arab corporations. A substantial part of those lands is owned by the Arab people of the village of Lifta. In fact, this is the only land remaining in their possession since all their other lands were forcibly taken over by Israel in 1948. The Israeli representative had the nerve to come before this Council on 27 April 1968 and say that most of the land involved in this project is not Arab-owned but either Jewish-owned or public domain. He said that land records happen to be in Jerusalem, not in Amman. Earlier, the Israelis said that the Jews owned one third, and that the other two thirds were owned equally by the Government of Jordan and the Jordanian people. It is significant that neither of these two stories was mentioned again by Mr. Tekoah during the last meeting.

12. My delegation is anxious to know whether Mr. Tekoah was satisfied with the explanation of the Mayor, or should we furnish more substantial evidence which would show that the Israelis are not only defying United Nations resolutions, but are also trespassing on Arab lands with the deliberate intention of usurpation? Not only Jordan but your own country, Mr. President, the United Kingdom, which was the administrative Power over Palestine, and also the United Nations Conciliation Commission, can certainly bring to the Council copies of the land register, records of these lands, and thus once and for all put an end to all Mr. Tekoah's falsifications.

13. In his distortion of facts the Israeli representative went to the extent of saying that the new housing construction is planned on empty land and that the development of this area is based on a master plan prepared by a British engineer, which was later recommended to the Jordanian authorities by Brown Engineering International. It is true that the recommendations of the two town planning specialists, Mr. Kendell and Brown Engineering International, aimed at making those areas purely residential zones. Certainly residential zones were intended to accommodate the owners of the land, not usurpers and dispossessors. Since 91 per cent of the land belongs to legitimate Arab owners, is it open to the Israelis to confiscate the land, apply the Kendell and Brown recommendations, start implementing them, and then invite Jewish immigrants to own and occupy these areas in utter disregard of United Nations resolutions? The Israeli claim that the new housing construction is planned on empty land does not hold water. The land was only recently partitioned among its many owners, and they were just contemplating working out their own construction in accordance with the approved municipal town planning scheme when the Israelis confiscated those lands and started bulldozing them in open defiance of the General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V).

14. What is more important is the fact that there is a vicious attempt, as shown by the Mayor, to achieve strategic advantage by dividing the Arab people of the southern part of the west bank from the people of the northern part. They have already given the two parts the names of Samaria and Judea. Jerusalem, with the other towns to the north and south—Ramallah, Bira, Bethlehem, Al-Khalil and Jericho—constitutes an interdependent unit in all aspects of life. Many inhabitants of these towns commute daily to Jerusalem for their jobs. Commerce and transportation are very interdependent, and so are education, housing, agriculture, industry and other functions. These attempts to divide and separate Arab inhabitants are in no way foreign to Israeli plans and tactics. They adopted the same measures—and I am sure the President of the Council is familiar with them—in the case of both the Arab cities of Jaffa and Nazareth in Palestine prior to its partition.

15. The third project mentioned by the Israeli representative embodied new acts of defiance to United Nations resolutions and authority. The particulars of this new aggression were not known to my delegation. He said that the project will take place in Neveh Ya'acov, an area situated between Jerusalem and the Arab city of Ramallah.

This, he said, was a Jewish settlement, destroyed during the war of 1948. I submit that the Israeli occupying authority has no right whatsoever to expropriate any land, regardless of the origins of the title of that land. This is in complete violation of international law and United Nations resolutions. There is no denying that the Israelis are aiming to change the character and status of Arab property and present the world with a *fait accompli*.

16. How can the Israelis raise the question of the national character of the city of Jerusalem when it is by now well known—and the United Nations records testify to this—that Jewish ownership of property in all of Jerusalem, both old and new, on the eve of partition in 1947 constituted not more than 26 per cent, and that through carefully planned military operations the Zionists occupied 84 per cent of the city in 1948? Through their aggression, they occupied the entire Arab commercial centres and residential quarters: Talbīyah, Al Qatamon, the upper and lower Al Baq'a quarters, Al Thowri, the Y.M.C.A. area, Musallabah, Sheikh Badr, Ukashah and other Arab areas of Jerusalem are but some examples. Is it not public knowledge now that the Arab residents of these quarters were driven out of their homes by Jewish terror, massacres and slaughter? Their houses, shops, offices were confiscated and promptly filled with new immigrants. Is it not a fact that many of those legitimate Arab owners became refugees? Others stayed on the other side of Jerusalem within sight of their properties. Now, twenty years later, they are experiencing the same crimes by the same Israeli authority and with the same goal of expelling them across the river to become refugees twice in less than twenty years, and with the same United Nations Organization watching. Should the Security Council this time again permit this to happen? This is the question before the Security Council and I submit that the United States and the United Kingdom have a role to play if they want the Security Council to maintain its prestige and effectiveness.

17. Surely, presenting the world with a *fait accompli* cannot be a source of title to Israel, the more so since all these violations challenge the United Nations jurisprudence; by an illegal act, no legal result can be produced, no right acquired, and no fruits gained from aggression. What Jordan, a small Member of the United Nations—one of the smallest among the Members of the United Nations—is facing today may face any small Member of the United Nations.

18. The Israeli representative keeps telling the Council that his compatriots established their sovereignty in their land. But which land? What is the definition of the land? Is it the 5.6 per cent they owned before the partition? This is the definition which the Israeli Foreign Minister gave of the land: "We are not seriously thinking of the Nile or the Euphrates, but to the Jordan River and its resources in the north, we devote our most serious attention." By "resources in the north" he intends As-Beini and Banias, parts of Syria and Lebanon. Here, too, is what Mr. Ben Gurion said in the introduction to the Israeli Government Yearbook of 1952, page 15: "The State has been established on a small part only of our true homeland."

19. I shall now answer another question raised by Mr. Tekoah, which I had a chance to answer earlier and find

myself compelled to bring up now in order to put an end to Israeli allegations and keep the record straight. Mr. Tekoah keeps repeating that the west bank of the Jordan was taken by Jordan through conquest. I will not indulge in a lengthy statement to refute this Israeli allegation. Suffice it to say that the red booklet¹—called a "book" by the President—which was submitted by the Mayor to the Council and is to be issued as a Security Council document, embodies statements and declarations showing the clear expression of the will of the people. Lawyers, doctors, leaders, dignitaries, mayors, municipal councillors, union leaders and people from all walks of life—Christians and Moslems—have, through demonstrations and protests, deplored the illegal annexation of Jerusalem, refused to recognize it, called for its rescission and for the immediate withdrawal of the Israelis and the re-establishment of the unity of Jordan on both banks of the Jordan River. The refusal of the Municipal Council to recognize the annexation and co-operate with the Israeli régime of usurpation offers enough proof of this.

20. Mr. Tekoah said before the Council last Friday, at the 1421st meeting, that everybody is happy except one person. The one person he was referring to was the Mayor of Jerusalem. There is no doubt that all the people of the west bank and the Gaza area and all the occupied areas now subjected to Israeli occupation and oppression are one person in their determination to reject and oppose Israeli occupation. Every one of them is Rouhi El-Khatib, the Mayor of Jerusalem. The Security Council will find the red book reflecting Arab resistance most enlightening. It gives an accurate picture of our peoples' demands.

21. Only the day before yesterday, the towns of Ramallah and Bira were both subjected to collective punishment. The Israeli occupying authorities imposed restrictive measures against the inhabitants of these towns, which lie eight miles north of Jerusalem, as punishment for their protest and strike last Thursday against the Israeli military demonstration in Jerusalem. Check-points south of Ramallah were established to prevent residents—most of whom are Christian Arabs—from travelling to Jerusalem or worshipping there. Even those inhabitants who work in Jerusalem were not permitted to go to their place of work. All these, the Israelis conceded, were punitive measures. *The New York Times* reported today that some of these measures had been relaxed, but, the *Times* continued, economic sanctions continue. Defence Order No. 101 of 27 August 1967, in Official Defence Bulletin No. 6 dated 27 November 1967, was enacted to enable the military authorities to take such punitive measures.

22. A military spokesman for Israel is reported in yesterday's *New York Times* as saying that the people of Ramallah "cannot act one day like great nationalists . . . and then return the next day to business as usual". In other words people under foreign occupation are not entitled, besides being nationalists, to earn their living. They have to make a choice. One wonders whether the Security Council takes Mr. Tekoah seriously when he says only one person is not happy about the Israeli occupation.

¹ See document S/PV.1421/Add.2.

23. Does this oppressive Israeli behaviour explain the story of the happiness of the people of Jerusalem and the adjacent area? Does it not rather explain the story of 450,000 Palestinians expelled since the June conflict from the west bank to the east bank? Indeed, these punitive measures give the answer to all Mr. Tekoah's monstrous falsifications.

24. Such harsh Israeli measures make everyday life difficult for the Arab inhabitants. While Security Council resolution 237 (1967) called upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the area, we found out that the Israeli defence army issued orders and decrees permitting Israeli soldiers and officers to enter any place at any time, causing havoc and bringing insecurity to these inhabitants. Many young men were taken from their homes, without any notice or explanation. The punishments varied from five years' to life imprisonment.

25. The Israeli defence army orders are many and cannot be dealt with at length. One of these orders pertained to the prevention of looting; the punishment for looting was prescribed as life imprisonment. However, many Arab shops and houses were looted by the Israelis, and these offenders went unpunished. The Israeli representative will certainly clarify things for the Council if he tells us how short was the sentence for those Israelis who stole the crown of the Virgin in the Holy Sepulchre.

26. Security Council resolution 237 (1967) also called upon the Government of Israel to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. The majority of these inhabitants could not get Israeli permissions to return. They applied through the Red Cross but in vain. Most of them had to find their own peaceful way to go back to their homes rather than add to the swelling numbers of refugees. Instead of facilitating the return of these inhabitants the Israeli defence army issued orders to prevent such return—Orders Nos. 106, 125, dated 27 November and 10 December 1967—and prescribed a punishment of fifteen years' imprisonment and 10,000 Israeli pounds for any person who crosses the River Jordan to return home. To the right of return incorporated in resolution 237 (1967) the answer was a military order and a punishment of fifteen years' prison and 10,000 pounds. Thus the Israeli authorities did not facilitate the inhabitants' return but obstructed and prevented it. More than that they expelled those who did reach home. These punishments and expulsions were severely applied against the inhabitants of Jerusalem and neighbouring villages in particular.

27. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the partition of Jerusalem. But who is responsible for the partition of the whole of Palestine? Not the Palestinians or the Arab States, but those who came from Europe carrying a destructive ideology to upset a life of coexistence in the Holy Land between Arabs and Jews. Before the appearance of the Zionists' destructive ideology and their recourse to the weapons of lawlessness and terrorism in support of their aims and ambitions, things were happy and peaceful. It was the Palestinians who opposed partition of any kind and called for the unity of Palestine, and it was the Zionists

who intrigued and conspired to bring about the partition. The Palestinians suffered no less than 30,000 casualties while struggling to prevent the partition of the Holy Land. The Zionists continued using all their pressure groups everywhere to bring about the partition of Palestine. Today, Mr. Tekoah wants you to forget the crime they committed in the name of partition, while it is this which set the whole country ablaze. And now he appears before this body as the champion of the unity of Palestine. Yes, they want the unity of the land but without its Arab people. To them unity is to create a Jewish State within an Arab State and without the Arab people.

28. The Mayor of Jerusalem, in his factual statement on what followed the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem, has given us a tragic picture of Israeli violations and changes in the status of the Arab sector of Jerusalem. These violations are meant to liquidate the Arabs in the city. One of the drastic measures taken was the introduction of a law called the "Absentees' Property Law". This law entitled the Israeli authorities to lay their hands on all the movable and immovable property of absentee Arabs. The so-called absentees include those who fled the horrors and pressures of the occupation. It also includes the thousands of Palestinians temporarily working in Arab countries. The Mayor reminded the Council that this illegal practice, if permitted to continue, will swallow a great deal of the Arab property in Jerusalem and will help in the liquidation of the Palestinians and the Palestinian cause. Certainly, the Security Council is expected to take urgent measures to remedy these monstrous illegal Israeli practices.

29. Our case is clear and simple. What is needed is the will to do what is right. The collective will, the collective conscience and the collective wisdom of this body should be more influential, more effective and more powerful on this Jerusalem situation. We know that the world conscience is being deluded and poisoned by a world-wide Zionist hate campaign directed against the Arab people. But this, we hope, will strengthen the will of the Security Council to do what is right.

30. Let us never forget that Jerusalem and Arab villages in the neighbouring area which was incorporated illegally and with a stroke of the pen in the Israeli designs for Jerusalem are not only pieces of real estate to be traded in the real estate market and in the Israeli fashion. Jerusalem is a great city, a centre of spiritual values for three great religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam. But this is not all. The Security Council should not overlook the fact that Jerusalem and the neighbouring villages have their own cultural identity and a way of life which the Council is expected to protect. Thus, unless Israeli arrogance is condemned and checked, I am afraid the entire concept of law and equity will be jeopardized, which is an invitation to disaster. You have heard Jordan explaining Jerusalem's struggle for survival. Jordan certainly emphasized attempts now being made to liquidate the national Arab character of our city and everything called Arab. The Mayor emphasized that the intention is to change what is Arab and forcibly make it Jewish and Israeli.

31. Now with regard to the situation in Jerusalem, should inaction by the Security Council be the criterion in this

most urgent question before it? Should it be the criterion? Does it help the area if the Council does not react to the Israeli measures changing the status of Jerusalem and challenging the United Nations authority? Will justice and peace really prevail in the area, as some permanent members insist, if no action is taken and the Israelis are allowed to use Mr. Jarring and his mission as a shield for continuous Israeli aggression and occupation? Jerusalem has fallen a victim to a well-conceived and wholly illegal expansionist move by Israel. If the prospects of justice and peace are to prevail and not to suffer irretrievable damage, this Israeli move must be reversed and the measures it entails must be rescinded. Action by the Security Council will be far more constructive than inaction.

32. I beg all members in this Council to ponder this and think of how constructive and positive action will be received by the people who still have faith in the United Nations, its Charter and the values it is intended to protect.

33. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): For nearly a fortnight, we have been discussing in the Security Council Jordanian accusations on such matters as a military parade, the restoration of synagogues and housing construction. The Security Council has already adopted two resolutions. Each one seems to have whetted Jordan's appetite even more. Thus we go on and on, while the principal problems and veritable dangers cry out to us in oblivion. Indeed, as the Council has proceeded with its deliberations, the roar of guns, the explosion of mines and the harvest of death have continued along the cease-fire line. Despite the cease-fire, Jordan has not put an end to its warfare against Israel.

34. The day before yesterday, King Hussein, appearing on British television, once more expressed his support for the pursuance of war against my country and my people by raids, terror and sabotage. Similar and even more extreme statements have been made recently by the heads of other Arab States. During the last three weeks, Jordanian military positions have attacked Israeli villages and Israeli forces with artillery and mortar fire no less than twenty-five times. Again innocent farmers, their women and children, in Neve-Ur, Ashdot Ya'acov, Yardena, Gesher, Shaar-Hagolan, Kefar Ruppin, Maoz Hayyim, have been victims of Jordanian aggression by night and day. At the same time, sabotage and terrorist raids continue, with the participation of ever-larger commando units. For instance, on 17 April 1968, a unit of six Jordanian commandos encountered a patrol of the Israel defence forces north-west of Damia bridge. In the exchange of fire, three of the band were killed and the others were wounded and captured. Six Kalashnikov rifles, more than twenty grenades, sabotage material and other equipment were found at the site of the encounter. On 25 April 1968, a patrol of the Israel defence forces clashed with another commando unit near Be'er Ora, north of Eilat. All six of the saboteurs in the band were killed. All of them wore Egyptian army uniforms. The commander had the rank of lieutenant in the Egyptian army. Two soldiers had had receipts in their pockets confirming that they had deposited their documents in the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. One soldier had a certificate issued in Cairo in 1967 and another a card indicating that he was a member of the Egyptian commando battalion No. 141.

35. The Security Council will recall that I have already brought to its attention the fact that officers and men of the regular armies of Egypt and Syria used Jordanian territory as a base for attacks against us. On 28 April 1968, another guerrilla unit encountered a patrol of the Israel defence forces on the west bank of the Jordan River at Wadi el-Aga. Thirteen men were killed and one captured. On 3 May 1968, two Israeli civilians and two Israeli soldiers were killed and two others injured when their jeeps were blown up by mines near the village of Neot Hakivar, south of the Dead Sea. The mines had apparently been planted by a band of saboteurs from Jordan, thirteen of whom were killed earlier in the same area in a clash with the Israel forces. Altogether six marauder units, totalling 'forty-one men, were eliminated during this period by the Israel forces. Israeli casualties were seven dead. Throughout the entire day of 5 May, Jordanian army positions fired on Israeli villages, Israeli civilians and Israeli forces. Yesterday, Jordanian military positions attacked Israeli farmers working in the fields of Kibbutz Gesher, north of the Beit She'an Valley.

36. Israel comes before the Security Council to plead with it not to allow this warfare to continue. These grave, persistent violations of the cease-fire are a direct, immediate threat to all hopes for a peaceful settlement in the area. The Security Council has already declared, in its resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968, that such violations cannot be tolerated. The Security Council cannot, the Security Council must not, remain silent in the face of this defiant Arab challenge to the cease-fire. We appeal to the Security Council to pronounce itself clearly and unequivocally on the dangers that emanate from continued Arab acts of war. We appeal to the Security Council to try at last to put an end to the armed attacks, raids and killings directed against Israel from Jordanian territory.

37. The present Jordanian complaint is but another expression of active belligerency. It is but another attempt to thwart Israel-Arab understanding, a plot to make it even more difficult for the Council to deal effectively with Arab aggression. The essence and goal of the Jordanian complaint are simple. Ten months after the repulsion of last June's Jordanian attack against Israel, with Jerusalem breathing freely again in unity and peace, should life stop, paralysis replace normal development and the wheel turn back to darkness and emptiness?

38. Jerusalem is a living city, a city made up of people, a city of Holy Places, a centre of universal interest, veneration and pilgrimage. The problems facing us are not of abstruse and contestable interpretations, but of pressing practical needs. Should measures adopted for the protection of Holy Places be considered regrettable? Must Jewish Holy Places remain desecrated? Should the local authorities stop issuing licences for the construction of houses by Arabs or by Jews? Must we tear up the pavements and roads and restore the ruins and barbed wire? Must we refuse the Moslem and Christian population of eastern Jerusalem increased quantities of that most precious of commodities in the Middle East, water, supplied now from west Jerusalem—and all this merely to satisfy the belligerent whims of an aggressor State?

39. The development of the situation in Jerusalem since last June constitutes a long-awaited revival, a return of the city to its normal state, casting away nineteen years of tragic, artificial division. This is not an Israeli view. This is the opinion shared by all who hold dear Jerusalem's welfare and happiness. No objective and unbiased observer could suggest today that the nightmare of Jordanian occupation deserves to be preserved. The United Nations itself has not been able to ignore the grim implications of the Jordanian conquest of part of this city. As early as 1951, the report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East stated:

"... the separation of the old city of Jerusalem from the more modern and prosperous part has deprived many persons of their livelihood, depressed the tourist trade and created great congestion and severe competition for the few jobs that remain."²

40. Even an organization commissioned by the Jordanian authorities found it impossible not to emphasize this city's unhappy state. The Brown Engineering International report submitted to Jordan in 1963 states: "Modern Jerusalem is largely a product of unnatural circumstances. That which was once a complete organism was cut in two."

41. It is this basic fact, this overriding circumstance, that explains why Jerusalem today is a rejuvenated city and why all its inhabitants—Jews, Arabs and others—are gradually joining together to rebuild it, beautify it, make it worthy again of its name. How much more testimony from Christians and Moslems, from church leaders and foreign visitors, from statesmen and journalists is necessary to convince the advocates of division and hostility that their bias, their abuse and their venom are inadmissible?

42. What we have heard today and at previous meetings is one long tale of distortion and callous disregard for the interests and happiness of the glorious metropolis and its people. Every stage of development since last June was misrepresented, every action by Israel misconstrued. The June hostilities were the most televised, the most fully reported war in recent history; nothing could be concealed from the lens of the camera or the eye of the press. *The Sunday Times* of London, for instance, published, on 11 June 1967, the following eyewitness account by its correspondent Colin Simpson:

"The infantry platoons swung left through the cloisters of the Fort of Antonia and into the vast courtyard of the great Mosque of Omar. From the small gate-houses beside the Mosque, machine-guns opened up and the Arabs used their mortars horizontally, the bombs sliding crazily across the paving stones before exploding.

"I called on the Little Fathers of Saint Nicholas who attended the wounded and marvelled at the nuns from the Monastery of the Sisters of Zion who were incredibly calm. Both told me that their buildings had suffered no damage. One of the really impressive things was the tremendous care taken by the Israelis not to damage

private or religious property. Every soldier I saw seemed to venerate the city, and several times held his fire when sniped on from a church roof."

43. The Jordanians did not confine themselves to the destruction of the thirty-four synagogues and innumerable houses of learning in the Jewish quarter. They did not stop at the profanation of the ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives. They were not satisfied with their indiscriminate shelling of Jerusalem, causing numerous casualties and damage to such buildings as the world-renowned Dormition Abbey. As *The Sunday Times* reported, they turned Holy Places into military bases and army positions. The eastern ramparts of the Haram Ash-Sharif area where the Mosque of Omar is situated served as gun emplacements; artillery and mortar fire was directed from the wall towards western Jerusalem; caves and cisterns in this holy compound were used as ammunition dumps; an ammunition store guarded by Jordanian soldiers was found even in the Holy Cave underneath the Rock of the Mosque of Omar; military tents, lorries, motor cycles and army offices were located inside the Haram area adjacent to the Gate of the Tribes—Bab al Asbat. The minarets of the Mosque of Omar and the Al Aqsa Mosque were used as sniper positions; so was the Minaret of the Mosque of Sheikh Jarrah; a military lorry full of explosives and ammunition was exploded by the Jordanian army next to the Al Aqsa Mosque at the approach of the Israel forces.

44. It is instructive, indeed, to compare this utter disdain shown by the Jordanians for the holiness of Moslem mosques with the protestations of concern for religious values voiced in Jordanian statements in this Council. How this alleged regard for religion appeared in the eyes of the local inhabitants is illustrated in a report entitled "Into Jerusalem, on to Bethlehem" by Mr. Royce Jones, printed in *The Sunday Telegraph* of 11 June 1967. The report states, *inter alia*:

"After Saturday comes Sunday, an Arab tells me—the proverb meaning that after the Jews are massacred it will be the turn of the Christians. Several of them crossed themselves to prove their religion."

Referring to this very victory, the report continues: "This is the best thing that could have happened to Bethlehem, said a Franciscan in the church."

45. A letter published in the *Jerusalem Post* on 30 April 1968 on behalf of a group of American Christians resident in Bethlehem states:

"We have been in the Arab world for the past twenty years and know what would have happened if the victory had been reversed. There would have been no thought of sensitivity towards feelings or confiscated lands; all would have been destroyed just so the Arabs could sit in bombarded buildings and brag as to what happened to the Jews and their fine buildings, letting the country and corpses deteriorate as they allowed their land to deteriorate in the past few centuries.

"We are Americans, Christians, and were here before, during and after the six-day war. Local residents were in

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 16, para. 22.

our house during the shooting, first to protect us from the mobs who had threatened. After the victorious army had occupied our city for one month, most residents felt they had been liberated but their propaganda-instilled minds still feared reprisals from a united Arab army, which still promises them a total victory from one lost battle. The Jews have desecrated nothing that is holy to another religion, either Christian or Moslem. They have cleared away rubble and filth which have accumulated for years and are in the process of restoring their own holy places that had been desecrated, ignored or allowed to decay by all other religions for centuries."

46. It is without the slightest hesitation that I invite comparison between the Jordanian attitude and Israeli policy, not only towards Christians and Christian Holy Places but towards Moslem Holy Places and Moslem institutions. The Haram Ash-Sharif, where the mosques of Omar and Al Aqsa are situated, remains entirely under Moslem jurisdiction. The entrance to it is guarded by Moslem Arab policemen. Special instructions are posted to prevent entry in attire unbecoming the holiness of the site. The Moslem Waqf continues to charge entrance fees to the various shrines. During prayers entrance is forbidden to non-Moslems. When, last August, Mr. Thalmann, the Secretary-General's personal representative, tried to visit the Haram Ash-Sharif area on a Friday morning when prayers were being conducted in the mosques of Omar and Al Aqsa, he was stopped by guards employed by the Waqf. The Supreme Moslem Council meets regularly; the Moslem Shar'ia Court continues its work in accordance with traditional shar'ia law; the Waqf Council functions normally; all Waqf officials continue in their posts; revenues from Waqf properties are collected as in the past; the first Moslem hospital in Jerusalem, situated on the Mount of Olives, has completed construction of its premises and the outfitting of its wards and will begin to operate shortly. The Red Crescent Society, the Moslem orphanages, Moslem cemeteries, Moslem private schools function normally under unchanged Moslem supervision; Friday prayers, sermons in mosques, celebration of holidays continue in accordance with all traditions; on Moslem festivals streets are decorated and illuminated and cannon salvos announce the beginning of the holiday. For the first time since 1948, Israeli Moslems are free to worship in the shrines of eastern Jerusalem; Moslem visitors from Arab States and from other continents have again begun to visit the city; the Moslem inhabitants have resumed their pilgrimages to Mecca.

47. On 14 July 1967, the Foreign Minister of Israel stated in the General Assembly:

"We have a deep and respectful understanding of the concern of Moslems for their Holy Places. It goes without saying that the custody of the Moslem Holy Places in Jerusalem should be in the hands of authoritative representatives of Islam, with free access fully ensured for all Moslems. Accordingly, we shall welcome consultations with Moslem representatives in the vicinity of our country and throughout the world."³

³ *Ibid.*, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 1554th meeting, para. 75.

This remains Israel's policy. I have already expounded our position towards the Holy Places in general. Unlike previous Governments, Israel does not wish to exercise exclusive and unilateral control over the Holy Places. We are ready to work out special arrangements with those traditionally concerned which will ensure the universal character of Christian and Moslem Holy Places, and steps in this direction have already been taken.

48. There is one way, and one way only, to judge present conditions in eastern Jerusalem: not by the bellicose pronouncements of hostile Governments, not by statements of disgruntled agents of Jordanian rule, but by the reaction of the people themselves. The Arab residents have rejected all attempts made by outside elements to prevent Israel-Arab co-operation in the administration of the city. Arab inhabitants of east Jerusalem now voice their views, their complaints and demands through a committee of thirty-nine mukhtars, neighbourhood leaders who represent all sections and clans of the population of east Jerusalem. The mukhtars constitute an advisory committee to the mayor and are the same persons who functioned in this capacity prior to 5 June 1967. Moreover, frequent question-and-answer meetings are held between the mayor and municipal department heads and the local public. Hundreds of Arab citizens, and in particular persons prominent in public life and professions, attend. At the meetings of the Mukhtar advisory committee and at the public assemblies the needs of the city are aired, the interests of the inhabitants voiced. Those who have attended these meetings cannot help feeling that statements like the one we have just heard from the Jordanian representative are very far indeed from reflecting the mood and wishes of the Arab citizens of Jerusalem. They, like their Jewish neighbours, are interested in the city's peace and prosperity, not in international tugs of war. The best indication of this is the utter failure of strenuous attempts made recently to rouse passions and create trouble in the city on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of independence. I should like at this point to deny most categorically that any measures have been taken in respect of the freedom of movement of the inhabitants of the towns of Ramallah or Bira, as alleged by the representative of Jordan.

49. It is through such meetings with the Mayor and with the public and its representatives that the municipality is able to act upon suggestions and advice offered to it freely and democratically. Many of the measures taken in east Jerusalem in the last several months are in response to such suggestions and advice: 110,000 square metres of roads have been paved, free medical services organized, public libraries opened. At the last meeting of the Security Council, mention was made, for example, of the removal of the plastics factory from inside the walled city. What was not mentioned, however, was the fact that this step was taken at the specific request of the local inhabitants who had objected to the noise and bad air created by the factory, and had demanded its relocation by the Jordanian authorities—in vain, however. What was also omitted was the fact that in a letter dated 17 September 1966 Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib announced that the licence of the factory would be revoked for these self-same reasons.

50. It is significant that the Arab citizens of Jerusalem adopt this attitude of joint effort for the benefit of the city

also in respect of the very measures and projects around which the Jordanian complaint attempts to create a controversy. The representative of Jordan takes exception to housing construction plans, but not so 200 Arab families who, together with 250 Jewish families, will be settled in these new homes, and not so the Arab workers who will be employed in their construction. The Jordanian representative finds only words of criticism for the clearing of slums around the Western Wall, in accordance with international recommendations. Not so the inhabitants of these slums, who have been provided with new housing. I should like to read to the Council the text of a letter dated 8 January 1968, addressed by forty-one heads of families to the Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Kollek:

"We, the undersigned, who constitute part of the residents of the Jewish quarter and of the Maghrabi quarter of the old city, who were evacuated from our homes there as a result of the six-day war, wish to thank His Honour, as well as Mr. Meron Benvenisti, in charge of east Jerusalem, and Mr. Faris Ayub, head of the public relations bureau in the eastern part of the city, for the financial aid and human care which were extended and are still being extended to us, which impressed us profoundly and which afforded us and our families more decent alternative accommodation. We pray God will grant you long life and a continuance of your good deeds."

May I add that, contrary to what we heard at the last meeting, there were no mosques among the Maghrabi houses.

51. The Jordanian complaint tries also to paint a bleak picture of the situation in eastern Jerusalem and the prospects of joint Israel-Arab endeavours for the good of the city. The well-known Nusseibah family, which the representative of Jordan enthusiastically extolled at a previous meeting, seems to disagree with him. The Nusseibah family is now constructing a six-storey, 140-room hotel in Jerusalem.

52. It must be emphasized that building activities are not confined to the Jewish sector. The district planning board is approving an average of ten applications a week, submitted by Arab residents for construction permits. In general, an unprecedented economic boom prevails today in Jerusalem. Thousands of Arab workers make a living in factories and construction firms in that part of the city which until a year ago they were told to consider as enemy territory. There is a shortage of manpower in the building industry. Mixed Jewish-Arab enterprises, such as construction firms, restaurants, souvenir stores, are mushrooming. The Arab Chamber of Commerce, under the old leadership, is pursuing its activities and expanding them. A special advisory committee was formed by the Chamber to work with the municipality on the assessment of income tax. Workers, government and municipal employees in eastern Jerusalem have joined the Israel Federation of Labour.

53. The most striking feature of present-day Jerusalem is probably the freedom of movement enjoyed by the city. Not only are the walls, minefields and barbed-wire fences that separated the two sectors no longer there, not only are

all Israeli citizens—Jews and Arab alike—free to come to Jerusalem and bask in the fullness of its glory, not only are all Gaza inhabitants free to do so, not only can the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem move freely throughout Israel, but they are also free to visit the east bank, including Amman and other Arab countries, and then to come back. There are regular daily bus and taxi services between Jerusalem and Amman. In the last few months 6,000 Arab citizens of Jerusalem have availed themselves of these services to visit the east bank and to return thereafter to their city.

54. I shall not burden the Security Council with a detailed analysis of the repeated misrepresentations advanced by Jordan concerning the statistical aspects of the urban development projects. The land registers and the title deeds in Jerusalem are available to all. The credibility of the claims made in Jordanian statements and the material distributed on their behalf is probably best illustrated by the following instance. An allegation was voiced in the Council and repeated today that 3,000 persons have been evacuated from the Jewish quarter. The true figure is 160 families, or about 700 souls, who were simply moved out of the ruins of the synagogues in which they had settled after the Jordanian capture of the old city in 1948. All have received alternative housing and full compensation, totalling 120,000 Israel pounds. There are still 3,500 Arab citizens residing in the Jewish quarter and, as I stated at a previous meeting, the restoration project would not affect them. Nor is it necessary to expatiate on the myths that have been woven before the Council concerning the alleged Israeli pressure on Arab inhabitants to leave the city and the resultant question of absentees' property. Again, let the testimony of third parties serve as an answer to slander. Mr. W. Byford-Jones, a well-known writer on the Middle East question, states in his book *The Lightning War*⁴ that the Israeli Government did all it could to prevent the Arabs from leaving their homes in old Jerusalem. There are numerous other eyewitness accounts to the same effect, including reports by representatives of the International Red Cross.

55. As regards the size of this problem and the question of absentees' property may I point out that relatives have been allowed to take over the homes of members of their families who have left, and that out of 8,000 houses in eastern Jerusalem, only 160 are considered as absentees' property.

56. Even archaeological excavations have not escaped Jordan's wrecking wrath. It is common knowledge that archaeological activities have always been an inseparable feature of Jerusalem's landscape. Excavations near the Temple Mount and the Western Wall have always taken place, in the Turkish period, during the British administration, and even under Jordanian rule. In the course of the last nineteen years the Department of Antiquities of the Government of Jordan, in co-operation with the British Archaeological School in Jerusalem under the supervision of Mrs. Kenyon, has carried out a number of archaeological excavations at the southern part of the Western Wall. Approval has now been granted for the continuation of these excavations outside the area of the Temple Mount,

⁴ London, Hale, 1967.

that is, outside the walls surrounding the Haram Ash-Sharif. Excavations in the area of the Western Wall are being carried out in co-operation with various Christian organizations.

57. The Jordanian statements treat the Western Wall as if it were nothing but a piece of real estate. How can blasphemy reach as far as that? In Rome, where eternal civilizations were born and the ancient world started, there stands a triumphal arch, an arch to mark one of the most significant contests of the Roman Empire. It is a monument to a victory that Rome considered a particularly significant expression of its grandeur, a victory over a people that in its struggle against foreign domination challenged Rome's hegemony in the East. Few of the innumerable Roman wars and conquests were considered as decisive for the future. This was the war against the people of Israel, the Judean State, its freedom and civilization. The arch depicts the defeated Hebrews being led into captivity bearing the symbols of the destruction of their sovereignty and their civilization, the symbols and paraphernalia of the demolished Temple.

58. In Jerusalem there stands the Western Wall, the last remaining relic of this Jewish Temple. Must hate bring the denial of Jewish rites even to this holiest of all Jewish Holy Places? At a previous meeting I described at some length the place of Jerusalem in the Jewish saga. It is too late in history for Jordan and its supporters to try now to rewrite it. I should like to add only the following striking account of the city's character in the eyes of the Moslem world.

59. In a book published in 1864, the Italian scholar, Ermete Pierotti, who spent many years in Jerusalem, wrote a number of works on the area and served as chief architect to the Ottoman Governor, the Pasha of Jerusalem, wrote:

"We all know, and the Arabs also are aware, that God said to Abraham: 'Unto thy seed will I give this land,' and repeated the promise several times to him and to Isaac and Jacob. So fully do the Mohammedans believe this.

"Now, on 8 July 1861, the day on which the news of the death of Abdul Megid and the accession of Abdul-Azis arrived in Jerusalem, the Jews waited with all formalities on the Governor, Surraya Pasha, and requested him to restore to them the keys of Jerusalem according to a right which they claim on the death of one sultan and the accession of another. At the same time, they brought forward such proofs of the justice of their demand that the Pasha did not refuse it but referred to his ordinary council consisting of the Mufti, or chief officer of religion, the Cadi, or chief judge, and other persons of distinction natives of the country. Their decision was in favour of the Israelites, the whole Council being aware that they were the ancient owners of the country. The ceremony was accordingly performed in the following manner. Saïd Pasha, the general of the forces, accompanied by officers of his staff and some members of the Council, and followed by a crowd of sightseers, went to the Jewish quarter where he was met by a deputation of that nation and conducted to the house of the Chief

Rabbi who received the Pasha at the door and there was publicly presented with the keys."⁵

The year was 1861.

60. Israel does not suggest that Jerusalem's problems have been solved. We discuss these problems openly and freely. We realize that after nineteen years of division and Jordanian education and hostility, propaganda and hate, difficulties of a technical and psychological nature inevitably arise at times. We are fully aware of the challenges that remain to be met. We cannot expect all of the 60,000 Arab inhabitants of east Jerusalem to show friendship to the 200,000 Jews of this city. We do, however, hope that the animosity of the few will not be used to harass and injure the many.

61. We also affirm without any hesitation that whatever measures have been taken in the last ten months are aimed at ensuring the welfare of the city and the happiness of its people. We affirm that the situation today for Jews and Arabs alike is better than in the years of division and Jordanian occupation in eastern Jerusalem. We agree with Père Riquet, the former preacher of Notre-Dame, who, upon his return from a recent visit to Israel, stated, according to *France Soir* of 25 April 1968: "The Israel authorities are practising true coexistence in peace between the religions. In Palestine, public security is greater today than ever before."

62. This is Jerusalem today—a venture in coexistence, a trial of faith. After all these years of hostility and suffering, Jerusalem is still groping on its way; but Jews and Arabs in it are already living together, working together, building together and dreaming together the dream of peace. For the first time in nineteen years, Israelis and Arabs talk one to another, shake hands and sometimes even smile at each other. If, at long last, agreement and peace come to the area, they will have drawn much of their inspiration from united Jerusalem. If the beginnings of understanding and community that exist in Jerusalem today were impaired, peace would be dealt a grievous blow. They must be nurtured with the utmost care for in them lie the real interests of the peoples of the Middle East.

63. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

64. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Despite all the desire to confine consideration to the item presented by Jordan, the Council has by now become used to the many diversionary tactics aimed at confusing the issue and diverting its attention.

65. I should like to make a few observations on the remarks made this afternoon by Mr. Tekoah. In the first place, let me reiterate that in my complaint I am referring to specific measures taken by Israel aimed at changing the character of the Holy City of Jerusalem in violation of two resolutions adopted by the United Nations General

⁵ Ermete Pierotti, *Customs and Traditions of Palestine, Illustrating the Manners of the Ancient Hebrews* (Cambridge, Dighton, Bell and Co., 1864), pp. 75-77.

Assembly; I do not need to remind you of the votes. The first resolution [2253 (ES-V)] called on Israel to rescind all measures taken with a view to changing the status of Jerusalem, and the second resolution [2254 (ES-V)] deplored Israel's failure to implement the resolution reflecting the will of the Assembly—the ninety-nine votes of the Assembly.

66. The Israelis, refusing to abide by or heed the will of the Assembly, continued their illegal defiance, their contemptuous behaviour. This being the case, we had to come to the Security Council. We brought to the Security Council two aspects of the question: one was the parade; the second consisted in the violations of the resolutions of the Assembly. On the question of the parade, Mr. Tekoah saw fit to say that we had made charges and to imply that the charges had no foundation; the charges were considered, and the Security Council concluded that Israel had violated the Armistice Agreement and the 1961 resolution [162 (1961)] and had created more tension in the area. This was not only the view of the Council but also world public opinion, and even some Israelis endorsed the belief that Israel would create and aggravate tension in the area by holding its military demonstration—that crude demonstration of power—in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

67. I need only cite one quotation about the parade, although this was discussed, and a decision was taken. Here is a translation from Hebrew of an article written in an Israeli magazine—I am not quoting a Zionist Jew from South Africa, as Mr. Tekoah did. I am quoting an Israeli who wrote in *Haolam Haze* on 24 April 1968:

“From one point of view, this parade will, to say the least, bring more harm to our security. This is especially so because it will take place in Jerusalem and pass through the Arab side of Jerusalem, and particularly the old city which is the capital for the Palestinians, and is where the Palestinian heart dwells.”

This was written by a well-known Israeli, whose name is Uri Avneri and who I understand is a member of the Knesset; if I am wrong, I stand to be corrected. He continued:

“This parade, which is meant to honour Israel, will not do that in the eyes of the Arabs and the whole world. The world will know that we have become a military people and that, because we do not possess other means, we turn to our armed forces.”

They do not possess the message of peace and tolerance, so they resort to armed forces. He continued:

“A parade like this will be bad in all senses: bad for the whole world and for public opinion.”

Why did this not come across to the minds of the Israeli top officials? Then he reached the conclusion:

“The administration—the Israeli Government—is tired, very tired . . . This is certainly not the way to run the policy of the country and to gamble with the future of the people of Israel.”

This is the impression of world public opinion, shared by certain Israeli personalities.

68. Mr. President, you finished dealing with the parade; then you came to the second phase of the question. What is it? I am not referring to the Nusseibahs' building of a house; I am not referring to an individual's efforts to get a licence; I am referring to acts of indecency, acts of confiscation of Arab lands belonging to Arab people. This question was not answered by Mr. Tekoah. I cited the facts and figures, the ownership, the titles. I spoke about who owns what, and the percentage; in the first place, the Israelis said: “You own one third, we own one third and the Jordan Government owns the rest.” Later, when the Mayor spoke, Mr. Tekoah said: “No, we own part of it.” But he did not mention a specific figure. When we came with the figures, Mr. Tekoah kept silent. Can he come forward now and say that it is true that he owns what he claimed to own in this area? He cannot because we offered the proof that this ownership is the ownership of the Arabs. Is it not illegal, immoral and a form of robbery to confiscate, expropriate and build settlements for the Jewish people, for Jewish immigrants, on Arab lands, thus depriving the people who own the land of their God-given rights? Is this something which was endorsed by the resolution of the Assembly, adopted by ninety-nine votes? This is my complaint.

69. Let us look at the other violation which is taking place in the Maghrabi quarter and in the area adjacent to the Wailing Wall. Again I am not misrepresenting the truth. I am presenting to you a decision taken by an *ad hoc* tribunal which your Government, Mr. President, appointed with the approval of the League of Nations. This tribunal came to the area. The Israeli side was represented by Mr. Eliash, a well-known Zionist jurist and legal-minded person and an advocate of the Palestinian cause. The tribunal, after hearing all the witnesses—fifty-three witnesses from both sides—and examining all the documents and all the evidence, went to Switzerland and prepared its decision. In its findings it said that even the Israelis themselves did not claim ownership of the Wailing Wall and the adjacent area. I quoted this in the Council's very first meeting. The Commission declared that the Jewish side, when making its claim, expressly stated that it did not “claim any proprietary right to the Wall”, and later discovered also that it never claimed anything in the area adjacent to the Wall.

70. Mr. Tekoah should therefore not ignore the proofs and the facts, the decisions and the findings of the tribunal, and claim that the Israelis have and own everything. He should not exploit religion. We are discussing titles and figures, not religion. It is useless to try to exploit religion for politics. We are discussing ownership; the Maghrabi quarter adjacent to the Wall is Arab property—one hundred per cent Arab property. To add a *dunum* or two of neighbouring Jewish property, then to say that both are under Arab-Jewish ownership and expropriate the whole area is an expedient which should not find favour with or the endorsement of any member of the Security Council. This is point number two.

71. Point number three: all this legislation, municipal and otherwise, and all these measures intended to annex the Arab sector of Jerusalem are illegal and defy every norm of international law. We have a jurist in our midst, Justice Goldberg. Let him explain to us whether Israel has any shadow of right to take such measures.

72. Mr. President, a resolution was adopted in the General Assembly by ninety-nine votes which says that these acts are illegal acts. Can you now permit yourself to be diverted from the question actually before you to a discussion of how much good Israel is doing, giving licences to a Nusseibah to build a hotel or to "X" to build a house, or to "Y" to build a little dwelling-house? I am not speaking about this. This is not my complaint. My complaint is the clear violation and defiance by Israel of your will, your resolution. My complaint is as simple as that, Mr. President, and I hope that any attempt to divert your attention from the basic issue will not be allowed to continue.

73. Another point was raised by Mr. Tekoah. He said that Israel comes to the Security Council to plead. To plead for what? Do you have a complaint from Israel, Mr. President? You have a complaint from Jordan. That is before the Council. But pleading has been the means used by Israel in every single forum: complaining, crying, wailing. It is used for political purposes here in the Security Council. This is not the question before us now.

74. Mr. Tekoah said that my complaint is an act of belligerency. I wonder whether the occupation of my land, the continued occupation of the west bank of the Jordan is the act of belligerency—or is it my complaint and my request for help? Is my reaction to the Israelis' occupation an act of belligerency, or is it their vicious attack, their continued acts of oppression that constitute the continued act of belligerency? I leave this to the Council to decide.

75. Mr. Tekoah said that Jerusalem is made up of people. I said in my statement this afternoon—and on this I am in full agreement with Mr. Tekoah—that it consists of people, traditions, a way of life, culture and spiritual values. It is the attempt to change the people, the traditions the culture, the values, the way of life, and the keen interest of Jordan in preserving these values that have brought Jordan to the Security Council. I should like the Council to preserve the status of Jerusalem, and this is the subject of my whole complaint.

76. Then Mr. Tekoah said we should know the truth—and I quote from his statement this afternoon—"by the reaction of the people themselves". Mr. President, this makes this red booklet, which you called a "book", very essential and very significant. I do not have copies available to give to Council members, but this booklet is very relevant to the subject. It reveals the positions taken by the people in almost every region of the west bank, by Moslems, Christians, people in all walks of life. Some of them involve complaints sent to Mr. Thalmann or to the Secretary-General or to the authorities of Israel about what those people think is right and about what they want. I say this because I feel that the most pointless of these misrepresentations by Mr. Tekoah is his argument that the people are happy. This is a serious misrepresentation which requires that this document come before the Council as an official document.

77. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the people. He quoted a journalist—not mentioning his name—as stating that the Jordanians said: "After Saturday comes Sunday". This is cheap propaganda. Here I have the statements of the

people. Bethlehem is a Christian town. I hate to mention that, for it is not the tradition in Jordan to take religion as a criterion for anything. Religion is a means of communication between men and God. But since this was brought up I have to mention Bethlehem which is a Christian town. Its inhabitants have sent a letter—signed by lawyers, college instructors, doctors of hospitals, public health doctors—in which they say "We renew our undertaking to insist on the eternal unity of the two banks beneath the shadow of your throne". This letter was sent to King Hussein. Although they are under duress in Bethlehem, they openly announced their allegiance to the king.

78. Again from Bethlehem I have a memorandum submitted to U Thant, our dedicated Secretary-General, and dated 9 August 1967. Here is what the people of Bethlehem declare:

"Israel's unilateral declaration of the annexation of Arab Jerusalem and its outskirts, and their complete isolation from the west bank, is an action which is incompatible with all international customs, principles and agreements, including the Hague Convention and the Geneva Agreement, and is therefore illegal and invalid. Israel's refusal to rescind this measure, despite the resolutions taken at the recent extraordinary session of the United Nations, is a challenge to the peoples of the world and an infringement of the rights of the inhabitants of the country, which requires that the United Nations should take"—this is an appeal to you, Mr. President—"decisive measures to ensure that justice is restored".⁶

The memorandum, which is very long, is signed by forty-two Arab women's federations and members of the municipal council, hospital doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, and others.

79. I could cite scores of villages and towns, people, unions, labour unions, lawyers, doctors, pharmacists—but I know that time is limited, and I hope that this booklet about the resistance of the west bank will be issued as a document. It is not a book, Mr. President; but it is very important, and I think I will be helping the Council in presenting it as a document.

80. Mr. Tekoah said that Brown Engineering International said of the situation in Jerusalem: "It is a product of unnatural circumstances". We of course agree with this. To expel the people from the occupied part of Jerusalem—more than 80 per cent of the area of both Jerusalems is Arab—to expel them from their homes to the other sector is unnatural; it causes complications. It makes it necessary for experts to come and help. I think this refers to the unnatural invasion of Jerusalem by Europeans—the Zionist invasion. I do not know what this proves, or how it helps Mr. Tekoah to cite it.

81. Time and again, at the last meeting and this meeting, Mr. Tekoah emphasized the question of Moslems and Christians. As I said before, this is unfortunate. We Jordanians do not have this kind of discrimination, which does not befit our traditions. It is not part of our values.

⁶ See document S/PV.1421/Add.2.

But let me remind Mr. Tekoah that the person who was leading the protest march in Jerusalem—and you have the pictures of the march—was a Christian lady by the name of Miss Halaby. So when Mr. Tekoah speaks about religion he should be careful, because people there—Christians and Moslems—resent this vicious attack and this cheap attempt to divide the people of Jordan by sometimes saying “west bank and east bank”, sometimes “east bank, Christian and Moslem”. I hope that this will be received by the Council in the way which it deserves.

82. Moreover, I need hardly say that the town of Ramallah, which is the cultural centre of the west bank, and Bira, which is its twin city—I do not know the percentage of Moslems and Christians here, though I know that the majority of the people of Ramallah are Christian Arabs—had a strike last Thursday against the Israeli demonstration of military power in Jerusalem. They are now paying for it and are subjected to the punitive measures that *The New York Times* mentioned yesterday and today. When I quoted from the *Times* this afternoon I was quoting its correspondent who met the military man in charge and was told by him—these are not my words, I am quoting—that the people of Ramallah “cannot act one day like great nationalists . . . and then return the next day to business as usual”. Here is an Israeli military man saying that the inhabitants cannot have it both ways: “Either submission, or no work, no living”.

83. With this, Mr. President, I will end. I feel I have taken advantage of your kind patience. I am grateful to you for giving me the floor, and if I feel that anything else needs to be answered I shall answer it at a future date.

84. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): At our meeting yesterday, I promised that I would put before the Council authentic factual material relating to the false allegations made by the representative of Israel regarding the internal affairs of Pakistan, and pertaining in particular to the treatment of Christian and other minorities in Pakistan.

85. I find that these allegations were made, in a different context, in the Security Council at its 1113th meeting in May 1964. The representative of Pakistan, speaking at the 1114th meeting of the Council on 14 May 1964 dealt with them in detail. I refer to paragraphs 16, 17 18 and 33 of the verbatim record of the 1114th meeting of the Security Council.

86. The representative of Israel also tried to malign Pakistan by referring, with exaggeration, to certain movements of people between India and Pakistan. Let me say that these are questions between India and Pakistan which are not the concern of the representative of Israel.

87. In the early part of 1964, when there was communal tension in the sub-continent, certain members of the Garo tribes in East Pakistan, who had been converted to Christianity over the years by foreign Christian missionaries, were induced to cross the border. This is what a prominent leader of that tribe, Khan Sangurra, stated on 7 April 1964 (this was published in the press at that time):

“We had never received any ill-treatment from anybody in Pakistan. We left our villages only out of fear, as one

day we suddenly saw a group of people belonging to the Bangshi and Hajang tribes leave Pakistan.”

88. When this situation was brought to the Government's attention, the President of Pakistan went to East Pakistan and, addressing a mass meeting on 4 March 1964, declared that Pakistan wanted all the emigrants to return to their homes, that the Government would in that connexion make earnest efforts to assist them and that their homes and their lands would be protected by the Government of Pakistan until they returned. In response to the President's declaration, these tribes are now gradually returning to Pakistan. This was brought to the Council's attention on 14 May 1964.

89. With respect to the treatment of the Christian minority in Pakistan, the representative of Pakistan stated on that occasion:

“... let me quote from a statement made today by Mr. Joshua Fazluddin, a Christian leader who is a recipient of the Pope's Medal and Rosary and a versifier of Holy Gospels. I quote:

“The Garos got direct inspiration, even aid, to leave Pakistan.

“The exodus of Garos, even their number, is not at all a true index of the treatment of the Christian minority in Pakistan.

“In Pakistan the Christians enjoy perfect social freedom and security as evidenced by the growing number of Christian schools, colleges, hospitals and other institutions. That they enjoy perfect religious freedom is clear enough from the growing number of churches and convents as well as theological schools and colleges, and that there is no prejudice against Christian workers is amply proven by the advent of many new missionaries.”
[1114th meeting, para. 19.]

90. I said that, rather than rely on reports and insignificant newspapers and journals published abroad and inspired by interested parties, I would place authentic material, additional material, before this Council. I shall now quote from the pastoral letter by Archbishop Graner of Dacca—I believe that he is an American national—that was read in various Catholic churches of East Pakistan on 26 July 1964:

“Recently I spent a month in several of our parishes in Mymensingh District”—this is a district of East Pakistan from which the Garos had crossed the border. “I had occasion to encourage our Garo Catholics who have returned to their homes and I myself was pleased to see them settle down again. A great deal has been done by the authorities, and more will be done, to make this possible. There is much that we also can do, as I mentioned in my Easter Message.

“My Easter Letter”—this is the letter that was read in all the parishes in East Pakistan—“was written to comfort those who had suffered and to reassure all of you by recalling the suffering of Christ and the joy that followed

on Easter Sunday. Unfortunately, my words of encouragement were overlooked by some who quoted out of context only that part of my message which referred to suffering, in order to prove their claim, not mine, that Pakistan persecutes Christians. In the bitter controversy that followed the Government of Pakistan and myself were both blamed.

"Now that the controversy has subsided, let me remove from your minds any doubts you may have had. Contrary to reports I did not go abroad, nor did I at any time make any statement to the foreign press. My only message was directed to you, as you yourselves know, dearly beloved, that Christians in Pakistan enjoy religious freedom. No one can deny that."

91. Here is what another Christian leader stated on 19 March 1964, about the time that these allegations were being made against the Pakistan Government. In a statement, Mr. F. R. Mendes, an influential Christian leader, stated:

"I being a member of the Christian community take pride in declaring to the world that we have been living in East Pakistan in absolute harmony with the majority community."

92. Mr. Michael S. Adhikary, General Secretary and member of the World Baptist Alliance Committee and Vice-President of the Pakistan Baptist Union, declared:

"The entire Christian community of East Pakistan is grateful to the Government of East Pakistan for rendering all possible facilities and amenities of life to this minority community. There is no ground for concern."

93. So much for the testimony of the Christian leaders in Pakistan.

94. Here is a statement by Major Raja Tridiv Roy, who is a member of the Provincial Assembly of East Pakistan, or the East Pakistan State Legislature, was a member of the Pakistan delegation to the United Nations General Assembly about three years ago and who as Chief of the Chakma Tribe of Buddhists in the Chittagong Hill Tracts—a district of East Pakistan—represents the entire Buddhist population of Pakistan:

"On hearing that some tribal families from the Hassalong rehabilitation area had gone across the border recently, I undertook an extensive tour of the area from where I have just returned. It is being propagated . . . that my people are being subjected to economic and religious persecution. This is nothing but baseless propaganda with an ulterior motive."

I do not wish to burden the Council with more of this long statement dealing with the generous policy followed by the Government of Pakistan. If anyone considers it necessary, I shall be glad to submit the full statement to the Council.

95. Now, here is a statement by the Venerable Visuddhananda Mahatheero, President of the East Pakistan

Bouddha Kristi/Prachar Sangha, the organization of the East Pakistan Buddhists:

"I have just returned from an extensive tour of Chittagong, particularly the Buddhist areas and villages. In the course of my tour I addressed several meetings in different parts and found that the Buddhists are living in complete peace and harmony. Thousands of Buddhists from far and near who turned up at the meetings in response to the call of the East Pakistan Bouddha Kristi/Prachar Sangha reaffirmed their faith in the Government in maintaining peace. On behalf of the Buddhists I can declare that the Buddhists are prepared to work hard as an integral part of the people of this country for the uplift of Pakistan. . . . The Government are determined to see that all communities can lead their lives peacefully and unhampered."

96. The Pakistan Buddhist Sangha is a member of the World Buddhist Federation; its Secretary-General is a member of the Executive Committee of the World Buddhist Federation. The Government of Pakistan fully supports the ceremony which the Pakistan Buddhist community is going to hold shortly to commemorate the return of the ashes from Tibet of a Buddhist Saint Depak Atish. The Pakistan Government has also approved the sum of 500,000 rupees to cover the expenditure in connexion with the forthcoming ceremony. So much for the treatment of the Buddhist minority in Pakistan.

97. I have statements here on behalf of the leaders of the other communities testifying to the treatment that they are receiving. I shall quote only one of them. The Sikh community migrated from Pakistan in 1947. Its members left behind in what is now West Pakistan many shrines holy to their religion. Every year pilgrims, Sikh pilgrims, come from India to Pakistan, where they are received hospitably, and the Government of West Pakistan has taken good care of their abandoned shrines. In that connexion, Sardar Rajinder Singh, a Sikh leader, said, on 1 December, that the Sikhs were satisfied with the maintenance and upkeep of gurdwaras (Sikh temples) in Pakistan. He thanked the people and the Government of Pakistan for making liberal arrangements for the Sikh pilgrims' visits to Nankana Sahib—the holiest Sikh shrine—and Lahore.

98. Pakistan gives free access to foreign missionaries, even though this sometimes creates problems. They are even permitted to proselytize in the Islamic State of Pakistan. In this connexion I wish to quote again from a recent article by Mr. Joshua Fazluddin which appeared on 26 November 1967 in *The Pakistan Times*, a leading Pakistani newspaper:

" . . . Pakistan gives a special place to its minorities in its Constitution and shows every concern for administering even-handed laws for their protection and progress."

He then goes on, in the course of the article, to say:

" . . . there is the Islamic State of Pakistan, which, in spite of its Constitution having given perfect religious freedom and better treatment than the British to the Christian minority in respect of land and even-handed laws, has often to face ugly situations because of the

creation, or mishandling of situations by the Mission-cum-Church complex."

99. While dealing with the question of Jerusalem, I do not wish to inject into the debate, despite provocation, matters extraneous to it. While we plead for the sanctity of the Holy City, we are prepared to suffer calumny. As the Hebrew poet, Yehuda Ha-Levy, who was quoted at the 1420th meeting of the Council, said in his "Hymn to Jerusalem": "Wrongs borne for Thy sake are an honour".

100. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Ambassador of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

101. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I shall try to be very brief, and I should like to start by expressing my appreciation to the representative of Pakistan for his quoting from the Hebrew poet Yehuda Ha-Levy's "Hymn to Jerusalem". As he is undoubtedly aware, Yehuda Ha-Levy spoke of the Jews' feelings for Jerusalem.

102. The statement made by the Jordanian representative, unfortunately replete again with venom and belligerency, recalls to my mind an Arab proverb which says: "*Darabini wabaka, abakani washtaka*"—"He struck me and wept, he snatched from me and complained".

103. Jordan occupied a part of Jerusalem in 1948, in a war of aggression launched in defiance of the United Nations. Jordan ruled eastern Jerusalem for nineteen years—a rule of vandalism, destruction and desecration. Jordanian rule was not recognized by any country, not even by the Arab States. In 1967 Jordan again launched a merciless attack against Jerusalem, ready to plunge it into another blood-bath. Now Jordan comes here before the Security Council to complain that its designs have been thwarted, that its aggression has been repulsed and that the city is reunited again.

104. The Jordanian representative referred again to documents fabricated in Amman and submitted to the United

Nations. He mentioned specifically a document concerning the alleged attitude of the inhabitants of Bethlehem. I have before me a petition dated 30 August 1967, signed by 453 citizens of the city of Bethlehem, Christians and Moslems, headed by their Mayor, Mr. Bendak. The petition requests the Israeli authorities to include Bethlehem in the united municipality of Jerusalem. Surely this is an indication of what the real views of the local Arab inhabitants are on the situation in Jerusalem.

105. Jerusalem is all too holy to us, Jerusalem is all too highly venerated by peoples and religions everywhere, for us to think of the city in terms other than of its well-being and glory. All measures taken in June by Israel and ever since then have been prompted by the interests of the city as a whole, the welfare and security of its inhabitants, the protection of the Holy Places, the healing of the wounds inflicted on Jerusalem during Jordanian occupation. Changing the past situation, we are determined to ensure to all peoples and to all religious communities and to see to it that Jerusalem no longer goes through the agonies of separation, sacrilege and destruction.

106. The PRESIDENT: I have no further speakers on my list for today. I would report to the Council that several members have urged that we should endeavour to bring our debate to the best possible conclusion with a due sense of urgency. A number of members have also urged that we first need a short interval to reflect and to consult and to consider what the best outcome would be. Accordingly, after full consultation, I propose that the Council meet again at 4 p.m. on Thursday, 9 May, or immediately after we have heard the address of His Majesty the King of Norway in the General Assembly that afternoon.

107. As I hear no objection, it is decided accordingly and we shall consequently adjourn until that time.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.