

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY
DEC 12 1972
UN/SA COLLECTION



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1454th MEETING: 27 SEPTEMBER 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1454)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 17 September 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8819)	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 FIFTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 27 September 1968, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. G. IGNATIEFF (Canada).

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/1454)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 17 September 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8819).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 17 September 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8819)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1453rd meeting I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel and the United Arab Republic to take places at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: In a letter dated 23 September 1968, circulated as document S/8829, the representative of Syria has likewise requested to be invited to participate without vote in the discussion of the question at present before the Council. If I hear no objections, I shall also invite the representative of Syria to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the question before it. As I

indicated at the close of our preceding meeting last Friday, the Council then adjourned for informal consultations, which have been carried on intensively in the intervening period. The Council has now before it a revised version of the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and Senegal. The new text in English and French is contained in document S/8825/Rev.2, dated 26 September 1968.

4. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): We have all been concerned that humanitarian action, in accordance with the clear purposes of the Council unanimously expressed within a day or two of the June war of 1967 and endorsed soon afterwards by the Assembly, has been so long delayed.

5. Our dismay at this long frustration of our unanimous aims has been increased as we have read the Secretary-General's note of 31 July this year [S/8699] and as we listened to the debate last Friday.

6. It appeared possible that the unanimous wish of the Council, expressed more than a year ago, would be defeated altogether. Indeed, it appeared that there were some who were content to contemplate no result at all. That would surely be an outcome quite unacceptable to most members of the Council, if not all. Nor would the Assembly thank us if we were satisfied with a deadlock.

7. This is one of the causes for concern; to escape from a stalemate, to get a result, to take positive action.

8. But we have another concern. The accusation of discrimination has been made. It is a serious charge, and throughout our consultations I have been most anxious, as members of the Council well know, that we should not lay ourselves open to any such accusation. To do so would diminish the authority of the Council and gravely weaken its capacity for effective action.

9. So with those two considerations in mind it seems to me incumbent on us all to go over the ground very carefully. So important are the issues that I wish to explain the arguments which I have been at pains to put to other members in the consultations which we have undertaken together.

10. What objectives did we set? First, to see that the aims of the Council and the Assembly were duly respected and implemented; second, to use our best judgement to ensure impartiality; third, and most important, to keep constantly in our minds the humanitarian objectives of the resolutions which represent the overwhelming wishes of the whole international community.

11. The main question I ask is this: what was the intention of this Council when it unanimously adopted the humanitarian resolution 237 (1967) on 14 June 1967?

12. The Security Council resolution was adopted within a day or two of the end of the war on the initiative of Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia. Most of us remember the exact circumstances very well. We remember how grateful we were to those countries for their initiative, and how happy we were that in pursuing these humanitarian objects we could act together in full agreement. We were concerned about civilians in the area of the conflict. We were not taking a partisan position. We were concerned with all those in the area of conflict.

13. At the same time it must be clearly stated that we had in mind, as our resolution said, "the area of conflict" and "the areas where military operations have taken place". That was stated in our resolution 237 (1967), and General Assembly 2252 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 welcomed and restated the terms of the Council's resolution. So there is and can be no doubt of the intention of the Council and the Assembly.

14. So much for the intention and purpose of the Council and the Assembly in June and July last year. What happened next? The Secretary-General has been careful to tell us the whole story of what took place. He explained that by "a broad humanitarian interpretation"—those were his words—"it was possible to stretch the terms of the resolutions"—again I use his words—"to include humanitarian inquiries concerning Jewish persons in Syria and the United Arab Republic as ancillary to the investigation of the condition and treatment of inhabitants in occupied territories" [*ibid.*, para. 10]. He also clearly explained why it was not possible to extend the inquiries to Lebanon and Iraq. To do so would obviously have gone far beyond the mandate of the resolutions. At the same time he made it plain that he was prepared to send a second special representative to the Middle East with exactly the same terms of reference as those given to Ambassador Gussing.

15. It could be said that the Secretary-General went beyond the strict interpretation of the resolution. But if he did so, he acted, as he has reported, for humanitarian reasons. We respect the reasons and we respect his motives. We should support his decision. It is, in my opinion, of the greatest importance that we should do so in view of the accusations of discrimination. No such charge can be made against the Secretary-General. On the contrary, he has acted fairly and humanely. We should accept and applaud his decisions and his actions.

16. It was with those developments and considerations in mind that we approached the present debate. We were first concerned that whatever action we took should be effective. We were concerned with results. We wished to avoid a bitter and barren debate. We wanted no partisan victory in a fruitless vote. We were constantly concerned with our obligation to a vast number of bewildered people, many of them helpless, in distress and in despair. We cannot feed them with votes. We cannot shelter them with resolutions.

17. We greatly hoped that, however deep our feelings and however strong our attachments, we could make a renewed

effort to find a practical way to go forward effectively in full agreement to help them. It was for those reasons that we put forward certain propositions in our consultations.

18. We wanted to see the humanitarian resolution 237 (1967) given full effect. Accordingly, we wished to enable the Secretary-General to dispatch his special representative to the area without further delay. We wished to make it clear that no obstacles and no conditions should stand in the way. We hoped that all members of the Council would rally to a unanimous decision to support and give effect to those three simple, clear, compelling propositions. We put forward detailed proposals to achieve that object.

19. If those propositions were accepted we should preserve the full agreement which we achieved when the original resolution 237 (1967) was adopted. We should provide the best chance for its effective implementation. We should best serve the interests of the people who depend on us for practical help.

20. My Government will, of course, support any effort directed to meet the humanitarian needs of those who suffered and are still suffering from the war. We shall, of course, support any call to implement resolution 237 (1967) on which we all agreed last year.

21. We do so, in appealing on truly humanitarian grounds. It should not be a matter of accusation or animosity or discrimination, but an appeal to give every facility, every assistance, every support to the Secretary-General and his representative. The Ambassador of Israel made a welcome gesture in that direction when he said that he was:

"... authorized to state that any person present at this Security Council table who wishes to come to Israel would be welcome and we would be happy to facilitate his visit to the territories under Israeli control so that he can form his own impressions." [*1453rd meeting, para. 99.*]

We trust that it will be in that spirit that the Israel Government will respond to the appeal we make.

22. We are not in any dispute about aims. On those we are all agreed. We hope that it is still not too late for this Council to reflect and agree on the best means of achieving those aims. It is perhaps still not too late to act not only in full agreement but also in the way best calculated to bring succour to those who suffer. They have been left to suffer too long. If their voices could be heard here, they would. I have no doubt at all, cry out for effective action. What we want is not any voting victory but a practical success.

23. When we leave this debate we know that we must move on to the greatest endeavour yet made to achieve progress in the search for a just and permanent peace in the Middle East. Ambassador Gunnar Jarring is already here and the Foreign Ministers are arriving. The stage is set for a supreme effort of consultation, conciliation and co-operation.

24. What we do here now could provide a good start for this new initiative. We could show that the Council is ready

and anxious to play its essential part fairly and fully both in relief of suffering and in remedy for injustice.

25. Those are the objects which we have endeavoured to put before anything else, and those are the objects which we trust will guide the Council now.

26. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): The continued occupation of Arab territories by Israeli forces more than a year after the hostilities which took place in the Near East, is inevitably also prolonging all the sequels to that conflict. It suffices to examine the list of communications on the treatment of civilian populations in the occupied areas appearing in the Security Council's draft report to the General Assembly, to realize that many problems continue to arise at the humanitarian level.

27. The Secretary-General was requested to follow the effective implementation of resolution 237 (1967) concerning the civilian populations and prisoners of war in the area of conflict, adopted by the Security Council on 14 June 1967, as well as of resolution 2252 (ES-V) concerning humanitarian assistance, adopted by the General Assembly on 4 July 1967. It is therefore understandable that he should be anxious to receive direct information on those problems, information no longer available to him since the conclusion of Mr. Nils Gussing's mission in October 1967.

28. My delegation, therefore, supported the idea expressed in the Secretary-General's note of 19 April 1968 [S/8553], that a representative should again be sent to the region, specifically to enable him to submit reports, as requested in the resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly. My delegation thought, as did the Secretary-General, that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interests of all the parties to draw up a report based on recent and first-hand information concerning the position of the civilian population. It regrets that certain obstacles should have made it impossible, for the moment, to send such a representative, as stated in the Secretary-General's note of 31 July 1968 [S/8699].

29. My delegation finds this all the more regrettable in that the Secretary-General repeatedly indicated that the second mission envisaged would have the same scope and the same terms of reference as the first. The first did not give rise to any particular difficulties. Mr. Gussing stressed the fact that he had received complete co-operation at all levels in the countries which he visited. Although he did not meet the spokesmen of the people and the local authorities except in the presence of government representatives, he at least enjoyed full freedom of movement.

30. Moreover, the Secretary-General gave the broadest possible interpretation to the provisions of the resolutions in defining the range and functioning of Mr. Gussing's mission. For obvious humanitarian reasons, France welcomed that interpretation. My country could not remain indifferent to the fate of ethnic or religious minorities in any State. France opposes all discrimination, whether on grounds of religion, race or colour. By tradition and by vocation, it is too firmly attached to the principle of respect for human dignity and human rights to remain unconcerned about such problems. It has never refused, nor

does it now refuse, within the limits and with the reservations prescribed by the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States, to take action in specific cases of which it has knowledge.

31. Why, in these circumstances, put forward new demands when it is obvious that they will impede the operation of the proposed machinery by placing genuinely unacceptable conditions on the special representative's mission? The resolutions whose effective implementation the Secretary-General was asked to follow are not essentially concerned with the matter in question. Both call upon the Government of Israel, in particular, to ensure "the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities". Today, those areas are occupied territories.

32. My Government has consistently pressed for a speedy end to that occupation, because it regards it as contrary to the Charter and because it is concerned about the danger of violence and reprisals, as well as about the threats to individual liberties and human rights which must inevitably follow upon any forcible occupation. It nevertheless believes that, since such occupation exists and is continuing, the Council must be informed about the conditions prevailing in the occupied territories, and in particular, about the welfare and security of the population.

33. My delegation therefore shares the views expressed by the Secretary-General at the end of his note of 31 July 1968:

"It is most unfortunate, in my view, that these considerations involving the well-being of a great many people, cannot be given sufficient priority and be regarded as having sufficient urgency to override obstacles such as those that have been encountered thus far."

34. My delegation calls for the removal of these obstacles, so that the Secretary-General may be in a position to carry out the task laid upon him by the Council and by the General Assembly.

35. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic to whom I give the floor.

36. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): We are grateful to the delegations of Senegal and Pakistan for having taken the initiative of bringing to the attention of the Security Council the question of the necessity of dispatching a Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the occupied Arab territories.

37. We also appreciate the urgency with which the members of the Council have considered the request of Pakistan and Senegal.

38. The Israeli authorities have pursued in the occupied Arab territories a policy which defies the rules of morality and contravenes the principles of the Charter. Their wanton

aggression of 5 June 1967 is but a glaring example of their disrespect for the rule of law. It should not be viewed in isolation from their continued illegal occupation and their brutal treatment of the civilian population in those areas. For these are the primordial elements which demonstrate their sinister expansionist designs. Their occupation of the Arab lands and their mistreatment of its inhabitants are a constant violation of the principles which the international community has adopted to regulate the behaviour of States in time of war and to alleviate the sufferings which armed conflicts inflict upon civilians.

39. The Geneva Conventions of 1949 defined the ethics and rules of conduct which States are legally obligated to apply in any armed conflict. The fact that Israel has signed these Conventions obviously does not exert any weight on the formulation of its policies in the occupied Arab territories. This should not be surprising for United Nations records definitely reveal that Israel has accumulated the longest list of perfidious violations of treaties and condemnations by the United Nations.

40. The cruel treatment which the Israeli authorities are inflicting on the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories is infuriating the whole Arab world. The news from Arab Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, the west bank of Jordan, the Gaza Strip and Sinai is distressing and dangerously provocative. The forms of this cruelty are varied; they include the deprivation of means of livelihood, indignities, internment in concentration camps, imprisonment, eviction, demolition of houses, desecration of Holy Places and even cold-blooded murder, of which a recent victim was the late Judge Shawki El-Farra, a cousin of the distinguished representative of Jordan. This dangerous situation calls for urgent action.

41. I could easily cite a multitude of violations and other unlawful actions perpetrated by the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories. However, since some of the unlawful Israeli actions have been the subject of previous letters to the Security Council, I shall confine my remarks to a very few of the most flagrant crimes committed by Israel. My intention is to illustrate that the unlawful Israeli behaviour has undoubtedly contradicted the injunctions of the United Nations organs and the obligations emanating from universal international agreements.

42. Israel has admitted, and even boasted, that its military forces in the occupied Arab territories have frequently resorted to the inhumane practice of indiscriminately demolishing houses as a means of suppressing the legitimate aspirations of the civilian inhabitants. Article 53 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, prohibits "any destruction by the occupying Power of real or personal property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or to the State, or to other public authorities, or to social or co-operative organizations"¹.

43. It is apparent that Israel is wilfully resorting to the devastation of houses to inflict and aggravate the suffering of the civilian population in order to attain its illegal objectives.

44. Another aspect of the unlawful Israeli behaviour, which has also been admitted and widely publicized by the Israelis themselves, is the appropriation of Arab lands owned individually or collectively by Arabs. The most pertinent example has occurred in connexion with the city of Jerusalem. Notwithstanding the fact that the General Assembly unanimously adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V) which considered all measures taken by Israel invalid and called upon Israel to rescind any measures which might change the status of that Holy City, Israel has nevertheless announced its annexation and adamantly refuses to heed the injunctions of the United Nations and the exhortations of the international community. In addition to the United Nations resolutions, article 147 of the 1949 Geneva Convention, which I have referred to earlier, stipulates that the "appropriation of property" is a grave breach of the said Convention. It is by now an established fact that the real motive behind Israel's actions in that Holy City was to consolidate its illegal annexation in complete violation of the United Nations resolutions and its international obligations.

45. In order to achieve its expansionist schemes, Israel has consistently and systematically enforced measures aimed at changing the ethnic and demographic structures of the occupied Arab territories. Intimidation, coercion and massive deportation were extensively used to empty those parts of the Arab homelands of their legitimate and lawful inhabitants. The "unlawful deportation or transfer" of the civilian population in militarily occupied areas has been considered a grave breach by article 147 of the same Geneva Convention. Moreover, this brutal practice has come to the attention of the international community in connexion with the revolting Nazi crimes during the Second World War. The Charter of the International Military Tribunal, annexed to the Agreement for the prosecution and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis, signed at London on 8 August 1945,² condemned those acts. Later, the General Assembly considered those principles as recognized principles of international law and directed the International Law Commission to formulate the principles of international law recognized in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal and Judgement of the Tribunal.

46. The International Law Commission formulation stipulates in principle VI³ that war crimes include "violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labour or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war, of persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity". Principle VI also considers "deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population" as crimes against humanity.

47. Moreover, the General Assembly, concerned with the failure of Israel to respect the rules regulating civilian treatment, adopted resolution 2252 (ES-V), which called

² *Ibid.*, vol. 82 (1951), No. 251.

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 12, part III.*

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973.

upon "the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities". The provisions of this resolution would undoubtedly condemn Israel's policy of deportation.

48. It is distressing, and indeed appalling, to notice that those who have suffered most in the dark nazi era have now developed a propensity to some of the same diabolical schemes. The civilian population of the occupied Arab territories have been subjected to cruel practices by the Israelis, who adamantly refuse to heed the rules of law and the injunctions of the United Nations organs.

49. In view of this established policy of repression it is no wonder, then, that the Israeli authorities refuse to comply with resolution 237 (1967) of the Security Council. This explains why Israel is adamant in its refusal to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Israel therefore undertook to put obstacles in the way of its implementation. It did not hesitate to introduce irrelevant matters into the discussion, to impose conditions, and to insist on an interpretation of the resolution which its authors had never contemplated.

50. It is to this type of behaviour on the part of the Israelis, to which I have alluded briefly but on which the representative of Jordan has elaborated, that we owe this dramatic performance of Mr. Tekoah in the Council. The legal acrobatics of his Government are a futile attempt to bury it from the eyes of the world and to divert attention from the extent of its cruelty and callousness.

51. It is interesting to follow the different phases of the Israeli reaction to the request of the Secretary-General to dispatch a Special Representative to the Arab territories occupied militarily as a result of the Israeli aggression committed on 5 June 1967, which will allow the Council to fully understand the scope of Israeli policies, as well as their evil contents.

52. During the early stages of the contacts conducted by the Secretary-General with the Israeli Government towards the accomplishment of this humanitarian mission, the first reaction was that, as a condition for their co-operation with a Special Representative, the latter's mandate had to be extended to the Jewish Communities in the Arab countries, victims of the Israeli aggression of last year. The Secretary-General, and rightly so, rejected by legal arguments the validity of that Israeli request. In this connexion, and although I do not intend to indulge in legal controversy, since the case is clear, may I be allowed to quote the statement delivered before the Council by the representative of Argentina, when introducing, on behalf also of Brazil and Ethiopia, resolution 237 (1967):

"First of all, we are deeply concerned at the fate of the civilian population whose persons and possessions are suffering from the consequences of war. A minimum standard of rights must be guaranteed to those who are not taking any active part in hostilities. We believe that these persons must be treated in a humane manner under all circumstances, that their family and residence rights,

their religious convictions and practices and their habits and customs must be protected and, above all, that they must not be subject to any act of physical or moral coercion.

"In our draft resolution this appeal is addressed specifically to the Government of Israel, since in present circumstances it is that Government which will be largely responsible for applying these humanitarian principles."
[1361st meeting, paras. 5 and 6.]

53. Realizing at this stage that they could not withstand the strength of the Secretary-General's legal argumentation, they proceeded in their customary manner to confuse the issues even further, and claimed that the Special Representative's mandate included also the Jewish communities in other Arab countries: namely, Iraq and Lebanon. By no stretch of the imagination can one take this Israeli claim either seriously or in good faith.

54. Having been faced with another failure in their endeavours to undermine the efforts of the Secretary-General to implement the resolution, and lacking any elements of substance or of law with which to obstruct those efforts, they intensified their confusing tactics by invoking resolution I adopted by the International Conference on Human Rights held at Teheran from 22 April to 13 May 1968.⁴ They alleged that the adoption of that resolution had only complicated the question of a Special Representative.

55. But what does the Teheran resolution really say, and what do its provisions in fact imply? The resolution expressed the grave concern of the Conference for the violation of human rights in Arab territories occupied as a result of the June 1967 hostilities. The Conference further draws the attention of the Government of Israel to the grave consequences resulting from the disregard of fundamental freedoms and human rights in the occupied territories. It particularly calls on the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from destroying the homes of the Arab civilian population inhabiting areas occupied by Israel and to respect and implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 in the occupied territories. It evidently affirms the inalienable rights of all inhabitants who have left their homes as a result of the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East to return, resume normal life, recover their property and homes, and rejoin their families, according to the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

56. This is a clear resolution, and its provisions speak for themselves. The Israeli violations have been recognized by the Teheran Conference. Far from complicating any issues, it renders it imperative for the Secretary-General not to delay the dispatch of his Special Representative.

57. My delegation, though it is not at all surprised at the behaviour of the Israeli authorities, cannot, however, but express its astonishment at the attitude taken by certain

⁴ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2).

Powers in this respect. This astonishment stems from the fact that by delaying the action of the Council—and in so doing lending a helping hand to Israel to pursue its procrastination with impunity—they are negating and sapping the foundations of the whole legal structure which humankind so laboriously erected in the wake of the Second World War to ensure the protection of the civilian population of the occupied territories. By encouraging the manoeuvres of Israel and playing its game, those same Powers are seeking to assist Israel in its inhuman policy, which as we all know can only result in the increased suffering of the civilian population of those territories.

58. The situation is self-evident. This Council has adopted a resolution, and Israel is flouting it by attempting to complicate its implementation. The resolution itself is also self-evident. In the words of the Secretary-General in the legal analysis contained in his note of 31 July:

“Operative paragraph 1 of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) calls upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place. This paragraph applies without question to the area occupied by Israel since June 1967.” [*S/8699, para. 10.*]

Furthermore, the Secretary-General adds:

“Likewise operative paragraph 2 strictly interpreted could not apply either to Arab persons in Israel or to Jewish persons in the Arab States. The provisions of the Geneva Convention Relative to Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 at present have application only to civilians in the occupied territories.” [*Ibid.*]

59. I should like now to turn very briefly to the alleged right which Israel has arrogated to itself to speak on behalf of all citizens of the Jewish faith in the world, irrespective of their nationality.

60. This is a dangerous concept and can serve no useful purpose but to complicate international relations. It brings back memories of the past when imperialist Powers invoked the right to protect certain minorities to further their colonial designs. It seems that Israel intends to revive this moribund practice.

61. The objectives are clear: territorial expansion in the Arab world, pressure on other Powers to comply with Israel's political aims and exploitation of men of Jewish faith who are citizens of other countries. Should this concept be accepted, it would constitute a double-edged weapon of blackmail used today against certain countries but which could serve tomorrow as a threat to others.

62. The Zionist attempt to exploit the citizens of Jewish faith in other countries will only lend itself to the increase of friction and the heightening of tension among States. It can contribute only to sowing the seeds of discord within nations. I am sure that people of the Jewish faith are loyal citizens of their countries and certainly resent the imposed patronage of Israel, which can only do harm. Israel would do better to refrain from advancing such claims and abiding

by and respecting the accepted norms of international behaviour.

63. Having said this, it was not my intention to be dragged into polemics concerning my compatriots of the Jewish faith. I merely wish to state once and for all that they are equal citizens, enjoying all the rights and certainly bearing the same obligations.

64. The inhuman conduct of the Israeli authorities with regard to the Arab population victimized by its aggression is only one aspect of Israeli policies. Toleration of this conduct can only bring more suffering and ever-increasing woes to the civilian population under its military occupation. An end must be put to these injustices, and dignity must be restored to the people.

65. It is only humane and urgent now to send a representative of the Secretary-General immediately and not to delay any further his dispatch to the area. Enough time has been lost and the suffering of the civilian population is increasing from day to day.

66. It should be realized that this particular step is only an expedient and a palliative in order to allay some of the hardships which the Arab inhabitants of the occupied areas are enduring through the continued Israeli occupation for their salvation can be assured only through the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the territories they have occupied as a result of their treacherous aggression.

67. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Syria.

68. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The Syrian delegation wishes to record its thanks and gratitude to the two delegations of Senegal and Pakistan for having taken the initiative in calling an urgent meeting of the Security Council for consideration of the Secretary-General's note of 31 July 1968 [*S/8699*]. The urgency of the problem that we are discussing can hardly be overemphasized since it now involves the deplorable fate of over half a million Arab civilians evicted by force from the areas of conflict occupied by the Israeli Army after the *Blitzkrieg* of 5 June 1967, as well as the humiliating and inhuman treatment of the remaining Arab population under Israeli domination.

69. It is about a year and three months since the Security Council adopted resolution 237 (1967) and since the General Assembly adopted its resolution 2252 (ES-V) on 4 July of the same year. Both resolutions unequivocally called on the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities.

70. Since the two resolutions were adopted they have been completely disregarded by Israel and the tragic plight of the victims of the 5 June war continues unabated.

71. Let me emphasize one significant fact at the outset, that these two resolutions have been referred to as the “humanitarian resolutions”. Our attention must be focused on the humanitarian aspect of the problem, the aspect

which deals with the basic universal human rights now enshrined in the covenants approved and adopted by the international community. I therefore propose that the humanitarian aspect of this problem is the one that should guide our deliberations. But humanitarian conditions by no means impose extraneous and artificial subjects to supersede legal stipulations. The Secretary-General made this point clear in his many answers to the Israeli representative and in the legal analysis which was attached, for the first time, to a note by the Secretary-General addressed to a United Nations representative [*ibid.*].

72. In a remarkable report on the Arab refugees submitted by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency⁵ to the International Conference on Human Rights held in Teheran on 22 April to 13 May 1968, speaking about the old, the intermediate and those new refugees who are the subject of our discussion today, he had this to say:

"... Without a just solution to the refugee problem the human rights which are enshrined in these international instruments cannot be achieved for the Palestine refugees: they will remain a people to whom the full realization of these rights is denied. It may thus be appropriate to search for a solution not only as a political settlement but as a means of implementing human rights. Perhaps a solution to this sad intractable problem may be more effectively and hopefully pursued by tempering consideration of a political character with simple humane concern for restoring humane rights to the Palestine refugees."

73. The Security Council, like any other council or tribunal, is entitled to know all the facts before a judgement or decision is rendered on the merits of a case. Do we have, outside the accusations and counter-accusations of Arabs and Israelis, objective sources from which information of the kind we are after could be obtained, information such as that with which the Special Representative who has been sent by the Secretary-General could provide this Council and which would help us to get a clear picture of the sad situation? I submit that such material exists, providing proof beyond any doubt that Israel committed and is still committing war crimes and crimes against humanity in the occupied Arab territories and against civilian populations. These sources are:

(a) Report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency submitted to the twenty-second General Assembly.⁶

(b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V), and Security Council resolution 237 (1967), known as the Gussing report.⁷

(c) Note by the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) and Security Council resolution

237 (1967), contained in document S/8435 of 2 March 1968.

(d) Note submitted by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to the International Conference on Human Rights in Teheran.⁵

(e) A number of books and articles written by Israelis themselves strongly objecting to the policy of their Government against the Arabs.

(f) Two reports in my possession from the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva, which, upon the request of my Government, investigated a number of crimes committed by Israeli authorities against the Arab civilian population in the occupied Syrian territory.

(g) A number of articles written by American and other Western writers who have visited the area and reported on the plight of the Arab population, collected in a volume entitled *Israel and the Geneva Conventions*, issued by the Institute for Palestine Studies in Beirut, 1968.

74. These, I repeat, are not Arab sources of information, but are either official United Nations documents or writings by Israeli, American and other Western writers. What does emerge from these sources?

75. Two basic points have already been dealt with at length by the representatives of Senegal and Pakistan, as well as by my Arab colleagues, the Ambassadors of Jordan and the United Arab Republic, which will make any further elaboration by me unnecessary, namely, the mandate of the Permanent Representative of the Secretary-General and the definition of "area of conflict where military operations have taken place" But to set the record clear I wish to point out that I have dealt at length with these two points in my letters to the Secretary-General of 18 March, 2 May and 20 May 1968, the texts of which appear in the reports of the Secretary-General dated 19 April [S/8553] and 31 July [S/8699]. It is, however, of the utmost importance to my Government to emphasize point 2 of my letter to the Secretary-General of 2 May 1968, stating:

"The members of the Jewish community in Syria are Syrian citizens with full equal rights and duties and have never been considered otherwise except by Zionism. In fact, Zionism, predicated on the concept of a 'Jewish people', and Israel, have arrogated to themselves the right to speak in the name of all citizens of Jewish faith wherever they are: a concept that has been totally rejected on adequate legal and political considerations. To stretch, therefore, the terms of reference of the special representative to include Jewish communities in Syria or other Arab countries, victims of the Israeli war of aggression of 5 June 1967, would be tantamount to interfering in the internal affairs by the United Nations which is precluded by the Charter. No discrimination on the basis of religion exists or has ever existed in Syria." [*Ibid.*, para. 2.]

76. Those representatives who expressed concern about ethnic or religious minorities in Arab or other countries can

⁵ Document A/CONF.32/22 of 29 April 1968.

⁶ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 13.

⁷ See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1967, document S/8158.

easily seek assurances from the International Red Cross Committee, which was invited to visit Syria. In a letter dated 1 June 1968, the representative of the International Red Cross Committee said to the Minister of the Interior of Syria:

"I know that the Syrian Government provided protection for the Jewish quarter during the events of June 1967; I know that recently a Syrian citizen of the Mosaic religion suffering from cancer was transferred through the Government's good offices to a Beirut hospital. Furthermore, a statement broadcast by the Ministry of National Education has again stressed that Syrian Jews are not enemies, but citizens like all other. I am even in a position to state that the businesses of Jewish citizens are still operating. All these facts are a tribute to you, and I feel honour bound to emphasize them." [S/8689.]

77. First, with regard to the new Arab refugees, according to the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA submitted to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, 234,000 Arabs were refugees from Jordan, Syria and the Sinai Peninsula following the war, in addition to 120,000 previous refugees registered with UNRWA who fled their refugee camps, over-run by the Israeli army. These numbers have been on the increase day by day, while the Israelis systematically, as in the past, apply terrorist methods to empty the Arab lands of their Arab inhabitants. That number has now reached over 600,000 victims of the Israeli policy of returning Arabs to the desert in vindictive fury against those whom they claim want to push the Jews into the sea.

78. This increase in the number of refugees is supported by the note of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) and Security Council resolution 237 (1967) contained in document S/8435 of 2 March 1968. To swell the number, the Syrian occupied area has been almost completely emptied of its inhabitants. Over forty villages have been leveled with those bulldozers which are now the symbol of Israeli mastery. In the Syrian occupied area the chill winds of desolation and death blow, interrupted only by the tramp and noise of the conqueror's boots.

79. In this connexion, it is relevant to quote two paragraphs from the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA submitted to the International Conference on Human Rights in Teheran on 29 April 1968, which reads:

"No one can pretend that the standard of living thus provided conformed to 'the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services' referred to in Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

He goes on to say:

"In the final analysis, however, all these endeavours are palliatives: they have helped to maintain minimum standards of living for the refugee population, they have restored some of their confidence and, possibly, preserved

something of their human dignity. What they have not done is to put an end to their refugee status and accord to them the full measure of human rights which the Universal Declaration and the International Covenants require."

80. I strongly draw the attention of the members of the Council to this report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA to the International Conference on Human Rights in Teheran.

81. Between 25 July 1967 and 16 August 1968 I addressed a number of letters dealing with the violation of human rights and the Geneva Conventions committed by the Israeli occupying authorities against the Arab civilian population and these letters have been circulated as documents of the Security Council and the General Assembly. I need not tax the patience of members of the Council with a repetition of the facts they contained, but to set the record clear I should like to read an excerpt from one of them concerning the inhuman, immoral treatment of the Arabs, while Israeli representatives, one after the other, were describing the virtues of their occupation and the advantages accruing to the Arab population under their domination. Thus, immediately following the Israeli occupation of Syrian territory, the Israeli army, committed the following atrocities:

"1. The intimidation carried out against the inhabitants of villages has been such that most of the population have fled their homes . . .

"...in other instances they resort to starving the population—through the burning of fields of wheat—as happened in the region of El-Joukhadar, thus compelling peasants to quit their villages in search for means of subsistence . . .

"2. The seizure of innocent civilians, their blindfolding and driving into prisons has become a daily practice in Kuneitra and in many other localities . . .

"3. Looting . . . Every shop in Kuneitra was robbed . . .

"4. Murder in cold blood is the lot of some youths who are considered to be dangerous for the future of the conquest. This was the case of fifteen captives taken out of the dispensary of Nab in the region of Al-Zaweeyeh. This was also the case of any male carrying the service-to-the-flag booklet . . .

"5. The ruthlessness of the invaders crystallizes particularly against those suspected of being members of the Baath Party or the Popular Army. In one case, a national guard . . . was transported into occupied Palestine by helicopter because a few party leaflets were found on him. Thereafter, the inhabitants of the village were expelled. In another case, in the village of Al-AI, the invaders were carrying lists of supposed suspects. They divided the inhabitants of the village into two categories: those under thirty-five years of age were taken to occupied Palestine; those above thirty-five were subjected

to torture, hands tied behind their back, blindfolded and then expelled to Haouran.”⁸

82. While Israeli representatives and spokesmen continue to deny our accusations, a series of atrocities continue to be committed. From among the most recent I cite the following:

“(a) On 29 June 1968, the Israeli Army bulldozed the Syrian village Al Dabboussia . . .

“(b) On 1 July 1968, the Israeli Army also bulldozed the Syrian village Al Jurnia . . .

“As to the inhuman treatment of civilians, following are some facts:

“(a) Of 200 Syrian soldiers who disappeared following the 5 June 1967 war and who could not be accounted for, the Israeli authorities presented the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) four death certificates only.

“(b) One hundred and twenty civilians captured during the attack on Syria in the Kuneitra area and led away under the eyes of their families to unknown destinations have mysteriously disappeared.

“... ”

“(d) Syrian and Arab prisoners are being forcibly subjected to blood extraction which is turned over to Israeli hospitals. On 26 June 1968, the Syrian Government officially requested the ICRC to investigate this inhuman treatment of prisoners of war.

“... ”

“(f) The forcible expulsion of the few remaining civilian population continues up till now in spite of the repeated denials of the Israeli representative and his authorities. This is done sometimes in the most horrifying manner. Thus on 4 May 1968, Idriss Mustafa Lahuj, from Al Mansoura village occupied by the Israeli army, was offered 1,000 Syrian pounds, the equivalent of US \$250, to leave his home for Damascus, but he refused. Next morning he was found killed in cold blood and his household turned over the dead body.”⁹

83. These crimes merit a place in history beside the Nazi atrocities. Should there be any doubt as to the veracity of the account given, I would ask the Council to listen to this open letter addressed by eighty-five Israeli intellectuals to the Israeli Press on 3 March 1968:

“Dear Sir,

“We have the honour to forward to you a declaration, asking you to publish it.

⁸ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1967*, document S/8077.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Twenty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1968*, document S/8689.

“The declaration reads:

“*Stop the violation of human rights in Israel and in the occupied territories.*

“Details were published in the areas about what is happening in Israel and in the occupied territories:

“Confinement orders, limitations of free movement and arrests without trial were recently imposed on Israeli citizens, Jews and Arabs.

“The imposition of collective punishments, like the curfew and the dynamiting of houses, continues in the towns and villages of the occupied territories at an alarming rate. Families of workers and fellaheen, children, women and old people, remain without shelter and means of existence. The stream of refugees and escapers from the Gaza Strip and from the west bank of the Jordan continues unabatedly.

“An increasing number of Arabs is driven out of the western bank by order of the Israeli military governor. A protest petition published in the western bank stated: “These methods are opposed to international standards and to the basic rights of the citizen to live in his home and on his soil. Enforced exile on political grounds reminds us of the British colonial rule.”

“Where do these methods lead to if not into an abyss of hatred?

“Acts like these will only strengthen the resistance and the underground movement, multiply victims on both sides, and lead to another war, with an unforeseeable number of casualties.

“The domination of another people exposes the subduing people itself to moral degeneration and undermines its democracy. Any people oppressing another one is bound to lose its own freedom and the freedom of its citizens.

“Jewish citizens, remember those courageous gentiles who stood by us in times of distress! Now that disaster has befallen the fraternal Arab people, can you deem fit to remain aloof and to keep silent?”

84. With your permission, Sir, I should like to elaborate on one point. We have complained about the new Israeli settlements, now thirty-eight in number, in the occupied Arab territories called Nahal. Nine of these are established on Syrian soil. Their exact locations were given in annex I to my letter of 18 June 1968 [S/8643].

85. The Israeli representative sitting on my right has repeatedly stated that:

“The Nahal Corps . . . are military units of the Israeli Defence Forces and their activities are designed to assist in ensuring the security of the area and in maintaining the cease-fire.”

This was stated by Mr. Tekoah in his letter of 27 June 1968 [S/8654]. But on 2 July 1968 the Jewish Telegraph Agency stated:

"The Golan Heights, occupied in the June 1967 war, will be converted into a summer resort area, the Israeli Parks Authority announced. The plateau enjoys relatively cool weather during the summer months."

86. However, that is not all the story, for on 15 July 1968 the *Jewish Post* stated, under the heading "Golan slated as cattle land", the following:

"Plans to graze massive herds of cattle on the Golan Heights were announced by the Jewish Agency Settlement Department yesterday. The plans envisage 15,000 head of cattle on 600,000 *dunums* of natural pasture.

"The Department's calculations show that Golan meat production could make it possible to cut Israel's imports by a quarter."

87. As described in the American-Jewish Yearbook, the Jewish Agency, American Section, which was mentioned previously represents in the United States the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Israel and Jerusalem, which is recognized by the State of Israel as the authorized agency to work in Israel for development and colonization, the absorption and settlement of immigrants and the co-ordination of activities of Jewish institutions and associations operating in these fields.

88. We should like to stop a moment here to see whether we are now living in the second half of the twentieth century, the third decade of the United Nations, or if history has been put back a hundred years to the time when Western colonial expansion was grabbing lands in Asia and Africa for the white settlers, displacing the indigenous population to lighten or discharge the white man's burden. No, this is not 1830 or 1870 or even 1900. This is September 1968, the season of the opening of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

89. We have time and again listened to Mr. Tekoah denying the charges of inhuman, nazi-type treatment of prisoners of war and of torture inflicted arbitrarily and with impunity on Arab refugees, over a hundred thousand of whom were made refugees twice in their lifetimes. I have with me here records of at least 120 cases, all of which, I submit, are established beyond any doubt. The names of the camps, the numbers of the tents, the locations, the dates and the details of the inhuman acts are given in full detail, so that the Council may check on their accuracy, and I hope this will be done.

90. Between the dates of adoption of the two humanitarian resolutions whose implementation we are discussing today, several committees and one conference which are dealing, in this Year of Human Rights, with the implementation of human rights, have looked carefully into the situation of the Arab civilian population in the Israeli-occupied territories. I want to mention these.

91. The Economic and Social Council adopted resolution 1336 (XLIV) on 20 June 1968, which endorsed resolu-

tion 6 (XXIV) entitled "Question of human rights in the territories occupied as a result of hostilities in the Middle East", adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-fourth session.

92. The Commission on Human Rights, after recalling the Geneva Conventions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two humanitarian resolutions we are discussing, stated in paragraph 2 of that resolution:

"Affirms the right of all the inhabitants who have left since the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East to return and that the Government concerned should take the necessary measures in order to facilitate the return of those inhabitants to their own country without delay".

93. There was also a resolution adopted by the Teheran Conference. The representative of the United Arab Republic has already quoted that, and so I will not deal with it.

94. On 8 March 1968 the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights sent a telegram to the Government of Israel upon the decision of the Commission at its 990th meeting on 8 March, which read:

"The United Nations Commission on Human Rights is distressed to learn from newspapers of Israeli acts of destroying homes of Arab civilian population inhabiting the areas occupied by the Israeli authorities subsequent to the hostilities of June 1967. The Commission on Human Rights calls upon the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from indulging in such practices and to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms."¹⁰

95. These resolutions, adopted by United Nations bodies other than the Security Council, should remind this Council of the gravity of the situation and the dimensions of the human problem involved in this Arab tragedy. It is enough to make it a binding and imperative duty upon us not only to condemn Israel for its acts and its violation of human rights, but to confirm in unequivocal terms the mandate given to the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative, without allowing the aggressor State to prevent such a representative from going into the area.

96. It is not unusual in this Council to hear the representative of Israel make appeals for peace. Nor is it unusual for Arab representatives to ridicule them as hypocritical pleas, for we have had twenty years' experience of Israeli occupation and seventy-five years of a vicious campaign of defamation, vilification and hate waged by world Zionism and Israel against the Arabs. Suffice it to say that the Israelis have devised every way and means to prevent the implementation of the two humanitarian resolutions, purposely to perpetuate the tragedy of the new refugees as they have in the past twenty-one years prolonged the tragedy of the old refugees.

97. This time, however, in commenting upon Mr. Tekoah's pleas for peace, I will allow an Israeli leader, now a member

¹⁰ Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 4, para. 400.

of the Knesset, to answer Mr. Tekoah on his plea for peace and in the way an Israeli Zionist understands peace. I am referring specifically to a member of the Israeli Knesset called Uri Avnery, a well-known writer whose latest book, *Israel without Zionists*,¹¹ appeared this year. He tells us on page 103:

"Like most Israelis, Ben-Gurion was convinced that making peace was entirely up to the Arabs, and that Israel could do nothing to initiate it. Peace meant Arab recognition of the status quo, from which Israel could not and would not budge."

98. On page 134 he quotes from a eulogy delivered by Moshe Dayan at the funeral of an Israeli who had been killed, citing this as Dayan's credo:

"Let us not today fling accusations at the murderers. Who are we that we should argue against their hatred?"

"For eight years now, they sit in their refugee camps in Gaza, and before their very eyes, we turn into our homestead the land and the villages in which they and their forefathers have lived.

"... We are a generation of settlers, and without the steel helmet and the cannon we cannot plant a tree and build a house.

"Let us not shrink back when we see the hatred fermenting and filling the lives of hundreds of thousands of Arabs, who sit all around us. Let us not avert our eyes, so that our hand shall not slip.

"This is the fate of our generation, the choice of our life—to be prepared and armed, strong and tough—or otherwise the sword will slip from our fist and our life will be snuffed out."

99. Uri Avnery makes a very good comment on this remarkable speech:

"This is a stark philosophy, the philosophy of a crusader who sees no doors open leading toward peace, who believes that the very thought of peace is demoralizing."

100. On page 135 he writes:

"An old story has it that a young kibbutz member, when asked how he views the Arab problem answers: 'Through the sights of a rifle'."

101. To conclude, let me draw the attention of the Bible-quoting Israeli representative to the words of an ancient Hebrew Prophet, Habakkuk, chapter 2, verse 12: "Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood and establisheth a city by iniquity."

102. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel to whom I give the floor.

103. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The degree of deception and guile in the complaint before the Security Council was demonstrated at our last meeting when certain delegations attacked Israel's right of expression in this Council. The true attitude of these delegations to human rights was convincingly displayed when they threw themselves in fury upon the grief and pain born of the persecution of Jews.

104. A quarter century after Hitler's concentration camps were liquidated, Jews are lingering in Arab concentration camps again, but the self-appointed champions of human rights are trying to bar discussion of this tragedy by the United Nations, despite the fact that this tragedy occupies a prominent place in the documentation on which the complaint before the Council is based. Innocent Jews are being tortured again in prison, while in the Security Council the cry "point of order" is sounded to prevent assistance to them. Entire Jewish communities, oppressed and discriminated, plead for help, only to be answered here by the cynical shout "point of order". Anti-Jewish legislation is promulgated and put into effect, but those to whom the invocation of human rights is but another political game scream "point of order".

105. For some years now the Security Council has been paralysed by the veto and the mechanical weight of numbers in all questions concerning Israel's basic rights. The world has become accustomed to the lack of equity and effectiveness in Council deliberations in which Israel is concerned. Lately, Security Council debates have been plagued by another malady, the irresponsible use of the device of "point of order". This malady, if allowed to continue, threatens to curtail freedom of expression in the Council and deteriorate our discussions to a point of farce.

106. The Arab delegations and their supporters have tried by devious arguments to dismiss the problem of oppression of Jews in the Arab States in the wake of the June 1967 hostilities. It is not the first time that they come before the Security Council proposing that justice and law be one sided, that Israel be denied their application, and that justice and law do not fetter the Arab States in their aggression against Israel.

107. However, no callous misinterpretations, no cynical denials can screen the enormity of the tragedy that has befallen Jewry in the Arab States since June 1967. Their suffering, their tears, their agony, will not be suppressed by speeches or votes in the Security Council. The entire world is witness to their torment. Not a single report has appeared that would allay concern for their fate or detract from the gravity of their situation. On the contrary, even sources friendly to the Arab States could not conceal the grim, horrid facts.

108. Irene Beeson, frequently quoted here by the Arab representatives in support of their claims, writes from Cairo in *The Scotsman* of 10 August 1968 of a conversation she had with ninety-year old Rabbi Haim Douek who had himself been arrested by the Egyptian authorities and released only after several months. According to her report: "At the time of the June war, about 500 Egyptian and other Jews were rounded up and interned, he said. He did not think that Red Cross officials had been allowed to visit the Egyptian Jews in detention."

¹¹ The Macmillan Company, New York, 1968.

109. In a dispatch from Cairo, Eric Pace reports in *The New York Times* on 10 September 1968:

"None of the more than 200 Jews who have remained in prison since the war in 1967 have been released this year . . .

"About 220 men are now thought to be held in Toura prison outside Cairo.

"A number of others who were jailed after the outbreak of war were released last year, but there has been no indication in recent months that any more would be set free."

110. *The Washington Post* of 4 September 1968 states:

"... an estimated 250 Jews remain in confinement, principally in the al-Thoura prison near Cairo. Other Jews freed previously have alleged that they were forced by prison officers to submit to sexual perversion and other indignities and were beaten and tortured."

111. At the last meeting I described at length the persecution of Jews in Syria resulting from the June hostilities.

112. An American citizen sent a letter on 12 September 1968 to Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., with copies to a number of missions at the United Nations, in which he writes:

"I would like to express my deep gratitude for the attention and steady co-operation that you have given me regarding my family which is still in Damascus, Syria.

"The latest reports that we have received indicate that the situation of the Jewish communities of Damascus, Aleppo, and Kamishli is worsening.

"The recent report by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the projected new humanitarian mission to the Middle East, contained a letter from the Syrian representative in which he stated that the new mission should not include 'Jewish communities in Syria or other Arab countries, victims of the Israeli war of aggression of 5 June 1967'.

"Does he feel that if Syria and other Arab countries failed in the battlefield to conquer the Army of Israel, then they would have the right to inflict damage and sufferings upon innocent civilians simply because they happen to be of the Jewish faith? "

113. In a document dated 16 May 1968, the United States Mission declared:

"Information on the Jews in Syria is limited. However, it is reliably reported that the Jews are being subjected to a variety of forms of harassment, discrimination, and restriction. We are also aware that no Jews are seemingly allowed to leave the country and that most would leave if permitted . . .

"... it is understood that the Secretary-General's Representative will also look into and report on the situation of Jewish communities in Arab countries . . . we will make clear to the Secretary-General our specific interest in that aspect of his Representative's mission."

114. Numerous reports have also appeared on the dire plight of Iraqi Jews. On 4 May 1968 *The New York Times* reported:

"Remnants of the centuries-old Jewish community in Iraq face virtual economic strangulation . . .

"The plight of the Jews described as desperate . . . stems from a new series of decrees giving the Iraqi Government control over nearly all Jewish sources of income."

115. *The American Examiner* of 9 November 1967 in an article entitled "Iraq steps up persecution of Jews", states:

"The Government promotes anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish propaganda through the newspapers, the radio and T.V. In the beginning it endeavoured to differentiate in its attacks between Zionists and Jews, but now rarely makes this distinction."

116. The situation of Jews in the Arab States since June 1967 was considered grave enough for Mr. Gussing, the Secretary-General's first representative on humanitarian matters, to concern himself with it. The situation of Jews in Iraq is considered woeful enough for the Secretary-General himself to have taken it up repeatedly with the Government of Iraq. Yet the Arab delegations and the sponsors of the draft resolution in document S/8825/Rev.2 would have it ignored.

117. To the Arab delegations, the imprisonment of innocent Jews, the oppression of Jewish communities, the starvation of Jewish families, the adoption of anti-Jewish laws, the refusal to allow outside observers to come into contact with this situation, are not a question of human rights.

118. What then is a human-rights problem? The Jordanian representative has given the Council some interesting views on this point. Can it seriously be contended that humanitarian issues are involved when Israeli mini-skirts appear in town or when Arab inhabitants buy Israeli goods? Can it really be claimed that the welfare and security of the local population are threatened by the fact that over a period of sixteen months, eleven individuals, confessed agents of Jordanian terror warfare are asked to cross the cease-fire line and join their employers in Amman rather than continue to undermine public law and order in Israel-controlled territory? The Arab delegations are up in arms when three Arab women who have engaged themselves in organizing terror attacks against Jewish women and children are arrested, and International Red Cross representatives are invited to visit them regularly as they visit other detainees. The Arab delegations see red because a house found to be a terror-warfare centre or an arms store is blown up in accordance with local Jordanian or Egyptian laws—I repeat, in accordance with local Jordanian or

Egyptian laws. The Arab delegations raise a cry that Arab inhabitants who left the area of hostilities before or together with the retreating armies of aggression suffered the results of the aggression unleashed by their own Governments.

119. This to them characterizes the general situation: not the freedom of movement within the Israel-administered areas and outside them; not the freedom of expression; not the fact that all local authorities continue to function as before June 1967; that schools, hospitals, public services are operating normally; that the local economy is being assisted in raising the shockingly low standard of life at which the Arab occupiers had kept the inhabitants of the west bank and Gaza. Nor is it of any interest to the Arab representatives that Jews and Arabs are showing that they can live peacefully side by side and work together.

120. Today's statements by the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Syria have continued in the same spirit of perfidy and deception. Like the allegations made by the representative of Jordan, they were based on wilful distortions incorporated in numerous letters circulated by them in the past as Security Council documents and fully repudiated in Israeli replies similarly circulated. The degree of veracity in those claims is illustrated, for instance, by the Jordanian statement that "the Israelis have forced prisoners of war to take part in services of military production, which would be used in war operations against their country". It so happens that the agreement for the exchange of prisoners of war was signed by me personally with the representatives of the Jordanian Government on 6 August 1967 and immediately implemented.

121. To all the Arab representatives and to their supporters I should like to point out the following.

122. War is a grim, sanguinary and tragic development. It inevitably brings grief and results in suffering for the civilian population on both sides. We have been telling this to our Arab neighbours for twenty years. We have been exhorting them to end the war and not to continue with their acts of aggression against Israel's territory and Israel's citizens. The Arab Governments, by their refusal, are directly responsible for the present situation. By continuing to wage war on us, they have brought it upon themselves and their peoples. They can hardly complain now of the consequences of their own criminal policy and actions. They still pursue warfare against Israel. Israel is still compelled by them to put its security before other considerations.

123. End the war, liquidate the twenty-year conflict, abandon aggression, conclude peace with Israel, and the present situation will change and there will be no room for concern on our part or on yours for the effects of war on civilian populations.

124. The Arab States are not justified in their complaints for yet another reason. At the last meeting I recalled Jordan's attitude to human rights, Jordan's destruction of all Jewish communities in territory under its control and Jordan's sacrilege against Jewish religious sites. Today, Egypt and Syria have come to the Security Council to

speak in the name of law and justice and human rights. We categorically reject the right of these States to arrogate to themselves that prerogative. One cannot forget what these countries stand for, what their policy and their behaviour have been and continue to be.

125. Egypt remains the leader of Arab aggression against Israel. Egypt has for years trampled underfoot international law, United Nations resolutions and obligations undertaken in bilateral agreements with Israel. Egypt is the State that killed Yemeni civilians with poison gas and bombarded peaceful villages in Saudi Arabia. It is the State that for nineteen years shut up hundreds of thousands of refugees in the Gaza Strip, depriving them of freedom of movement, barring them from leaving the area even to go to Egypt itself in search of work and keeping them under continuous curfew.

126. Here is what Radio Mecca of Saudi Arabia has to say about the methods of repression used by the Egyptian occupation authorities in the Gaza area. In a broadcast on 10 March 1962, Mecca Radio stated:

"These are the very methods which the dictator Hitler used in the countries he occupied during the World War. Imagine, Arabs, how Nasser, who claims to be the pioneer of Arab nationalism, treats the Arab people of Gaza - Gaza and its miserable people who starve while the Egyptian Governor of Gaza and his officers and soldiers bask in the wealth of the Strip."

It is the same Egypt that since June 1967 has persecuted Jews, kept hundreds of heads of Jewish families in concentration camps, subjecting them to torture and inhuman perversities.

127. Then there is Syria which has written horrifying chapters in the cruelty of man to man: kidnapping Israeli citizens, keeping them in prison for five, ten and fifteen years without even admitting their imprisonment, exposing them to the abuse of Syrian officers and officials before returning them as shadows of men, broken in mind and body. Syria, oppressing Jews and persecuting Christians and Kurds, cannot be recognized as an exponent of human rights. Syria, which has refused to co-operate with the United Nations peace efforts, Syria which continues to violate the Charter of the United Nations in relation to Israel, is not entitled to remonstrate on matters of law and justice.

128. These States cannot appear before the Council in the role of accusers. They are the accused.

129. As at the previous meeting, I shall allow detached observers to answer their falsifications regarding the situation in areas under Israeli control.

130. The London *Daily Telegraph* of 30 April 1968 declares:

"Israel's occupation of conquered territories has been the most human and generous in modern history, even more so than the American occupation of Japan after World War II.

"Economic conditions for Arabs in the occupied territories are improving. Many of them, even the professional refugees, are better off than they have ever been before.

"On its record so far, Israel can have a clear conscience before the United Nations or any other international bar on its handling of the occupied Arab territories."

131. We are satisfied to rest our case on this kind of testimony repeated in numerous similar reports by observers from all parts of the world. There has not been a single report in this spirit describing the conditions of Jews in Arab States.

132. In any event, as I explained at the last meeting, Israel has no objection to a second United Nations humanitarian mission's examining the situation itself. We still wait to hear that the Arab Governments are ready to take a similar constructive position with regard to the situation of Jews in their territories since June 1967.

133. The reasons why the Arab Governments oppose a United Nations investigation of the oppression of Jews in their lands are obvious. They have barred not only United Nations representatives from looking into this problem, claiming as the Nazis used to that persecution of Jews is not of international concern but an internal matter, but they have also refused to allow delegates of the International Red Cross and other humanitarian organizations to visit the prisons and concentration camps in which Jews have been detained as a result of last year's hostilities. The Arab Governments are undoubtedly the best judges of what conclusions would be reached by impartial international investigation of this grave problem.

134. How do the Arab States explain this refusal? Their argument is as simple as it is untenable.

135. Resolution 237 (1967) of the Security Council addresses itself to "Governments concerned". The Arab States suggest that this should be interpreted as applying only to one Government concerned. The draft resolution before the Council accepts this distortion as its basis. The preamble and operative paragraph 2 of resolution 237 (1967) make it plain that international concern extends over the Middle East region as a whole.

136. The Arab States would now have this resolution misinterpreted, its preamble and operative paragraph 2 ignored.

137. The area of conflict to which resolution 237 (1967) applies was defined for the purpose of the first humanitarian mission as including the Arab States and the situation of Jews affected by the June 1967 hostilities. A year later the Arab delegations suggest that Arab States should be excluded from the framework of the area of conflict. This area is to be defined, according to them, not on the basis of participation in the conflict, and not even on the basis of the area of actual hostilities, but by reference to one side of the cease-fire lines. This is too odd and blatantly one-sided a definition to be worthy of serious consideration. It is as strange as the view which suggests that Iraq, where the

situation of Jews has deteriorated to such an extent since the first humanitarian mission that the Secretary-General himself has taken up the matter repeatedly with the Iraqi Government, should now be left outside the scope of the mission, because Iraq allegedly was not in the area where military operations took place. It would require a considerable rewriting of history to vindicate such a proposition.

138. The Arab representatives have continued to argue here today that the Security Council resolution 237 (1967) in its reference to the area of conflict should be interpreted as applying only to the territories under Israel occupation. That this is contrary to law and reason had been made clear again in the introduction to the Secretary-General's annual report¹² in which the Secretary-General clearly distinguishes in paragraph 44 of the document between "the area of the conflict of June 1967" and the occupied territories which obviously are only part of that area.

139. Resolution 237 (1967) has been and continues to be implemented by Israel. Israel is fully discharging its responsibility for the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of all Israel-held territories and will continue to do so. All that Israel asks is that resolution 237 (1967) be implemented also by the Arab States, so that in accordance with its provisions the Jews in Arab countries victimized since June 1967 be spared suffering and their essential and inalienable human rights be respected.

140. We are a small people, and only one of the 125 Members of the United Nations. Yet we are right in opposing the distortion of resolution 237 (1967), right in objecting to a humanitarian resolution being turned into an anti-humanitarian text and right in insisting that human rights of Jews and Arabs alike should be upheld.

141. The world knows that we are right, and if again the suffering of Jews is derided and dismissed it will understand that Israel cannot acquiesce in such a disgraceful travesty of justice.

142. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It is no fortuitous question that the Security Council is now discussing, namely, Israel's failure to implement Council resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967 and its refusal to permit a special representative of the Secretary-General to enter the Arab territories it has occupied in order to investigate the situation of the Arab inhabitants, temporarily subjected to the aggressor's authority.

143. The Security Council is dealing with yet another manifestation of one and the same Israeli policy of aggression in the Near East, a policy pursued by the ruling circles of Tel Aviv in violation of the United Nations Charter and the decisions of the Security Council, and in defiance of the will of the majority of States Members of the United Nations and of world public opinion.

144. The nature of the aggression is such that the aggressor is flouting international legality in many direc-

¹² Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 1A.

tions at once, one of them being the perpetration of violence and terror against the population of the occupied territories.

145. In their statements, the representatives of Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Syria have given many examples, facts and proofs of the way in which the Israeli authorities are spurning human dignity and wreaking violence and terror upon the population of the Arab territories which they have occupied. Documents have been read out, including numerous letters and statements filled with anger and indignation from persons suffering under the yoke of the foreign invaders. These represent the voice of the suffering Arab population and are a fierce protest against the aggressor's crimes.

146. The question of the situation of the Arab population subjected to the aggressor's yoke and the dispatch to the Near East of a special representative of the Secretary-General for humanitarian purposes is not a narrow or private question; it is an integral part of a problem of fundamental importance, affecting the rights and interests of all the peoples of the Near East—the problem of eradicating with all possible speed the consequences of the Israeli aggression against the Arab States.

147. In his statement, the Israeli representative addressed an appeal to the representatives of the Arab countries. But before making appeals, it is necessary to settle the main problem, that of withdrawing the Israeli forces from the occupied territories. The question will then resolve itself.

148. We have to point out in that connexion that, as long ago as June of last year, immediately after Israel's attack upon the Arab countries, and on the basis of the first disturbing reports of the aggressor's excesses and brutalities in the occupied Arab territories, the Security Council adopted its resolution 237 (1967), in which it called upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas temporarily under its occupation.

149. That resolution, which pursued so lofty a humanitarian goal, was in itself a direct indictment of the aggressor. It was intended as a serious warning to Israel to avoid a policy of coercion and lawlessness in regard to the Arab population temporarily subjected to the invaders' power. But the aggressor did not heed the warning. He has committed, and continues to commit, acts of lawlessness in the occupied Arab territories, and has established a régime of tyranny and repression there. The aggressor has adopted the policy of assimilating occupied Arab lands with, as a consequence, the expulsion of the Arab population from its native soil, the destruction of Arab villages and the demolition and levelling to the ground of whole blocks of dwellings in the towns. Measures are being taken to annex and "Israelize" the Arab sector of Jerusalem.

150. This policy of aggression and repression that Israel is pursuing is the cause of the deep hatred felt by the Arab population for the aggressor as it groans under the occupiers' yoke.

151. The régime of terror and violence which the Israeli authorities have established on Arab soil is clear evidence of

the aggressor's true character and of his reckless expansionist intentions.

152. The aggressor fears exposure; hence the Israeli authorities' refusal to allow a special representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to enter the occupied territories. If Israel were not conscious of its guilt and of its responsibility for the wrong done to the Arab peoples, if it were not afraid that an international inquiry into the facts would fully expose the crimes committed on Arab soil and would heap new disgrace on the aggressor and yet another condemnation by world public opinion, it would not be placing obstacles in the way of the admission of a special representative of the United Nations Secretary-General to the areas which are illegally under its control as a result of the aggression of June 1967.

153. Obviously Israel's hypocritical attempts to invent excuses for its refusal to implement Security Council resolution 237 (1967) on the dispatch of a special representative of the United Nations Secretary-General to the occupied Arab territories cannot be taken seriously. Those excuses are fabrications, and are in themselves evidence of Israel's expansionist policy, directed to intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab States.

154. In this connexion, it is pertinent to draw attention once more to a most important international document—the resolution recently adopted by so authoritative a body as the International Conference on Human Rights. There is no need to go into it in detail; the representative of the United Arab Republic has already referred to it. It should, however, be emphasized that, in this resolution adopted by an eminent international body such as the International Conference on Human Rights, grave concern is expressed for the violation of human rights in Arab territories as a result of the hostilities in June 1967.

155. This resolution specifically draws Israel's attention to the grave consequences resulting from disregard of fundamental freedoms and human rights in occupied territories. It specifically calls upon the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from destroying homes of the Arab civilian population inhabiting areas occupied by Israel, and to respect and implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949.

156. What is happening at the present time in the Arab territories occupied by Israel again confronts the Security Council and the United Nations most forcibly with that most important and vital question: the necessity for the speediest eradication of the consequences of the Israeli aggression, the necessity for the speediest withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Arab territories and the necessity for a political settlement in the Near East through the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

157. Of course the Security Council cannot disregard the criminal actions of the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories or the sufferings which the aggressor is inflicting upon the Arab population.

158. It must, unfortunately, be noted that the consultations among the members of the Security Council have

dragged on for too long. The reason is that several members of the Security Council have fallen ill and are beginning to suffer from a disease which might, perhaps, be called "implementation phobia". The external symptoms of this disease are fear and dread of implementing not only those resolutions for which these members of the Security Council voted but even those resolutions which they themselves submitted to the Council. At the time they submitted those resolutions, they were apparently in better health and were not infected with this dangerous disease. Fortunately, the disease has not assumed epidemic proportions. There are healthy forces in the Security Council with sufficient effective immunity against the virus of this strange disease. This has made it possible for the members of the Council, after lengthy consultations, to find a basis for the preparation of a draft resolution—the revised draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Pakistan and Senegal, which is now before us. In view of the gravity of the matter under discussion and its humanitarian character, any attempts to secure further postponement of a decision on the question would be inadmissible.

159. The draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and Senegal [S/8825/Rev.2] should be examined at today's meeting and put to the vote; it should not be put off to the next meeting, particularly since we do not know when the next meeting will take place, in view of the fact that the United Nations is now busy with the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

160. Because of the Israeli authorities' refusal to comply with the Security Council's resolution 237 (1967) and to admit a special representative of the United Nations Secretary-General to those territories, notwithstanding all the Secretary-General's efforts and the attention he has paid to this important humanitarian question, the Council must decisively condemn Israel, approve this resolution and demand its immediate implementation.

161. The draft resolution submitted by the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal, despite its inadequacy, by and large answers that purpose; the USSR delegation therefore supports it and will vote in favour of it.

162. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The Council finds itself in a position which is both unfortunate and of frequent occurrence. As the Council has been informed, and whatever other assertions may be made, Israel is setting conditions for the execution of a humanitarian mission, conditions which it knows in advance will be unacceptable, so that it need not account for the living conditions of the populations displaced in consequence of its expansionist policy.

163. The Security Council is discussing a mission which was clearly defined in its resolution 237 (1967); the execution of the humanitarian mission awaits only the removal of the obstacles and conditions imposed by Israel.

164. There is little hope that Israel will take such action, for its unavowed aim, in allegedly espousing the cause of all minorities of the earth, is to sow dissension among the different national elements within each State and to create an atmosphere of suspicion towards their minorities.

165. That is undoubtedly the object which Israel is now endeavouring to achieve, for it is seeking acceptance of the principle of dual allegiance which would give it a form of permanent jurisdiction over the citizens of all countries who are of the Jewish faith.

166. We do not concede such jurisdiction to Israel, but we are perfectly clear about the goal pursued. What Israel wants, essentially, is to set in motion, or increase, a flow of immigration prompted by fear or hatred, a flow which would enable it both to increase the size of its population and to occupy and colonize the newly conquered territories after they have been systematically cleared of their populations, who would thus swell the ranks of the refugees. This goal obviously runs directly counter to the humanitarian mission on which the Council decided.

167. Moreover, Israel refuses to account for the manner in which it is administering the occupied territories; this does not surprise us, given the measures and arrangements which have been adopted with a view to nothing less than the outright annexation of the invaded regions.

168. Israel's entire position rests both on this outright annexation and on the refusal to draw the obvious conclusions from such an attitude with respect to the populations under its control. Israel's policy is, indeed, twofold: to seize territories and place them under its effective control, while at the same time declining all political responsibility for the predictable consequences of such annexation. Israel refuses to admit that its occupation generates and strengthens Palestinian resistance, and whether out of blindness or political design, prefers to place the responsibility for these consequences on the Arab countries.

169. This attitude explains the repeated meetings of the Security Council during the last few months and the acts of retaliation which Israel has carried out against the Arab countries. Can anyone here dispute the fact that this policy of repression of the indigenous population and of outright intimidation has greatly reinforced the attitude of active resistance of the Palestinian population?

170. The systematic dynamiting of Arab houses in occupied territory has seriously aggravated the plight of the inhabitants, who are swelling the ranks of the homeless, and has repeatedly attracted the attention of international opinion.

171. Israel alone, caught up in the fervour of its Messianic mission and clearly concerned to recreate the kingdom of David by fire and the sword, is still unaware of the situation or prefers to close its eyes to it.

172. The humanitarian mission under discussion has a specific purpose which far transcends the political considerations in which an attempt is being made to engulf us. That mission must be upheld, as correctly defined by the Council and the Secretary-General, for several reasons. Firstly, to take any other course would be to perpetrate a legal enormity; it would mean confirming Israel's jurisdiction over all Jews in the world, regardless of differences in nationality. Secondly, recognition of such a claim would

inevitably cause public opinion, which is only just beginning to glimpse the depths of Israeli Machiavellianism, to harbour doubts with regard to a certain category of citizens. The sole result of such a surrender would be to increase immigration to Israel, that is, to compound the injury inflicted on the Palestinians, whose exodus would be intensified.

173. It should be possible to relieve the present sufferings of the displaced populations very speedily in accordance with the spirit permeating the Secretary-General's note of 31 July 1968 [S/8699], from which it is clear that resolution 237 (1967) must be put into effect without delay and to the letter.

174. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): As one of the original co-sponsors of resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967, I consider it my duty to make some brief comments at this stage of our deliberations in order to explain and clarify the position of my delegation both with regard to resolution 237 (1967) and, in particular, with regard to the present draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Senegal and Pakistan contained in document S/8825/Rev.2, a draft resolution which we recognize as a follow-up of the first decision.

175. I must say from the very outset that in sponsoring resolution 237 (1967) our primary purpose was to ensure the safety, welfare and security of peoples who had been directly affected by the military conflict of June 1967 and, more particularly, those people inhabiting the territories which came under Israeli military control during and subsequent to that conflict. Therefore, in requesting the Secretary-General to follow the effective implementation of resolution 237 (1967) and to report to the Security Council in due course, we took special care not to specify any rigid course of action which would have made it difficult for him to carry out the mandate given under that resolution, and we chose instead to create a framework within which the Secretary-General would have the latitude and discretion to find the best ways and means for the accomplishment of the mission entrusted to him. We thank the Secretary-General and commend him for his efforts, and we trust that he will continue those efforts in the future.

176. The Secretary-General's note of 31 July 1968 [S/8699] shows in fact that whereas he did succeed in sending a Special Representative at the initial stage of his efforts, subsequent progress towards the fulfilment of resolution 237 (1967) could not be made because of certain conditions advanced by the Government of Israel with regard to the scope of that resolution. The representative of Israel repeated the same conditions in his statement at our last meeting and sought to give to resolution 237 (1967) an interpretation which would, in our view, go far beyond the terms and purposes of that resolution.

177. While always ready to consider with attention and sympathy the submissions of Member Governments on problems and issues that preoccupy them, I must say, in all frankness and with all due respect to those who may feel otherwise, that my delegation cannot share that interpretation of resolution 237 (1967) and cannot therefore accept the conditions that emanate from it.

178. This is not to say that we are unconcerned about or uninterested in the necessity of universal respect for religious freedom. On the contrary, I want to make it absolutely clear where Ethiopia stands in this regard. As a multireligious society and as a country with a long tradition of respect for all religions and faiths, Ethiopia upholds the principle of freedom of religion as a fundamental human right for all peoples everywhere. By the same token, we condemn all policies and practices aimed at religious persecution and all discrimination on grounds of race, religion, colour or creed. Thus our position on the matters of principle is clear beyond any doubt.

179. However, we cannot but maintain that resolution 237 (1967) and the present draft resolution before us deal with the specific problem of the safety, welfare and security of Arab populations affected by the occupation that followed the war of June 1967, in those areas in particular that are under Israeli military occupation. That being the situation as we see it, we find the present draft resolution, submitted by the delegations of Senegal and Pakistan, to be both appropriate and relevant since it attempts to ensure the continuity of the Secretary-General's effort by providing a clear and reasonable framework for his continued endeavour in this regard.

180. The draft resolution does nothing more than deplore the delay caused by the introduction of extensive conditions by Israel and only calls on Israel to accept a special representative of the Secretary-General, while recommending at the same time "that the Secretary-General be afforded all co-operation in his efforts to bring about the implementation of the present resolution and resolution 237 (1967)". This we find to be a proper course of action for the Security Council to take.

181. I realize that neither Israel nor the Arab States will be fully satisfied with the draft resolution before us. In a situation of this kind it is difficult, if not impossible, to satisfy all sides, and the Council, for its part, must endeavour to base its action not so much on who is right, but rather on what is right, and must go ahead to do what it deems to be fair and just.

182. I believe that, in the circumstances and in the light of the report of the Secretary-General, the course of action proposed in the draft resolution before us is fair and just; and, therefore, should the revised draft be put to a vote as it stands, my delegation will not deny that draft its support.

183. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): For the last several days the Security Council has deliberated on the Secretary-General's report. /Ibid./ The Secretary-General has given a detailed account of his efforts to send another mission to West Asia. The purpose of this mission is to collect first-hand information on the conditions of civilian populations in areas under the military control of Israel since June 1967. This objective has not so far been achieved because of the conditions laid down by Israel for receiving a Special Representative of the Secretary-General. It is on these attempts to broaden the terms and scope of investigation that the projected mission has foundered.

184. There can be no doubt about what the Secretary-General has been requested to do by the Council. Equally,

there is general agreement around this table on the desirability and urgency of getting full information on the condition of civilian populations in the area of conflict in West Asia. What, then, are the obstacles that have come in the way of the implementation of resolution 237 (1967)? My delegation believes that in this context two elements need to be considered.

185. First, it is well known that the Security Council's humanitarian concern with the civilian populations originated in the conflict of June of last year and is reflected in its unanimously adopted resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967. In paragraph 1 of this resolution the Council specifically called upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of areas where military operations had just taken place. The language of this paragraph makes it quite clear that the scope of the inquiry is limited to the occupied areas.

186. Second, the task of the Special Representative is quite simple and unambiguous. It is to gather full information on the basis of which the Secretary-General can report to the Security Council on the implementation of resolution 237 (1967).

187. In the light of the Secretary-General's report one can only draw the conclusion that the purposes and provisions of the Council's resolution 237 (1967) have not yet been fulfilled.

188. We are deeply concerned about the plight of the hundreds of thousands of Arab civilians who find themselves today under foreign occupation. Many of them have lost their homes and hearths and had to flee their ancestral places of residence for the second time in a generation. Their dire circumstances need to be ameliorated and their fundamental human rights protected.

189. In the light of the foregoing remarks and in the larger interest of reducing tensions in West Asia, we would urge Israel to receive the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and to facilitate his work by extending him full co-operation. It is for this reason that my delegation will support the draft resolution contained in document S/8825/Rev.2.

190. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): After lengthy consultations the Security Council, on the initiative of Pakistan and Senegal, is now discussing the note by the Secretary-General dated 31 July 1968/ibid./.

191. We have before us a draft resolution [S/8825/Rev.2] submitted by the same two delegations. The draft resolution, while deploring in very mild terms the refusal of Israel to receive the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, requests the dispatch of the Special Representative to the Arab territories under Israeli military occupation and a report by him on the implementation of resolution 237 (1967), and requests the Government of Israel to receive him, to co-operate with him and to facilitate his work.

192. I should have thought that a draft resolution constituting a logical follow-up to resolution 237 (1967) would

encounter no difficulties. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

193. The discussions on this item at our 1453rd meeting and at the present meeting have shown that the representative of Israel attempts to widen the scope of our debate to include issues outside the framework of the subject-matter.

194. We listened with attention to the statement of the representatives of Jordan, the United Arab Republic, Syria and Algeria, representatives of Arab countries, who have impressed us with a large number of facts marshalled in favour of the urgency of the visit of the Special Representative to occupied Arab territories.

195. These irrefutable facts, contained in document S/8820, among others, and widely reported by the international Press have been contemptuously referred to by the representative of Israel as "trash". It is not too difficult to understand Israel's interest in treating the facts of its occupation rule in such a way and trying to shift our discussion to matters outside the scope of this item. The Security Council should not show any leniency towards these attempts.

196. In considering this item, two problems emerge concerning the manner in which the resolution should be implemented. These problems are connected with the subject of the resolution and have been raised by various delegations and widely discussed. These two main aspects are territory and population. This subject has been and remains—until resolution 237 (1967) is superseded by another text—a humanitarian problem, namely, "the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place" and the facility to be given to "the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities", to quote the words of resolution 237 (1967).

197. I do not think that there can be several interpretations of the term "areas where military operations have taken place". This term thus clearly defines those areas as the areas of the Arab States which have been the objects of Israel's aggression and consequently of its illegal occupation. Members of this Council have already referred to the fact that the date and the context of the adoption of resolution 237 (1967) exclude any other interpretation of the areas concerned. It is significant that Israel itself has not deemed it necessary to contest that interpretation before the missions of Mr. Gussing and Mr. Thalmann. It is only now that we have heard that the areas in question should cover not only those envisaged in resolution 237 (1967) but apparently all the areas of all States of the Middle East, whether they were the scenes of military operations or not, and even other countries that are concerned about the developments in the Middle East.

198. The other aspect I wish to refer to is the problem of population. As a pretext, in order to escape responsibility, the representative of Israel frequently speaks of the Jewish people and their sufferings and losses during the Second World War. Thus he tries to confuse others with semantics by abusing religious beliefs. International law does not

recognize Jewish citizenship. Mr. Tekoah can only refer to Israeli citizens, and this expression applies to non-Jews as well. He seems to ignore them completely, displaying thus a clear-cut policy of discrimination against a large number of Israeli citizens, as far as the application of human rights is concerned.

199. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of this problem, which is completely beyond the scope of our present agenda. I wish, however, to emphasize that the inhabitants of the occupied areas are not Israeli citizens, no matter what religious or non-religious beliefs or convictions they hold. Israel is responsible for implementing resolution 237 (1967) and the resolution that may be adopted by this Council as a result of the present discussion, regarding the humanitarian conditions of these Arab citizens, whatever their religious beliefs may be.

200. As I have stated earlier, my delegation understands that Israel is not anxious to provide access to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the occupied areas, in view of its policy, which is contrary to the provisions of resolution 237 (1967). However, that should not influence the Council in its taking the necessary steps required by that resolution. In so doing the Council will be acting in full harmony with the views of the Secretary-General as set forth in his note. In the view of the Hungarian delegation, the draft resolution is very modest in its form and very careful in its wording. For all these reasons, my delegation thinks that it should be supported unanimously by the Council, and my delegation will most certainly vote in favour of it.

201. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Syria, who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

202. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I am fully aware of the lateness of the hour. If I have asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply, it is not to dignify the Israeli representative's statement by a reply but to make the record clear for the Security Council and to establish the facts.

203. I heard the Israeli representative say in his statement, much to my amazement, that not a single report from an international organization had been issued about the situation of minorities in the Arab countries. However, if you will remember, I quoted in my statement this time and in my statement in August a letter addressed by the International Red Cross Committee to the Syrian Government. I have also stated today that I have in my possession two reports from the International Red Cross Committee, whose representatives had been invited to Syria. As I have quoted the second of the two reports, I shall permit myself to read only the first paragraph of one of the two letters addressed by the International Red Cross Committee to the Syrian Government. It reads as follows:

"Damascus, 26 June 1968

"I have the honour to write to you, on the instructions of the International Committee of the Red Cross, to inform you of some of the Committee's activities on behalf of the victims of the events of June 1967.

"Before dealing with these matters, may I be permitted, Your Excellency, to pay a tribute to your Government and to the various Syrian authorities for the cordial hospitality which the delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross have always enjoyed in your country, and to thank you for the extensive facilities which they have always been accorded.

"At our conferences and in our discussions abroad, we never fail to emphasize the extent to which our task in your country is facilitated by the understanding and constant consideration which we receive in the Syrian Arab Republic.

"I take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude to all the authorities concerned."¹³

204. In view of this, I am bound to draw one or two conclusions. Either the Israeli representative does not listen to all that is said or he does not want to listen except to himself. In either case the mental attitude is quite a dangerous one. The Israeli representative referred again to intolerance being practised in Syria and other Arab countries against Christian minorities, Jewish minorities, Kurds and so on. I have already replied in the Security Council to these ridiculous fabrications of the imagination of the Israeli representative, having been obliged to mention once that I myself come from a Christian community of Syria, one of the oldest Christian communities in the world, and that Syria has always been proud of its record of tolerance and is still proud of its record of tolerance in regard to the treatment of all populations. In fact, restrictions of religion or ethnic distinctions of any kind have never existed there.

205. The Jews in Syria have always lived and still continue to live in peace. If any trouble has taken place, it is due to the Zionist movement which, as they themselves have recognized, prior to the partition of Palestine established in all Arab countries underground cells in order to undermine the good relations that had always existed between the Jewish communities and the citizens of the Arab countries where they lived.

206. The Israeli representative again denied the accusations levelled at him concerning the inhuman treatment of the civilian population under Israeli occupation. I have also stated that I can cite a large number of cases. I shall be satisfied with reading only one. The following is a statement given to Major Derek Cooper, a member of the British Red Cross, who himself investigated this case. The place is Khan Younis. The date is 4 March 1968. The name of the man is Tayssir Saad. The statement reads as follows:

"In November 1967 Israelis came to my house at Khan Younis and accused me of being a member of the Liberation movement. I was taken to the police station and inquiry started and I denied the accusation. They insisted on obtaining from me information I do not know about the activity of the resistance, and so I was taken to one of the rooms in the police station and an Israeli soldier came to me, fettered me and started pulling out

¹³ Quoted in French by the speaker.

my ten fingernails. Thereafter, the officer asked me to leave Khan Younis, but I refused because I have nine children. I remained free until the afternoon of 3 March 1968, when an Israeli military vehicle carrying four military men arrived and informed me that I had to leave Khan Younis immediately, and I left it the same day and arrived in Jordan on 3 March."

"His ten fingernails have been pulled out; he has been severely beaten all over his body with iron bars."

This is signed "Major Derek Cooper, witness, member of the British Red Cross".

207. In view of the lateness of the hour I will not read everything or refer to other, similar cases of inhuman treatment. But the same Major Derek Cooper submitted a report on 5 August 1968, from which I should like to read the following:

"I beg to inform you that in the course of a conversation with a senior official of the United States Embassy in Amman about the causes of the evacuation of the inhabitants of the Gaza Strip, I explained to the concerned that persecution and all forms of economic pressure and intimidation were the chief causes of the evacuation of the refugee and resident inhabitants of the Gaza Strip. In fact I brought the evacuees whose names appear below before the official concerned and asked him to question them regarding these causes: Sayid Tewfiq Mahmoud Abu Fakhir of Jebna, an inhabitant of the Jabalia Camp; Sayid Ibrahim Khalil Taurmous of Majdal, an inhabitant of the Rafah Camp; Sayid Amer Abdul Rahim al Rautisi of Yabaa, an inhabitant of the Jabalia Camp; Sayid Muhammad Rashid Matar of Majdal, an inhabitant of the Seacoast Camp.

"When they were questioned, they replied that the Israeli authorities, particularly the paratroops, were committing the following acts of savagery:

"1. After the occupation authorities had conducted a strict census in every house in regard to present and absent members of families and the reasons for their absence in detail, the occupation forces marked houses with a seal during the night and began to beat the father of the family and the present male members and to ask them about the absentees and whether they were commandos.

"2. Covering children below ten years of age with earth and opening fire to intimidate them so that they would guide the authorities to the place where arms were being kept. If women intervened to ask the authorities to cease beating their men and children, they, the occupation forces, threatened to take them to brothels in Israel so that they will learn not to meddle in affairs which are not their concern.

"3. Mukhtars in refugee camps were warned that they should persuade the refugees to leave their houses and work for the west bank or the Jericho area because the town of Gaza and its neighbourhood were a military zone. Moshe Dayan ... was present at one of these

meetings. He spoke on the subject. When they said that each of them was responsible only for his own family, some of them were imprisoned and tortured.

"4. One of the methods of intimidation and torture was the gathering of men and youths, dropping them into a pond near the camp and keeping them in it for three days.

"5. Demolition of houses by means of tanks.

"6. Theft of money, jewelry and valuables in the course of the artificial search for arms.

"7. Giving refugees living in tents near the camp notice to leave. When they rejected this, their tents were destroyed by fire together with their contents.

"8. Arrest of young men for any unimportant reason, transporting them to the King Hussein Bridge and expelling them to the east bank without any clothes or money and without giving them a chance to notify their relatives.

"9. Employment of bribes to tempt the inhabitants to leave the Strip for Jordan, where work of a quiet life were to be had, in return for the payment of compensation as follows: father of the family, £250 Israeli; wife, £150. Each person whose name was included in the card £50.

"10. Employing refugees holding ration cards free of wages, and in return for obtaining their ration given to them by UNRWA.

"11. Arrival of Israeli policemen at coffee houses to inspect and collect identity cards and the policemen's return afterwards to ask for identity cards. When those whose cards had been taken protested and say that the police had taken their cards, they are taken to prisons on a charge of being commandos.

"At the end of the conversation the official concerned showed his displeasure as a result of this barbarous and inhuman treatment. He asked what was the solution? I said: 'The solution is that you should exert political and economic pressure on the occupation authorities to compel them to respect and implement the United Nations resolutions'. I asked him to convey this information to his authorities and he promised to do so."

This was signed by Major Derek Cooper of the British Red Cross.

208. It is no wonder, therefore, that the humanitarian resolution 237 (1967), in paragraph 1:

"Calls upon the Government of Israel to insure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of the hostilities".

That is completely forgotten by the Israeli representative, who confines himself to reading operative paragraph 2 of the resolution.

209. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of the right of reply.

210. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I shall be very brief indeed. I should like to quote from a report which appeared only a few days ago, following a visit by a British citizen to the areas under Israeli occupation. It is a report which appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* of 19 September and which states the following:

"Against this discouraging background remains the problematical future of occupied areas, notably the west bank of the River Jordan and the Gaza Strip.

"The occupation is one of the most extraordinary of modern times because a population approaching half that of Israel itself is being controlled by a handful of soldiers and much local administration has remained in Arab hands. ;

"There have inevitably been discontents and ugly incidents, but on the whole this must be the most unresisted occupation ever."

211. I would like to add, as the representative of Syria referred to a number of letters signed by representatives of the Red Cross, that the Government of Israel received an apology from the Red Cross with an explanation that those letters had to be sent to the Syrian authorities in order to permit the continuation of the humanitarian activities of Red Cross representatives in Syria.

212. I can understand fully the sensitivity displayed by the Syrian representative concerning his country's record on human rights, in particular with regard to Christian and Kurdish communities. I should like to assure the Security Council that the persecution of Christians and Kurds, in addition to Jews, in Syria is a matter of record, reported in numerous international documents. I should like to quote briefly from two of them.

213. The *Bulletin of the International Commission of Jurists* of September 1967 states on pages 40 and 41:

"Last May, the Secretary-General of the Committee for the Defence of the Kurdish People's Rights, in a letter to the International Commission of Jurists, stated that the Syrian Government had begun to carry out its 'Arab Belt' plan whereby thousands of Kurdish peasants, living on a strip of land ten kilometres deep, adjacent to the Iraqi and Turkish frontiers, are to be removed to desert land and to be replaced by Arabs and Bedouins from elsewhere. In one region the government has already confiscated the land and crops of the villagers, who, refusing to move, are suffering from starvation and disease. At present, 150,000 to 160,000 Kurds are threatened by the 'Arab Belt' policy.

"Outside these areas, ... the Kurds are in no better position. In one region, as a result of a new population census, 150,000 Kurds have been deprived of their nationality, are no longer considered to be persons before the law, and cannot avail themselves of the social amenities in Syria since their identity cards have been

withdrawn. They are, moreover, unable to travel to another region or village without a permit from the military government, which is almost impossible to obtain."

214. As for the rights of the Christians, I should like to quote from a message from the Catholic Bishop of Syria, dated 11 November 1967, which states the following:

"We could not imagine that the Minister of Education would impose this set of measures against our schools and would turn a deaf ear to the voice of truth, liberty and justice. Surely we could not imagine, and even today we have difficulty in believing, that in the Syria of the twentieth century events would transpire that successive Governments of our homeland refrained from bringing about at all other times.

"Today the right of parents to educate their children according to the principles of their beliefs and their religion has been violated. Today the freedom of the Church has been outraged by barriers which prevent it from carrying out its spiritual mission towards its sons. Today justice has been denied by two sanctions of extreme severity for a crime without foundation. Our schools were broken into, their locks smashed; after that, some were provisionally seized, others were closed and had their licenses revoked; finally, and vitally important, the most important among them were definitely confiscated.

"Let public opinion and the conscience of all citizens know then and understand that the Ministry of Education has by this action struck a blow at the sanctity of Church property and has expropriated without a valid cause and without any right the properties and possessions of the Church used for charity and good works."

215. With regard to Syria's attitudes towards Israel, I would not like to fatigue the Council with additional quotations from statements of policy made by Syrian leaders. Frequently the simple expressions found in such documents as schoolbooks reflect more than anything else the real attitude and the atmosphere existing in a particular country. In the ninth elementary grade schoolbook on Arab history used in Syrian schools we find the following statement:

"Our path depends on never recognizing Israel, absolutely refusing to make peace with her, avoidance of all direct or indirect contact with her and enforcing of the economic boycott around her. Yet this will not suffice, for we must raise a large army to destroy her."

216. I do not think the Security Council really intends to determine here this evening or at the next meeting that human rights are a one-sided question.

217. Now, I know that the representative of the Soviet Union expects me to respond to his statement, and I should not like to disappoint him. On listening to him expound on human rights, I was reminded of a well-known representative of a Middle Eastern country who, in a discussion in the Assembly on freedom of information, stated: "I can

speaking objectively about freedom of the Press. We have no newspapers in our land."

218. The invitation I had the honour to extend the other day to all the representatives around this table to come and visit the territories under Israeli control applies, of course, to the representative of the Soviet Union as well. In his case, I should like to go even further: I should like to assure him that we shall be ready to consider favourably all his advice concerning the welfare of the civil populations in territories under Israeli control if the human rights enjoyed right now by the Arab inhabitants in Israeli-controlled areas will be granted also to the Jews of the Soviet Union.

219. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Syria to exercise his right of reply.

220. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I can well understand the extreme sensitivity shown by the Israeli representative in his reply. In fact, in one part of my first statement I said: Are we in the nineteenth century witnessing a colonial conquest, or are we in the twentieth century? The fact is that what we have just heard from the Israeli representative is a statement typical of what a colonial representative or an imperialist occupying a foreign land would have said. During our life we have grown accustomed to seeing occupying authorities trying to drive wedges between various sections of the population. Having failed in his effort to say something more about the Jews in Syria, the Israeli representative has taken the liberty of making himself a spokesman for the Kurds and for the Christians, of which latter I myself, I repeat, am one.

221. Now, with regard to the Kurds, all that the Israeli representative has said is a fabrication of his own mind, made up out of false reports and distortions that have no value or foundation whatsoever.

222. As to the Christian schools in Syria, although this is not the item on the agenda of the Security Council, what the Syrian Government has proceeded to do is to unify the programmes of education in all schools, not only in Christian schools but in private schools, some of which are Moslem as well. Therefore, the issue does not arise at all.

223. But the Israeli representative, as a representative of a colonial Power, must be reminded of the spirit of hatred with which the Israelis face the Arabs and look at the Arabs. I have quoted Uri Avnery. In one part of his book he describes how he joined the Irgun. The first question that he was asked when he joined the Irgun was: "Do you hate the Arabs?" He did not reply. That is the spirit of Israel.

224. If that is not enough, let me quote one very great Israeli authority, well known in responsible circles of thought in the world. I am referring to Martin Buber and to his book *Israel and the World*¹⁴ in which he has this to say about the spirit of Israel:

"The most pernicious of all false teachings, that according to which the way of history is determined by power alone, insinuated itself everywhere into the thinking of the peoples and their Government, while faith in the spirit was retained only as a mere phraseology."

What we heard from the representative of Israel was "a mere phraseology".

225. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in right of reply.

226. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In exercise of my right of reply, I wish to answer the customary slanderous attack by the Israeli representative. I am used to it; he attempts to slander the Soviet Union at every meeting, this seems to have become his second profession.

227. I protest categorically against the Israeli representative's attempt to use a Security Council meeting to make crude and slanderous attacks upon States Members of the United Nations, to meddle in their domestic affairs and to distort well-known facts concerning the position of Soviet citizens of Jewish descent in the Soviet Union. I am bound to reject with the utmost indignation the Israeli representative's routine slanderous attack upon the Soviet Union.

228. There are over 100 national groups in the Soviet Union. They all live together as friends, as brothers. The Soviet Constitution provides as follows:

"Equality of rights of citizens of the Soviet Union, irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, government, cultural, political and other public activity, is an infeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the privileges, rights or conversely the establishment of any direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, are punishable by law."

229. A striking example of the equality of all citizens of the Soviet Union, regardless of origin, is provided by the group of colleagues with me in the Council: one of them is of Ukrainian descent, one of them of Jewish descent and two of Russian descent. Here is a clear rebuttal of the Israeli representative's slander. That is all I have to say.

230. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in right of reply.

231. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to express my appreciation to the representative of the Soviet Union for that clarification and in particular for the recital of the Soviet Constitution. I should like to assure him that after having spent three years in the midst of the Jews of the Soviet Union I know that all of them probably know that particular paragraph by heart. They are still praying that it will be translated into reality.

232. The PRESIDENT: There are no further representatives inscribed on my list to speak before the vote. If no member of the Council wishes to take the floor at this stage, I shall proceed to ask the Council to vote on the revised joint draft resolution of Pakistan and Senegal contained in document S/8825/Rev.2.

¹⁴ Schocken Books, Inc., New York, 1948.

233. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

234. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): On a point of order, I should like to suggest for the consideration of my colleagues in the Security Council that now that we have finished our debate it might be well for us to postpone the vote until, shall we say, Monday of next week.

235. Earlier in the day I had discussions with a number of members of the Council. Certainly I speak only for myself, but I gathered that there was a feeling among a number of members that it would be well in this important matter—where we must reflect on what has been said in the Council and where we have to deal with a draft resolution which we have seen in its final form only this morning—if we could postpone the important vote we have to take until the beginning of next week.

236. Speaking for my own delegation, I would say that having very carefully considered the various formulations which have been put before us, we were not content to be critical only; we were anxious to be constructive. As members know, we have put forward an alternative both to the sponsors of the draft resolution and in the informal discussions which we have had together. I have again referred to it in the speech that I made earlier this evening. Sponsors told me that proposals would be carefully considered. I am sure they were genuine in saying so. We have had no response to the suggestions we have put forward. We have seen no readiness to discuss the alternative that we suggested. I had hoped that there might be a readiness to discuss what we had proposed. But that is another reason, perhaps, why a final decision might be taken at the beginning of next week rather than tonight.

237. That is the suggestion, on a point of order, which I was anxious to put before the Council.

238. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on a point of order, has just made a suggestion. If there are no further comments, I should like to ask the representative of the United Kingdom if he has a formal motion to propose.

239. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): No, Sir, I did not put forward my suggestion in the form of a formal motion. I put forward my suggestion for the consideration of my brothers in the Council.

240. The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on the suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom?

241. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): With regard to the suggestion that has just been made to postpone the vote until early next week, I should like to say a few words, and in doing so I should like to look at the facts as they are.

242. The original draft of the Pakistan-Senegal draft resolution was presented a whole week ago, on 20 September. Ever since then, constant discussion has taken place informally among members of the Council. Secondly, the revised draft resolution is dated, as can be seen from document S/8825/Rev.2, of 26 September.

243. Looking at those two drafts, that is to say, the original draft and the revised draft, one can see that there are some changes which reflect a certain amount of effort and the results of the informal discussions aimed at reaching a text in accordance with those consultations.

244. Now, I should like to recall that yesterday afternoon in an informal meeting, after we had arrived at this revised text which is now before us, you specifically asked all members, Mr. President, either to wait, themselves, or to leave one of their representatives to receive the revised text so that it might be possible to obtain instructions for this afternoon's meeting. All of us got, or should have got, the text at that time. Twenty-four hours have passed since then.

245. In any case, members have been discussing this question; they have discussed it thoroughly; we have had long consultations, and in the course of those consultations all proposals, drafts, suggestions and amendments have, one by one, been considered and either adopted as part of the revised draft or, regretfully, rejected since adoption was not possible. There was not a single suggestion which we did not consider. All of us are now clear about the substantive position held by each of the delegations around this table.

246. These facts clearly suggest that the vote on our draft resolution should not be delayed any longer. Above all, the issue here before us is humanitarian. We should not allow it to be obfuscated by political considerations. Many members, may I point out, have repeatedly indicated during our informal consultations the difficulties they are facing in respect of the work of the General Assembly due to the unnecessary prolongation of the consideration of this question. We also know the difficulties involved in getting this afternoon's meeting itself convened. And yet, despite the difficulties faced by individual members, we convened; we convened to consider this draft, to take a decision on it, after having done all that we could possibly do to improve it. To us, a postponement of the vote at this stage does not seem to have any justification.

247. The PRESIDENT: As the presiding officer of the Council I, of course, have to try to apply the rules of procedure and maintain impartiality. I am in the hands of the Council. The suggestion has been made to postpone the vote. Such a postponement, of course, could be decided upon by common consent, and I would be guided by that decision. If the desirability of a postponement is questioned—as it has been—by one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, a member of the Council, we obviously cannot proceed by common consent.

248. Are there any comments?

249. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have listened carefully to the arguments adduced by the representative from Pakistan. They correspond to the facts. Yesterday, during the consultations held at an informal meeting of members of the Security Council, the sponsors of the draft resolution dictated, very slowly, each word of this draft. We all took down the text. We all knew it; we had been discussing it for more than a week, we had consulted together. There is very

little difference between the new text and the old. I therefore consider that those representatives who have taken a serious approach to this matter and who have studied all these paragraphs with due attention have had every opportunity for deciding what action to take with regard to the draft resolution.

250. In these circumstances, therefore, I see no justification for postponing the vote, particularly since the text was dictated word for word yesterday, twenty-four hours ago. There was an opportunity for co-ordination, had that been needed. There is nothing new in this text except for the last paragraph, which the sponsors agreed to accept, rather reluctantly, and under considerable pressure. Hence the USSR delegation sees no justification for a postponement of the vote on this question, particularly since no proposal has been put forward—only considerations. But there are considerations of one kind and considerations of another. Consequently, taking into account the whole line of argument adduced by one of the sponsors, I believe that the Council could vote on the text today.

251. The PRESIDENT: There appear to be no further comments. The situation as I see it is that, while no formal motion is before us, we have heard certain comments on the considerations put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom. It seems to me that, unless the Council is presented with a formal motion to postpone the vote, I must proceed with our business and put the revised draft resolution before us to the vote.

252. Since no formal motion for postponement has been made, and since there seem to be no objections to what I have just said, the Council will now proceed to vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Pakistan and Senegal and contained in document S/8825/Rev.2, dated 26 September 1968.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

In favour: Algeria, Brazil, China, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.¹⁵

253. The PRESIDENT: The Secretary-General has asked to speak after the vote and I call on him.

254. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: With regard to paragraph I of the resolution just adopted, I need only call to the attention of the Council that, as indicated in my note [S/8699], I have been ready for some time to designate a Special Representative to undertake a second humanitarian mission to the Middle East. The representative can be on his way with minimum delay once there is assurance that he

will have the access and co-operation indispensable to the fulfilment of his mission.

255. The PRESIDENT: A number of Council representatives have inscribed their names on the list to speak after the vote. I shall now call on them.

256. Mr. DE ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): Allow me to state very briefly the reasons which have prompted the Brazilian delegation to vote in favour of the resolution.

257. As you will recall, resolution 237 (1967), inspired by clearly humanitarian considerations and without any political motivations at all, originated from a joint effort on the part of the delegations of Argentina, Ethiopia and Brazil. In considering the resolution the Council has just adopted and in voting for it, my delegation was faithful to that same humanitarian concern. We deem it imperative that the members of the Security Council should bear such circumstances in mind so that the present resolution will not be construed as being directed against any State or any of the parties involved in the Middle East dispute. We interpret it as a measure to help the Secretary-General in his efforts to bring about the implementation of resolution 237 (1967), and that is why we have taken a favourable attitude towards it.

258. When at the 1361st meeting of the Security Council, held on 14 June 1967, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Ruda, introduced on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Ethiopia and Brazil the draft text of that resolution, he stated very clearly the intentions of the three sponsoring delegations:

“First of all, we are deeply concerned at the fate of the civilian population whose persons and possessions are suffering from the consequences of war. A minimum standard of rights must be guaranteed to those who are not taking any active part in hostilities. We believe that these persons must be treated in a humane manner under all circumstances, that their family and residence rights, their religious convictions and practices and their habits and customs must be protected and, above all, that they must not be subject to any act of physical or moral coercion.

“... this appeal is addressed specifically to ... Israel, since in present circumstances it is that Government which will be largely responsible for applying these humanitarian principles.” [1361st meeting, paras. 5 and 6.]

259. We have quoted rather extensively from Ambassador Ruda's presentation because we feel that his words have an important bearing on some of the issues raised and on some of the doubts that have arisen as regards the interpretation of resolution 237 (1967). My words should not in any way convey the meaning that Brazil is indifferent to the situation of minorities which in certain countries may be subject to restriction or vexation because of race, nationality or religious creed. We have a large number of Arabs and Jews living in Brazil; they coexist in my country in a peaceful way, and we would be happy to see them coexist in other areas. Brazil lives and thrives on the assumption of

¹⁵ See resolution 259 (1968).

the peaceful collaboration of all races and nationalities, and we know from experience that human beings have a tendency to associate and to work together whenever politics is not injected into the situation. It is our firm conviction that the present resolution is in keeping with the language and spirit of resolution 237 (1967) and that it does not in any way detract from that resolution. In this regard we fully share the views set forth today by the representative of Ethiopia.

260. Although we did not hesitate to cast an affirmative vote on the resolution the Council has just adopted which, I repeat, we view as a reaffirmation of resolution 237 (1967) and as a measure aimed at strengthening the hand of the Secretary-General in his efforts on this matter, we sincerely regret that many circumstances—it would be futile to dwell on them now—prevented this Council from agreeing on a text that could be unanimously endorsed. We would have welcomed such unanimity and we would have been quite prepared to support a broader and more thorough formulation consistent with our points of view. Nevertheless, we wish to state our fervent hope that this resolution will further the aims of resolution 237 (1967), and we should like to be comforted by the thought that we have supported the efforts of the Secretary-General in dealing with this important humanitarian question. This is a humanitarian, not a polemical or punitive resolution. It should therefore be complied with without hesitation.

261. Mr. LIU (China): In voting for the draft resolution that has just been adopted, it is the understanding of my delegation that that resolution is a follow-up of resolution 237 (1967) for the purpose of enabling the Secretary-General again to dispatch a special representative on a humanitarian mission. The present resolution, in our view, will in no way detract from the terms of resolution 237 (1967) or prejudice the discretion of the Secretary-General in his efforts to bring about the implementation of that resolution.

262. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): My delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution that has just been adopted by this Council primarily because in certain respects we are not convinced about the adequacy of the approach applied in the resolution to the problems confronting us. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I do however wish to underline right from the beginning that we feel very strongly that the United Nations, in pursuance of resolution 237 (1967) unanimously adopted by this Council on 14 June 1967 and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967, should take an active interest in the safety, welfare and security of the civil populations affected by the hostilities in the summer of 1967.

263. The fundamental basis for the considerations of my delegation in the matter before the Council has been the note presented by the Secretary-General to the Security Council on 31 July 1968 [S/8699]. From that note it is obvious that the Secretary-General has done everything in his power now, as in the past, to comply with the request of the Security Council and the General Assembly to follow the implementation of the two resolutions that I have mentioned.

264. Taking as his starting point the simple fact that only first-hand knowledge about the conditions of the populations in question would allow him to do that in an adequate and conscientious manner, the Secretary-General in July 1967 sent out to the Middle East a Special Representative, Nils Göran Gussing, on the basis of whose findings a report was issued on 2 October 1967 [S/8158] which contained much useful information on the safety, welfare and security of the population in the areas under Israel control, on the situation of displaced persons from areas under Israel control and the question of their return, on the treatment of prisoners of war and on the question of the treatment of minorities.

265. It was therefore highly regrettable when the Secretary-General, at the beginning of this year, felt that in pursuance of his efforts in accordance with Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V), he wished to send a Special Representative out again whose mission, as the Secretary General has repeated time and again, should have the same scope and terms of reference as that of Mr. Gussing, that conditions were laid down and obstacles raised which so far have prevented the carrying out of a second humanitarian mission. We regret this since we believe it is the duty of those concerned to co-operate fully and unconditionally with the Secretary-General in the exercise of the duties of his high office, especially in a case like this where the Secretary-General, in a truly humanitarian spirit which we welcome, has shown a considerable degree of flexibility and has given to the resolutions in question what he himself has called a broad humanitarian interpretation. In our opinion there can be no doubt that those concerned, and here I must also and not least mention the Government of Israel, should have been more forthcoming in this matter.

266. However, as we have said over and over again during the private consultations, we believe that the approach adopted in the present text will hardly fulfil its purpose. In our opinion, the Council should rather have expressed its full support of the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General with a view to the implementation of resolution 237 (1967), including the dispatch of a further Special Representative within the scope and with terms of reference set forth in the report of the Secretary-General, and should have called upon those concerned to co-operate fully and unconditionally with the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. That would have been consistent, in our view, with the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General, it would more appropriately have acknowledged the validity of his efforts, and it would, in our opinion, have stood a better chance of leading to constructive steps to the benefit of the populations whose interests are in the minds of the members of this Council and of the Secretary-General.

267. My Government stands firmly on Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) and the interpretations given by the Secretary-General in the exercise of his functions under those resolutions. We hope and we expect that those concerned, and not least the Government of Israel, will co-operate with the Secretary-General on this basis, without conditions and in such a manner that a new humanitarian mission can be dispatched to the Middle East.

268. We fear, however, that the resolution now adopted may not serve that purpose. We therefore abstained from voting on it.

269. Mr. JARA RECALDE (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): At this stage of our deliberations, I shall endeavour to be very brief.

270. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which has just been adopted. It did so for two main reasons. The first was humanitarian. Our primary concern is with the plight of the populations which, in one way or another, are suffering the consequences of the grave conflict. Secondly, it is a fundamental principle of my Government and of my delegation that all resolutions of the Security Council should be carried out to the letter. In this particular case, I refer to resolution 237 (1967) sponsored by two Latin American countries, Argentina and Brazil and also by Ethiopia, which was unanimously adopted at the 1361st meeting of the Council.

271. In the light of the principle to which I have just referred, namely, that Council resolutions must be fully implemented, my delegation is somewhat concerned at the omission from the resolution we have just adopted, of the first and second preambular paragraphs of resolution 237 (1967) and of the express recommendation in paragraph 2 of that resolution, which I shall take the liberty of reading out:

"Recommends to the Governments concerned the scrupulous respect of the humanitarian principles governing the treatment of prisoners of war and the protection of civilian persons in time of war contained in the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949".

272. I wish to say, finally, that the Paraguayan delegation considers that the Governments concerned should conform their actions strictly and unequivocally to the provisions of resolution 237 (1967) to which such emphatic reference is made in the present resolution.

273. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): I should like to explain very briefly the reasons why the United States abstained from voting on the resolution which the Council has just adopted.

274. First, let me say what our abstention does not mean. It does not mean that our concern at the humanitarian plight of the civilian population in the area of the 1967 conflict has in the slightest decreased over the past year. We continue to believe that the United Nations has a legitimate interest in the treatment and the welfare of those who suffered from the conflict, including particularly the large number of Arab people living in the Israeli-occupied territories. We expressed this concern by our affirmative vote for resolution 237 (1967) on 14 June 1967, and the United States continues to support an approach to this issue on the basis of that resolution. In fact, we should have been very pleased here tonight to vote affirmatively again for a draft resolution which clearly provided for the dispatch of a United Nations representative on the same basis.

275. As every member around this table is aware, an informal proposal was advanced to us yesterday during our consultations and that particular proposal, in our judgement, offered such a useful point of departure. I might recall—since, I believe, it has not been mentioned on the official record yet—that the proposal which we considered in its operative paragraphs asked the Secretary-General urgently to pursue his efforts including the dispatch of a special representative, with a view to implementing resolution 237 (1967), and requested that the Special Representative be given all necessary assistance and be permitted to carry out his task without conditions being imposed. My delegation would have been prepared to support such a text. But the sponsors, to our regret, did not find this text acceptable. More than this, the sponsors, as I understood them, in adhering to their original text with the modifications made during the deliberations, very clearly in the draft resolution which they presented this evening, wished, as far as they were concerned, to disassociate the Security Council in this particular effort from the fate of the Jewish minorities in the area of the conflict. Such a philosophy was not acceptable to my delegation.

276. We believe that the mission of Mr. Gussing last year properly embraced the fate of all those in the area of conflict and we frankly saw no valid reason why the Security Council should now suddenly appear, at least, to abandon its concern for some of those affected by the war while retaining its concern for others.

277. I hasten to add that we are well aware that a number of delegations which voted for the text tonight do not give it such a restrictive interpretation, and I do not wish to quarrel either with their interpretations or with their motives—not in the slightest. But, in our view, a text which at least seemed designed to narrow the terms of reference of the special representative or which, at the very least, was most ambiguous on this, was not thus designed to achieve practical results.

278. For all those reasons we were unable to support the present text.

279. I should like to emphasize, however, that the United States remains deeply concerned about the plight of those who suffered and continue to suffer as a result of the hostilities, and we believe that the United Nations should pursue its humanitarian role.

280. In that regard I should like to point out that, aside from the ambiguities of the present resolution in paragraphs 1 and 2, it does clearly envisage continued efforts to implement resolution 237 (1967). Several representatives have already spoken to that point.

281. Paragraph 3 of the text just adopted recommends that the Secretary-General be afforded all co-operation in his efforts to bring about the implementation of this resolution. The scope of resolution 237 (1967), as applied by the Secretary-General in dispatching a Special Representative, is a matter of official record and it is on this basis, which produced practical results last year, that we believe even now further progress is most likely to be made.

282. In conclusion, I would say that, despite the unfortunate and divisive elements introduced by the adoption of the present text, we should like to hope that a common ground may yet be found that will permit the United Nations to proceed again in a practical way to manifest our very legitimate and our very real concern with the fate of the people in the Middle East.

283. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): We have been in some difficulty in deciding how to vote on this resolution. On the one hand, as we have made very clear, we felt that the resolution was in a form unlikely to achieve the purpose of facilitating the implementation of resolution 237 (1967). It was for that reason that we put forward alternative proposals. We greatly regret that those alternative proposals were rejected.

284. On the other hand, the purposes of resolution 237 (1967) and the dispatch of the Secretary-General's representative to the Middle East are purposes which we strongly support and have always supported. We have argued for the implementation of the humanitarian resolution without conditions. We remain firmly of that opinion.

285. It is for that reason that, while we do not accept certain sections of the resolution, we support in particular the last operative paragraph. That paragraph sets out a recommendation with which we wholeheartedly agree.

286. For those reasons we voted in favour of the resolution.

287. The PRESIDENT: Speaking as the representative of CANADA I should like to explain our vote on the resolution.

288. As President of this Council I did my best to direct the difficult and prolonged consultations with impartiality and endeavoured to achieve a more generally acceptable text. The difficulties which we encountered have been revealed for everyone to see in the statements made both before and after the vote. Now I should like to explain very briefly the Canadian position on this item and why we abstained from voting on the resolution before the Council.

289. Canada, as a member of the Security Council in 1967, voted in favour of resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967. We also supported the related resolution 2252 (ES-V) in the General Assembly. We share the deep and general concern about the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants in the area of conflict in the Middle East. We likewise support the efforts of the Secretary-General, who, in carrying out his responsibilities under resolution 237 (1967), has been endeavouring to send another Special Representative on humanitarian questions to the Middle East. The main question before the Council has been the basis on which such a mission should proceed. This is made quite clear in paragraph 15 in the Secretary-General's note [S/8699] to which reference has been made. This has been the matter of dispute between the parties and so far has prevented the mission from being sent.

290. The Canadian delegation would have been entirely willing to go along with the Secretary-General's suggestion

in paragraph 16 of the same report that the projected second mission should have "the same scope and terms of reference as the first".

291. The Canadian delegation would have also agreed with the Secretary-General that the "broadest possible humanitarian interpretation" should be given to the terms of reference of this mission. Unfortunately, the resolution before us takes, in our view, an unnecessarily restrictive view of the mission, particularly in operative paragraph 1, and is, therefore, we believe, unlikely to achieve its primary purpose, namely, the dispatch of another Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the Middle East.

292. The Canadian delegation, in this case as in the case of other resolutions of the Security Council, is indeed concerned that resolutions should be carried out and therefore should be drafted with that aim in view. It is because of this that the Canadian delegation was obliged to abstain from supporting the resolution.

293. I should add that I have noted the remark by the Secretary-General this evening that he could have a representative on his way with a minimum of delay, once there is assurance that he will have the access and the co-operation indispensable to the fulfilment of his mission. That is, of course, the important point we have had in mind throughout in considering the draft resolution and the various texts which have been presented. We still have not lost heart that the Secretary-General's plea will be heeded.

294. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): At our last meeting, I had the opportunity of expressing my views on the matter with which we are dealing today. After the vote which has just taken place, my thanks and those of the delegation of Pakistan go to you, Mr. President, for the impartiality and skill with which you have conducted our deliberations, both official and unofficial.

295. On behalf of the delegations of Pakistan and Senegal, I also wish to thank all those, round this table, who from the outset gave their complete support to the draft resolution on which we have just voted. I further wish to thank the delegations which were good enough to offer us the suggestions which we incorporated in our text with a view to securing the widest measure of agreement within the Security Council.

296. In expressing my thanks, I would not wish to overlook the delegations which sought to find a compromise by offering suggestions that we were unfortunately unable to accept, solely because we were concerned to avoid any confusion or misinterpretation in regard to the provisions of a resolution, which would then have remained a dead letter.

297. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not also thank our distinguished Secretary-General, who drew the Council's attention to the difficulties which he had encountered in connexion with the implementation of resolution 237 (1967). He thus enabled us to review the problem, to study it thoroughly and to look for the possible causes of those difficulties.

298. It was on the basis of the Secretary-General's note of 31 July 1968 [*ibid.*] that the delegations of Pakistan and

Senegal set out to find a solution to the deadlock in which the Council found itself. I should like, for my part, simply to quote paragraph 21 (b) of that report.

"Because of humanitarian considerations, and on the basis of sound legal advice, I gave the broadest interpretation to the provisions of the resolutions in defining the range and functioning of the Gussing mission".

The report goes on to say (and I wish to stress this point):

"In this connexion, although it is not necessarily conclusive, it is not without significance that the records of the debates in the Security Council and the General Assembly on the two relevant resolutions disclose no reference to the possible inclusion of the Jewish communities in the Arab States as a concern of the resolutions. The records of the discussion preceding the adoption of the Security Council resolution demonstrate that it was concern for the inhabitants of the occupied areas or 'of the areas where military operations have taken place' that motivated that resolution."

299. We have taken account of certain provisions of that report and we hope that, after the adoption of the resolution on which we have just voted, it will finally be possible for resolution 237 (1967) to be effectively and speedily implemented.

300. We are not against anyone; all we ask is that a representative of the Secretary-General should go and ascertain the position of those who are suffering, that is, of the Palestinians living in the Arab territories under Israeli military occupation. The representative appointed by the Secretary-General will be able to act only on the basis of the resolution which has just been adopted. It is clear that he will be unable to find in this resolution any legal basis for entering sovereign States which no longer administer the areas currently occupied by Israel. If Israel does not wish to receive a representative of the Secretary-General, it has only to withdraw from the occupied territories. That is the key issue. We firmly hope that no further obstacles will be raised with a view to preventing an impartial inquiry into the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the territories under Israeli military occupation.

301. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): The representative of Senegal has already spoken on behalf of his delegation and mine regarding our joint draft, just adopted by the Council. I speak merely to make two points, very briefly.

302. First, I explained the position of my delegation regarding the implementation of resolution 237 (1967) at the 1453rd meeting on 20 September. We believe that the Council adopted that resolution out of concern for the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of Arab territories which had come under the temporary military occupation of Israel. That position remains unchanged. It provided the basis for the draft resolution which we had the honour of submitting to the Council, together with Senegal.

303. Secondly, the amendments accepted by us to the original draft do not, in our opinion, represent a change or modification in the basic concept of that resolution.

304. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of the United Arab Republic.

305. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): The Security Council has been convened because one of its resolutions has been consistently flouted by Israel. The Council has acted today, with its usual wisdom, to indicate clearly to the Israeli authorities that its resolution 237 (1967) should be complied with immediately and that the Council will not tolerate any more delaying tactics. By its action today the Security Council is indicating without any ambiguity that the responsibility for co-operating with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General lies specifically with the Israeli authorities. The Council is informing Israel that no conditions will be accepted with regard to the fulfilment of the Special Representative's mission.

306. The representative of the Secretary-General should be despatched immediately to the occupied Arab areas and all facilities should be accorded him to enable him to fulfil his mission efficiently and in a short time. All guarantees are to be ensured so that the inhabitants will have full access to the Special Representative and so that he will be free in his movements and will not be shadowed by agents of occupying authorities. The Council, I am confident, expects the Israeli authorities to extend full co-operation to the Special Representative.

307. This is our understanding of the resolution that has just been adopted and of its provisions.

308. It is to be deeply regretted that the delegations of the United States, Denmark and Canada have abstained from voting for a mere humane resolution. This is a grave responsibility which the world will never forget. The responsibility of a Government like that of Denmark is all the graver because the Danish people suffered during the Nazi domination. As to the United States Government, we are used to its unfriendly policy against the Arab peoples. Nevertheless, we could not believe that they would go so far as to encourage Israel to persist in and even increase its criminal policy against a part of the Arab people.

309. The PRESIDENT: I have no further speakers on the list. However, I see that the representative of Syria wishes to speak. I shall recognize him. I do beg representatives not to reopen the debate now that the vote on the resolution has been taken. It is usual to have explanations of vote; it is not usual to reopen discussion on resolutions that have been voted on.

310. Since I have already made one exception, I shall make another. I do ask representatives to consider the lateness of the hour.

311. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I merely want to associate my delegation fully with the statement just made by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

312. The PRESIDENT: There being no other speakers at this time, I propose to adjourn the meeting. Before doing so, I should like to remind members of the Council that a private meeting has been scheduled for 11 o'clock Monday morning, 30 September, to consider the draft report of the

Security Council to the General Assembly. The meeting should not take long. I would ask members to come promptly in order that the Council may conclude the business as quickly as possible.

313. The Council having concluded its consideration of the question before it, I declare the meeting adjourned.

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.

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. Приводите справки об изданиях в нашем 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.
