

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1482**<sup>nd</sup> MEETING: 30 JUNE 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1482) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 26 June 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9284) . . . . .	1

## NOTE

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

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

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

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 30 June 1969, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Miguel SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay).

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1482)

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

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

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

1. **PRESIDENT** (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the normal practice I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to participate in this debate, without the right to vote.

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

2. The **PRESIDENT** (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to inform the Council that I have just received a request from the representative of the United Arab Republic that he be permitted to participate in this debate, without the right to vote. Following the normal practice, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite the representative of the United Arab Republic to take a place at the Security Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic) took a place at the Security Council table.*

3. The **PRESIDENT** (*translated from Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item

proposed by the representative of Jordan in his letter of 26 June 1969 [S/9284], in which he requests an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider matters concerning Jerusalem.

4. In this connexion I should like to remind the Council that on 11 April 1969 the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report under Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968. The Secretary-General's report was circulated as document S/9149.

5. **Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan)**: Mr. President, permit me at the very outset to express the gratitude of the Government of Jordan to you and to the members of the Security Council for holding this urgent meeting to consider a situation threatening not only the political, social and economic life of Christian and Moslem Jordanian citizens in Jerusalem, but also international peace and security.

6. We have had many legitimate reasons for coming to the Security Council during recent weeks and months because of repeated Israeli violations of the Armistice Agreement and the cease-fire. We have not done so, owing to our genuine desire to create conditions conducive to the success of the peaceful efforts of the four permanent members of the Security Council. This attitude on the part of Jordan has in no way deterred the Israelis from committing acts of aggression nor diminished their determination to achieve their plan for expansion.

7. However, we are compelled to come to the Council now over the issue of Jerusalem.

8. At this stage we shall not put before the Council a summary of the daily Israeli attacks on Jordan. All of you are acquainted with that picture. You know that the shelling of our villages, whether in the north or in the south, deep inside the east bank of Jordan, has become a daily practice of the Israeli armed forces. You are aware that hardly a day passes in which the peoples of the occupied territories do not experience acts of imprisonment, torture and bloodshed. With every passing day there is more destruction and insecurity, and every Israeli act of lawlessness warrants Security Council action.

9. But it is not my intention today to deal with those problems, important as they are. Rather, the complaint I am bringing to the Council deals only with the Jerusalem area.

10. On 21 May 1968 the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968) declaring all legislative and adminis-

trative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem as invalid and calling urgently upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which would tend to change the status of Jerusalem.

11. The Security Council action on this question followed the Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), which were adopted by a vote of 99 members of the General Assembly in favour.

12. What has been the Israeli reaction to the first part of the Security Council resolution? The Israeli authorities have not rescinded any of the steps taken. Their defiance has continued and more violations have been committed.

13. When the British writer Michael Adams asked a senior Israeli diplomat whether he felt any alarm at the fact that by imposing Jewish rule on Arab Jerusalem they were defying the almost unanimous weight of the world community, the Israeli diplomat replied: "Not at all. What does a United Nations resolution amount to? Ninety-nine votes, ninety-nine speeches. What else?"

14. The Secretary-General, in his report [S/9149] presented to the Council on 11 April 1969, informed the Council that he had addressed a note to the Permanent Representative of Israel requesting the information necessary in the discharge of the reporting responsibilities placed upon the Secretary-General under resolution 252 (1968). The Israeli reply was negative.

15. In the second part of the resolution, the Israeli authorities were requested to desist forthwith from taking any further action which would tend to change the status of Jerusalem. On 23 August 1968, the Israeli authorities passed and published the so-called "Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law" [S/9149], the clear object of which is to complete the process of Israel's unilateral annexation of Jerusalem and other surrounding areas. Thus the Israeli reaction to the Security Council decision and to the Assembly resolutions was contemptuous of the Organization and of world public opinion.

16. It will be recalled that on 28 June 1967 the Israeli Minister of the Interior issued a decree illegally extending the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem to include many villages and neighbouring areas totally inhabited and owned by Christian and Moslem Jordanians. The clear intention behind that decree was to create a greater Jerusalem to be part of a greater Israel, in conformity with Israeli plans. The new law confirmed the previous territorial annexation and the Israeli objective to absorb the Arab population and institutions of Jerusalem into Israeli life, to change the character of Jerusalem completely and to create another fait accompli.

17. The new law cannot be separated from the law of 27 June 1967, called "The Law and Administration Ordinance", which provided that the law, jurisdiction and administration of Israel should apply in any area of the State designated by order of the Government. It should not and cannot be isolated from the order issued under that

provision which stated that the area to be part of Israeli jurisdiction should cover the Old City, Sur Baher, all the way up to Kalandia Airport, together with Mount Scopus and its vicinity, as well as Hanina and Shufat. This was affirmed by the Secretary-General's personal representative, Mr. Thalmann, in document S/8146, paragraph 35 of which reads as follows: "The Israeli authorities stated unequivocally that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable."

18. That previous legislation paved the way to the total annexation of Jerusalem. I hardly need to remind this body that all these laws were declared invalid on 4 and 14 July 1967 by the Assembly in its resolution 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V). That was the legislation dealing with the geographic annexation of Arab Jerusalem. The new legislation, therefore, was promulgated to accomplish yet another phase of annexation. It deals with the cases of the property and residence as well as the economic life of the Arab citizens of Jerusalem. The new law tends to subordinate all previous Arab life to Israeli laws and gradually to liquidate the whole Arab character of the city.

19. It may be helpful at this stage to examine some of the provisions of the new law. Article 2, concerning the holy places, makes no reference to Waqf—a Waqf is a charitable endowment—and thus subjects Waqf property to the provisions of the new law and makes it liable to the arbitrary measures contained therein. Al-Waqf is a Moslem religious institution, which owns much of East Jerusalem's land. By not expressly placing Waqf outside the jurisdiction of the Absentee Law, the Israeli authorities are leaving all these properties subject to confiscation. This is all the more the case since they are not inhabited by the owners.

20. Articles 3 to 5 deal with the status of non-absentee property in Arab Jerusalem. This has been applied with a double standard: one for the Arabs—and indeed for all the Gentiles—and another for the Israelis of the Jewish faith. The provisions of the 1950 Israeli Absentee Law are still applicable to the Arabs of Jerusalem and those outside the City. It may be recalled that under that law, anyone not living in Israel in 1950 was classed as legally absent, and his movable and immovable property was placed under the "Custodian of Absentee Property".

21. With eviction on political grounds a daily occurrence in occupied Jerusalem, the Israelis are able to confiscate Jordanian property under the law. Israel is using the same law which allowed it to take over land and property of the 1948 refugees to take the property of people who currently own land or businesses in Jerusalem but reside in towns adjacent to it.

22. On the other hand, Israelis are no longer regarded as absentees. Articles 2 to 5 permit Israelis in Jerusalem or anywhere in Israel to possess property they owned in Arab Jerusalem prior to 1948. However, no similar provision was made to safeguard the rights of the Arab citizens in the Israeli sector of the City and some of their property has actually been confiscated. Such measures show clear religious discrimination and emphasize that many privileges accorded to a person of the Jewish faith are denied to a Christian or a Moslem. It must be emphasized at this

juncture that Jewish ownership in the Old City of Jerusalem is not more than 26 per cent and the rest is legally Arab.

23. Articles 6 to 11 are designed to make it impossible for Arab business to maintain its independence and identity: instead they are intended to subjugate Arab business to discriminatory Israeli legislation and to forcible amalgamation with Israeli firms and institutions. It is apparent that the Israelis will settle for nothing less than the complete absorption of the political, economic, cultural and other aspects of the Holy City into Israeli life.

24. Thus, while difficulties confront the Arab businessman, amalgamation, affiliation or transfer to Israeli firms is made so easy as to be routine. In other words, the Jordanian citizens of Jerusalem are expected under the law to substitute a vested right derived from legislation under Jordanian laws for a mere privilege which may be denied at the discretion of the Israeli authorities.

25. There are more than 180 Arab companies and firms in Jerusalem, employing more than 4,000 persons. According to the articles in question, these firms, which represent the economic life of Arab Jerusalem, are faced with two alternatives: either to be totally absorbed into the Israeli economy, which was rejected repeatedly by the owners and shareholders and declared invalid by United Nations resolutions, or to be automatically liquidated. Many of these companies to be registered in Jerusalem have branches, as well as owners and shareholders, in different parts of Jordan. The effect of this law could accomplish complete severance of those relations and isolate Jerusalem from the rest of Jordan. The ultimate objective is to force the non-Jews to leave their homes and their beloved and sacred city. Many prominent members of the business community, including members of the boards of directors of Jerusalem firms, have already been expelled or forced to leave on flimsy pretexts so that they could be considered absentees.

26. Articles 12-14 apply these provisions to Arab cooperative societies and their conversion into Israeli societies. Article 15 denies to professionals and craftsmen the right to practise their professions and vocations unless they have submitted to the requirement of the Labour Organization Law of 1968 and obtained an Israeli licence. According to the new law, no man will be able to earn income through his profession unless his ties are not with his Arab brothers but with Israel. The loyalty of these Jordanian citizens to their country will thus cost them their means of livelihood.

27. I could go on citing more examples about the vicious designs behind these invalid provisions enacted by Israel in utter disregard of the will of the Security Council. I could cite Article 16, which forces lawyers and judges against their own free will to become members of the Israeli Bar Association. This measure is mainly intended to extract loyalty to Israeli objectives. I could cite article 17, which requires any patent, whether pertaining to an invention or to a commercial enterprise, to be registered in accordance with Israeli laws—an article which is designed to obliterate the Arab character in favour of an Israeli one and, above all, to protect Israeli patents. However, I will not dwell on this analysis any further. Suffice it to say that this whole law is

against the will of the people and forced upon them; it contravenes the Security Council jurisprudence on the subject, violates international law and utterly disregards the Geneva Convention. It is null and void and has no legal basis.

28. As I said earlier, it was not our intention to come to the Council at this stage. We certainly did not want to prejudice the peaceful efforts of the four permanent members of this body. I want to emphasize again that it has been the policy of my Government to support any peaceful efforts and it is for this reason that my Government has never hesitated to co-operate with the United Nations efforts. We have certainly co-operated with the four permanent members of the Security Council, whose efforts so far, unfortunately, have not led to any promising results, and we have encouraged every effort intended to bring about peace in our troubled area. This is in marked contrast to the attitude of Israel. The Prime Minister, Mrs. Meir, has repeatedly said, and I am quoting here from *The Jerusalem Post*, weekly edition, of 2 June 1969: "Israel must be the sole judge of what is best for its security. We must live within borders that we, and we alone, consider secure." It is for this reason that Israel has done everything to try to undermine United Nations efforts to achieve peace and it has even used these efforts to commit one aggression after another, in order to present the world with a *fait accompli*. Indeed, what is the use of talking about peace when Israel has been violating the cease-fire every day, defying the will of the Council and ignoring the United Nations directives? The Powers that have special responsibilities under the Charter must insist on putting an end to this contemptuous Israeli behaviour. Peace efforts have been used as a shield for continued Israeli aggression.

29. Immediately after the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem, a special United Nations effort for peace began. At the same time, however, Israel began its wanton course of destruction to change the whole character of the Old City and the way of life of its inhabitants. Leaders including the Mayor of Jerusalem, doctors, lawyers and businessmen, have been expelled, hundreds of houses have been razed, thousands of persons evicted.

30. According to information received this week, the Israeli authorities have given notice to the occupants of Anata refugee camp, located north of Jerusalem, to the effect that they should prepare for being moved to the vicinity of Jericho within a few days. Our information is that this second forced evacuation of these people is a prelude to their expulsion to the east bank of Jordan. More evictions, more deportations and more destruction are going on—and they talk about bringing peace to the land of peace.

31. On 18 June 1968 my Government sent a strong letter of protest [S/8642] to the Secretary-General about the expropriation by Israel of land and buildings within the old city. At that time this *blitzkrieg* on this small community—and it is worth remembering that the whole of the old walled city of Jerusalem is less than one square mile in area—accounted for the destruction of over 100 buildings and the expropriation of some 116 dunums of land, including 700 buildings varying from two to four storeys

high. The Arabs owned 595 of those buildings. The expropriated real estate included 437 places of business and 1,048 apartments housing over 5,000 people.

32. Recently the pace has begun to quicken again. Only this week *The New York Times* reported that the Israelis were in the process of evicting more people living in buildings near the Wailing Wall. Those buildings include a mosque, a religious court and a Moslem school, which apparently are now to be used as billets for the Israeli security forces.

33. The arrogance with which the Israeli authorities have gone about their destructive work is unbelievable. Whole families have been evicted with little or no warning; journalists have been barred from the scene; force has been used; and then, to add insult to injury, the most patently bogus reasons have been given to cloak those illegal acts. There is talk of the buildings being "threats to public security" because of cracks in their foundations, and so on. But I ask you: is it not surprising that houses which have been standing for centuries—some of them since the thirteenth century—should suddenly, after two years of Israeli occupation, develop large cracks and be declared a threat to public safety? The truth of the matter is that the Israelis wanted to raze those buildings in order to lay bare a possible extension of the Wailing Wall and they used trumped-up excuses to get their way. It is the same with the digging which is at present going on near the Al Aqsa Mosque. What will happen, may I ask, when cracks are discovered there too—as doubtless, if permitted, they will be? Will this unique mosque, Al Aqsa, the third holiest in all Islam, be condemned and demolished as well? Where will the line be drawn? Or will Israel be left to continue unhampered its "excavations", its looting and wanton destruction, its desecration of holy places and its gross disregard for the rights of others? Only the members around this table can answer those questions. And time, I remind you, gentlemen, is running short. Even while we talk bulldozers are at work in the old city of Jerusalem. I have submitted in a letter [S/9289] this morning some pictures showing the process of Israeli bulldozing of Arab houses and Moslem shrines in Jerusalem adjacent to the western wall of Al Aqsa. This is a process starting with the old Maghrabi quarter and ending with the plaza facing the Wailing Wall. These pictures speak for themselves. They will be before members within a short time—if not today, perhaps tomorrow morning. This is a living example of cruelty and injustice. While we talk, bulldozers are at work in the old city of Jerusalem. The Israelis talk of "restoration". But restoration of what? Jerusalem at the time of King Solomon? If they continue with this mad, wholly illegal enterprise, they will not only wreak havoc in the lives of thousands but also destroy the essential character of one of the most beautiful and holy places in the world.

34. Earlier I brought to the attention of the Security Council the Israelis' expropriation of 827 acres in east Jerusalem and its northern suburbs. The Israelis are now speeding up the completion of their project—and here I am quoting from an article entitled "The Re-Peopling of Jerusalem" published in east Jerusalem—to add 40,000 Jewish settlers to the population in the next four years. The Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* of 24 March 1969 reported that

more than 8000 units will be built in the eastern—Arab—part of Jerusalem. The Israeli newspaper *Lamerhav* of 24 June 1969—so far I have been quoting only Israeli sources—reported that in a meeting which went on until the early hours of the morning, the Israeli Municipal Council of Jerusalem approved a new zoning map projecting the city's development up to the year 1985. That new map envisions Jerusalem as the centre of a district extending from Bethlehem to Ramallah. It includes plans for a new transportation network, a central commercial district, the preservation of natural sites and a projected population of half a million Israelis.

35. May I remind the members of the Council that in 1964 the same City Council had approved a zoning map which included the Arab sector of the city—even before the occupation of June 1967. Now Israel is making plans for the whole area extending from Bethlehem to Ramallah. And the Israelis do not hide the fact that Jewish habitation in the Old City will one day extend beyond their quarter. The Israeli Mayor spoke openly of "thinning out"—those are his words—the population of the Old City. What is indicated in those declarations is that deportation, expulsion and demolition of Arab houses lie within a planned policy that is being systematically applied by the Israeli authorities.

36. It is not only Arab lands that have been affected in this area by those vicious Israeli designs. Members of the World Lutheran Federation were faced with an Israeli attempt to seize a large slice of their property near the Augusta Victoria Hospital. They protested and resisted, but the problem is still there. Certainly, the Israelis can hardly plead the case of public safety or historical restoration in this instance.

37. It is worth noting at this point that Israel's destructive actions in East Jerusalem have not gone without protest by the inhabitants. There have been strikes and demonstrations, and even more violent acts of resistance which make a mockery of Mr. Eban's statement in a letter to the Security Council dated 30 April 1968, that "where there has been hostile separation there is now harmonious union; where there has been constant threat of violence there is now civic peace." [S/8565] The Israeli Mayor, Mr. Kollek, was more revealing of the reality of the situation when he admitted that the integration of the two sectors of Jerusalem had been "a total failure".

38. In June 1967 Israel, after enlarging the municipal area of Jerusalem, adopted legislation for the annexation of the city; and although the United Nations condemned this act, declared it invalid and asked Israel to rescind it, Israel failed to do so. In May of last year the Security Council considered this matter, deplored the Israeli non-compliance, declared all Israeli measures invalid and called for compliance. Israel's answer was more violations, more acts of defiance and the new legislation I have mentioned.

39. The new law aims at destroying the Arab character of the city, absorbing Arab life and institutions into Israeli life and obliterating all traces of Arab economic independence. We submit that it is not possible to create the necessary precondition for peace—I repeat, with all due respect, we

submit that it is not possible to create the necessary precondition for peace—if the Israeli actions intended to create a *fait accompli* remain unchecked.

40. The action of the Security Council today will determine the way to the future. If no action is taken now, the Security Council will face more conflict in our troubled area. This is predicted because the Council is dealing with Zionists who appear to be intoxicated by their victory. You gentlemen are dealing with people whose arrogance of power has blinded their minds. Ironically, they even seem proud of their acts, which offend the basic freedom of man and his human decency.

41. Nothing apparently impedes Israeli's colossal conceit. They can get away with all these acts of aggression unchecked. Their actions with regard to Jerusalem have been in defiance of world opinion, of international law and of the United Nations resolutions. It may be recalled that the Israeli representative, Mr. Tekoah, here in this august body, called the Security Council—and these are his words—"normally, juridically and politically bankrupt".

42. The Israelis show no sign either of changing or even of moderating their attitude. In fact, matters are becoming much worse and, unless they are checked soon, will certainly produce dire results. I predict that if something is not done soon—and surely something can be done—the City of Peace may very well become a city of real conflict.

43. We do not subscribe to the Israeli view in the matter, and the Council's action on the issue at hand will determine the amount of truth in the Israeli statements. We feel that positive action is needed for the Council to reinforce belief in its effectiveness and to restore confidence and prestige to its image.

U 44. In view of the critical nature of the problem:

(a) We urge the Council to take note of the Secretary-General's report [S/9149]; to deplore the failure of Israel to show any regard for Security Council resolution 252 (1968); and to condemn in the strongest terms the non-compliance of Israel with that resolution.

(b) We urge the Council to emphasize once more the established principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible.

(c) We urge the Council, as an interim measure, once more to call urgently upon Israel to rescind all measures taken by it that have resulted or may result in changing the status of the City of Jerusalem and, in the future, to refrain from all actions likely to have such effect.

(d) We urge the Council to issue a solemn warning to Israel that unless the above-mentioned illegal acts of legislation are rescinded the Council will reconvene without delay to take action, including the application of Article 41 of the Charter.

(e) We urge the Council to request that Israel inform it, within a fortnight, of its intentions with regard to the implementation of the provisions of the resolution.

(f) We urge the Council, as an interim measure, to appeal to all Member States to refrain from sending arms and military equipment to Israel until it complies with the above-mentioned requests of this body.

(g) We call upon the Council to reaffirm its resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, as well as General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 and 14 July 1967, respectively, on Jerusalem, and to declare the new Israeli legislation dated 23 August 1968 and the subsequent decrees and legislation null and void.

(h) We appreciate the efforts of our distinguished and dedicated Secretary-General and we hope that the Council will call upon him to submit a report to the Council on the implementation of its resolution.

45. Mr. President, I must admit that it was not the desire of the Government of Jordan to come before the Security Council. It is not a pleasure for Jordan to knock at the door of the Security Council seeking remedy. It is not a pleasure, because we know that after 11 months of hard work members of the Council had hoped that July would be a month of rest and holiday. It is not a pleasure, because the present time is not the right time, since this is the campaign season of the United Jewish Appeal for tax-exempt donations; it is the season when situations are created in order to help Zionist groups everywhere to campaign for tax-exempt donations. It is not a pleasure, because I know that Mr. Tekoah welcomes this forum today and will use it to speak to the gallery, to the television channels and to other information media, but not on the issue now before the Council. It is not a pleasure for Jordan to come before the Council, because we would like to see peace in our area, peace with justice, and not have to complain about continued Israeli aggression. But Jordan cannot afford that luxury, and therefore I am appearing before the Council to request a remedy for the situation, in the hope that we shall get the right remedy.

46. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, to whom I now give the floor.

47. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is significant that on the very day that the Security Council meets on the Jordanian complaint directed against Jerusalem's life, tranquillity and development, another meeting is taking place in Jerusalem itself. Some 60 internationally outstanding personalities in the humanities, arts and sciences, who have agreed to serve as members of the "Jerusalem Committee" initiated by Jerusalem's Mayor, are opening a conference to consider plans and projects for the preservation of the city's historical monuments and religious shrines. Among these are the Reverend T. M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University; Thomas Hoving, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York; Vittorio Veronese, former Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and Chairman of the Italian Commission for Human Rights; the Reverend W. Brandful, President of the Christian Council of Ghana; Carlos Garcia, former President of the Philippines; Dr. B. Betancur, Chairman of the Writers Association of Colombia; Jorge Amado of Brazil; Sir Robert Menzies; the sculptors Henry Moore,

Jacques Lipchitz and Isonnu Noguchi; Mrs. Marietta Tree; John Pope-Hennessy, Director of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London; Pastor Marc Boegner, Past President of the World Council of Churches; Manuel Aguilar, publisher from Madrid; Professor T. Segerstoeft, Rector of the University of Upsala, Sweden; Ignazio Silone; and representatives of religious and cultural institutions from Africa, Asia and Latin America.

48. If any illustration were required of the difference between Israel's attitude to Jerusalem and that of Jordan it is to be found in the juxtaposition of these two meetings convened on the same day, one here by Jordan and the other in Jerusalem by Israel.

49. Two years have elapsed since Jerusalem became one again; two years since the city threw off the shackles of war, chased away the invader who had bisected it and defiled its peace and sacredness and unity for 19 years. Two years have gone by since the sombre walls that tore into the city's heart were brought down, the barbed wire and field mines cleared away. And today Jordan comes before the Security Council to plead the cause of its 1948 invasion, to speak with nostalgia of Jerusalem's past amputation, to put forward the absurd suggestion that the rights of the population's majority be disregarded and violated.

50. Let there be no confusion. Jordan does not speak even for the Arab minority of Jerusalem. Two decades of occupation of the city's eastern part, achieved by aggression in defiance of the United Nations, cannot bestow that right upon the Government of Jordan. Moreover, that Government can scarcely be regarded as being solicitous of the welfare of the Arab inhabitants of east Jerusalem or the west bank. The stagnation, the oppression and discrimination which characterized Jordanian rule west of the Jordan River have not been forgotten by the local Arab population. A Government whose regular army forces are even now capable of carrying out armed attacks against Arab localities, such as the shelling of the Arab town of Jericho on the night of 27/28 May and of the Arab Development Society's farm and orphanage on 14 and 26 May; a Government whose irregular saboteur forces explode dynamite charges in the Arab-populated streets of east Jerusalem or throw grenades into crowds in Gaza and Nablus is surely not concerned about the fate and welfare of Arab inhabitants.

51. The perfidy of the Jordanian complaint is illustrated by the specific questions it raises. First, there are the regulations concerning registration of business enterprises in Jerusalem. An old proverb says: "Malice seldom wants a mark to shoot at." Jordan and other Arab States are openly pursuing warfare against Israel. There are daily acts of aggression along the Suez Canal and the Jordan River in violation of the cease-fire, necessitating Israel defence measures. President Nasser has proclaimed that this is only the beginning. The Jordanian regular army and the Iraqi forces stationed in Jordan are actively involved in terror operations. In Arab countries innocent Jews are still lingering in concentration camps and prisons. To seize the Security Council of technicalities of registration of commercial enterprises in these circumstances is the height of frivolity and irresponsible malice.

52. Israeli villages are being shelled and Israeli citizens murdered by terror squads whose avowed aim is to destroy Israel, but the Security Council is asked to deal with the registration of companies. Arab Governments openly finance, organize and encourage military terror operations against Israel in breach of the Security Council cease-fire resolutions, but Jordan suggests that licensing regulations constitute a threat to peace. President Nasser expresses public approval of the terror organizations' rejection of the 22 November 1967 resolution, Syria repudiates the resolution, Iraq declares its opposition to any peaceful solution of the conflict with Israel, but the Security Council is called upon to delve into administrative formalities. The intensification of Jordanian and Egyptian armed attacks is widely condemned as prejudicing the search for peace in the Middle East, but an attempt is made to focus attention instead on how business permits are granted to merchants.

53. It is obvious that the Jordanian complaint is a manoeuvre to divert attention from the fact that the Arab Governments have hardened even further their refusal to conclude peace with Israel and that Arab aggressive warfare against Israel continues unabated.

54. The pretext for Jordan's call for an emergency meeting is a year-old law which provides for the issuance of licences and permits for the exercise of commerce and professions. Modern society is largely dependent on the regulation of its life through the process of licensing. Vehicles must be registered, and their mechanical state checked from time to time; drivers' licences must be renewed; taxes and rates must be paid. Of even greater importance are such aspects of daily life as, for instance the need to ensure that only recognized pharmacies handle medical prescriptions and only diplomad doctors practise medicine. Standards of products and consumer goods and of construction must be assured to meet requirements of quality and safety. It is a simple, fundamental rule in every society that new enterprises and professional workers must receive authorization before they start their occupations. The welfare of the population, Jewish and Arab alike, requires such regulations; and this is the objective of the provisions in question. Most important of all, the regulations which are the subject of the Jordanian complaint provide for the automatic recognition of licences issued by the Jordanian authorities. They thus simply facilitate the continued and lawful conduct of Arab business and professions in the city. No flight of imagination could portray those regulations as being injurious to Jerusalem's population. The true nature of the Jordanian complaint is best demonstrated by the Jordanian representative's criticism today of a regulation which guarantees the rights of Arab absentee owners of property in Jerusalem. What matters to Jordan is not what Israel does, but that it is Israel that does it, even if the objective is to protect the interests of Arab inhabitants.

55. The Jordanian complaint mentions also the demolition of houses and, in particular, a number of structures adjacent to the Western (Wailing) Wall. For Jordan to complain about this is to add insult to injury. For 19 years Jordan had barbarically desecrated Judaism's holiest shrines. The tombstones of the ancient cemetery on the Mount of Olives were completely uprooted and used in the

construction of barracks and latrines for the Jordanian Army or for paving roads. All the synagogues in the Old City were destroyed or turned into stables, warehouses or chicken coops. The Wailing Wall itself was kept in a state of shameful and apparently intentional neglect and filth. The pavement in front of it was used for stationing donkeys. Access to the Wall was barred to all Jews. And now Jordan has the audacity to object that two structures, one of them containing a public latrine purposely constructed by the Jordanians to defile the holiest of Jewry's ancient sites, were removed so as to restore to the Wall its majesty and sacredness.

56. Those two structures were uninhabited. In addition to profaning the Wailing Wall, they were in a state of neglect and near collapse, which endangered visitors to the site. Nevertheless, meticulous care was taken to compensate the holders of titles to those buildings and to transfer the few pieces of furniture which remained in one of them, though it too was uninhabited. Jordan is not satisfied with having desecrated the Western Wall for 19 years. It now raises its voice against measures aimed at ensuring the beauty, the safety and the dignity of the Holy Place. The Government which today expresses a grievance because of the demolition of a few slum structures in danger of collapse is the self-same Government which, upon capture of the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem in 1948, razed to the ground and wantonly destroyed 34 out of its 35 houses of worship, all its institutes of learning, and hundreds of private homes. If there is a question on which the Jordanian Government is certainly not entitled to speak, it is the question of the demolition of houses.

57. The Jordanian representative has also referred to the transfer of the tenants of five small buildings in a narrow, three-metre-wide lane leading to the Wall, to premises provided by the municipal authorities elsewhere. Seventeen families were thus relocated. The lane in question is the one in which saboteur squads from Jordan set off, on the Sabbath eve of 20 June, three explosive charges with the clear intention of catching the crowds on their way to the Sabbath prayers at the Western Wall. Only a chance delay in the detonation of the charges limited the casualties; three Arabs and one Israeli were wounded and severe damage was caused to several Arab houses. All three of the charges were placed inside houses situated in the lane. The following day the Jordan-based Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine issued a communiqué admitting responsibility for this dastardly attack. The communiqué was immediately disseminated by the official Jordanian media of communication and broadcast by Amman Government radio. The Jordan Government's participation in terror warfare waged from its territory against Israel is, of course, a matter of common knowledge.

58. This was not the first Jordanian attempt to sow murder at the Western Wall. On 1 October 1968, and again on 20 December 1968, two saboteur squads on their way from Jordan were intercepted by the Israel Defence Forces. The interrogation of the saboteurs captured in clashes in which some of their accomplices were killed revealed that they were dispatched with clear instructions to perpetrate sabotage attacks against worshippers at the Wailing Wall. The people of Israel and the world at large will follow with

interest the views of members of the Security Council on such outrageous assaults on peaceful worshippers at a holy place in the City of Jerusalem.

59. The attempt at mass murder on 20 June left the Israel authorities with no choice but to take precautionary measures to protect the Western Wall and ensure the safety of Jews and non-Jews who flock to it daily in the thousands; and the vacated houses will serve these security needs. One of those buildings housed a school attended by 20 students. None contained, however, a religious court or a mosque, as falsely alleged by the Jordanian representative. By complaining about this step to the Security Council, the Government of Jordan adopts an odd attitude. In its view, the killing of Arab and Jewish civilians and the wanton destruction of Arab houses by Jordanian saboteurs is permissible, but measures by Israel to protect Jewish and Arab lives and the lives of foreign visitors are not. Is there no limit to absurdity? If Jordan would abide scrupulously by the cease-fire and refrain from actions designed to disturb the peace and serenity of the city, Israeli security measures would be superfluous. Jordan is mistaken, however, if it believes that having by force of its occupation barred free access to the Western Wall for 19 years it will succeed in doing it now by means of sabotage and murder.

60. Mr. President, the Jordanian representative has allowed fantasy to dominate his description of life in the Jerusalem of today. However, the Security Council and world public opinion are not dependent in this matter on material fabricated in Amman. On any one day there are thousands of foreign visitors in the city, including numerous representatives of foreign governments, international organizations and the press. They would attest to the fact that Jerusalem is basically content and flourishing in its integrity. New commercial and industrial enterprises are springing up all over the city. There is an economic boom, with a shortage of manpower. Joint Jewish-Arab commercial ventures are multiplying. Joint cultural activities are on the increase. Jewish-Arab youth clubs are devoting themselves to creating greater understanding between the two peoples. A combined Arab-Jewish song-and-dance ensemble has already toured Europe. Nearly all Arab workers of east Jerusalem are members of Histadrut, the Israel Federation of Labour, and of its medical insurance fund. They now enjoy the same social benefits as their Jewish colleagues. There is freedom of movement to and from the Arab States. Thousands of students and others from Arab countries visited Jerusalem last summer. Many thousands have already applied and are expected this year. One can take a taxi or a bus and travel to Amman and beyond. Two Arabic language dailies are published in the city, one of them outspokenly critical of Israel. There is free access to all the holy places without distinction.

61. On 3 February 1969 the well-known liberal American weekly *The Nation* described daily life in the united city as follows:

"Every morning, between 6.30 and 9.00, hundreds of Arab workers from east Jerusalem flow across the old boundaries to their jobs in west Jerusalem. Shops on both sides of town display the most modern Israeli goods. Intra-city bus lines clog the roads. Bus services connect

the city with all points in the country, from Haifa to Hebron. And many of the Arab taxis promise even more—a trip to Amman across the Allenby Bridge, and from there to Damascus, Baghdad, Beirut, Kuwait.

“The city’s main problems have little to do with war; much more to do with the fact that, before June 1967, both sides of the then divided city were little more than large villages. Today, the cosmopolitan Jerusalem of pre-1948 is again a reality.

“Tension in Jerusalem is beneath a peaceful surface. This is a bi-cultural, bi-national city in which two populations live in 99 per cent peace. A woman can walk alone at night on either side of town. One has the feeling that Jerusalemites, left alone, could solve their own problems.

“Incredibly enough, in the war-pocked world of the Middle East, Jerusalem Arabs like to spend long weekends in Amman. They get their passes from the Israeli authorities, travel down to Jericho, cross the Allenby Bridge, and then spend a few days shopping in Amman (it’s cheaper there) and seeing relatives. I know people who had never before been to Amman who decided they must make the trip. It’s easy for Jerusalem Arabs to make the trip east; they must pass a rather innocuous security test, wisely based not on a person’s political opinion but on his possible association with terrorist organizations.

“The ‘open border’ policy applies to goods as well as to people. A very great trade in agricultural produce and other west bank goods has been crossing the border regularly. The terrorist organizations bitterly oppose this evident accommodation and collusion with the enemy, since it encourages the normalcy of life which they, as good guerrillas, would like to destroy. But to a great many Arabs the trade is essential to life. When Israel shut the border briefly after the (Jerusalem) Mahane Yehuda bombing, in which 12 persons were killed, Arabs throughout the west bank pleaded that trade be restored.

“In Jerusalem, 200 or 300 women and children engaged in a moderately heated shouting match with some Arabic-speaking Israeli police. There seemed to be none of that fierce antagonism and hatred which can mark a civil rights demonstration in the States. . . .

“Quiet prevails. One has the feeling that it is possible for Arabs and Jews to live together in the same city—if not in friendship, then at least in tolerance and harmony. Today it is winter in the city, a particularly mild winter with occasional down bursts of fierce rain, but with many bright and warm days. Dramatic clouds form over the hills, sweep and linger, dance over the harsh rock-landscape and disappear.

“I believe that peace is a difficult but possible goal, because no one—at least no one in Jerusalem—wants war. The dangers are from outside Jerusalem, from across the borders. It is only from out there that war could come again in Jerusalem.”

As far back as a year ago, on 29 June 1968, *The Economist* of London wrote: “With no overt clashes to speak of,

mutual adaptation in Jerusalem has reached a point where the city might never have been divided.”

62. Certainly an incident does sometimes occur. Which city in the world is free from it? Indeed, since June 1967, in accordance with law, incidentally in force under Jordan rule as well as in Israel, several houses used as terrorist bases and arms caches were blown up in Jerusalem. During this period 16 agents of the Jordanian Government, who had engaged in fostering and organizing violence, were asked to leave town and return to their employers in Amman. In the meantime one of them has been allowed to come back, after having signed an undertaking not to pursue activities undermining public welfare and security. Certainly some of Jerusalem’s inhabitants may not be entirely happy. Is this an unusual situation in the life of cities? Is this reason for summoning the Security Council to an emergency session?

63. The representative of Jordan has arrogated to himself the right to speak of the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem. The records of the debate held in the Security Council in May 1968 contain a long list of public pronouncements by Christian leaders expressing full satisfaction with the situation of Christian communities and their holy places. Among these are statements by the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Patriarch of the Church of Ethiopia, Catholic and Protestant theologians and the latin Custos of the Holy Land.

64. Today I should like to add a more recent testimony. On 9 December 1968 Dr. G. Douglas Young, President of the Institute of Holy Land Studies, stated:

“It is also erroneous to say ‘Jerusalem has been overwhelmingly Arab from the seventh century until the modern influx . . .’. Historically the opposite is true. The Jewish population has been the majority in Jerusalem for many, many years; long before modern times. To unify a Jewish majority city after 20 years of its being divided by others is surely no cause for antagonism abroad. Our churches damaged by wars since 1948 are being repaired by Israeli compensation funds. The extremely stringent laws protecting holy places and worshippers at them have been consistently and strictly enforced. We feel at peace and at ease in our united city as Christians, with actually less fear of personal assault than in other cities in which we have lived abroad, such is the force of Israeli law and order being maintained. This may be said in spite of the border incidents and occasional Arab terrorist acts.”

65. Two weeks, later, Christmas was celebrated in Jerusalem by local Christian inhabitants and thousands of pilgrims and visitors from abroad. Among them was Angelo Cardinal Rossi of São Paulo who, on his return to Brazil, expressed his gratification with conditions in the city. The traditional Catholic Christmas procession in Jerusalem was led by the Latin Patriarch Alberto Gori. Similarly, the Easter holidays last April were celebrated in a spirit of traditional piety and ceremony.

66. As for the state of Moslem religious life, it would seem appropriate to rely less on Jordanian Government appointees and more on objective Moslem sources. Thus

Sheikh Ibn Issa, Adviser on Moslem Affairs to the President of the Malagasy Republic, stated following a recent visit to the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem:

“One must come to Israel to see for oneself to what great extent peace and tranquillity reign there, and how false is the picture disseminated by Arab propaganda.”

The President of the All-Moslem Congress of Sierra Leone broadcast the following message after his visit to the Al Aqsa Mosque:

“From this Holy Place I declare frankly and with conviction that places holy and consecrated to Islam, the mosques and the chapels are properly guarded and there is no violation of them. The gates of the El-Ghazar Mosque as well as the mosques of all towns and villages are wide open and filled with worshippers who fulfil their religious obligations in complete freedom.”

The Kadi, the Moslem religious judge of Jaffa, Sheikh Muhmad Tewfiq Asbya, declared on 29 June 1968:

“As a Kadi in Jaffa and a native of this country who has in the past fulfilled various religious posts, I would like to put your mind and the minds of the Moslems of your country at rest by assuring you that the Government of Israel is assiduously safeguarding all the holy places in the country without distinction of religion or community . . .

“A year has passed since Jerusalem was reunited and I should like to declare that thousands of Moslems from Jerusalem and from other towns in this and the neighbouring countries visit these holy places and regularly recite their prayers in them without encountering any interference whatsoever. The Moslem festivals have been celebrated with the usual pomp and ceremony.

“Those in charge of the Moslem holy places are Moslem notables and dignitaries who see to it that decorum and cleanliness are maintained there.

“The Government of Israel has appointed guards for these places. These ask visitors to conduct themselves in a manner fitting the holy character of the sites. The many Moslems living in Israel have fulfilled one of the five *rukn* (pillars) of Islam this year by making the pilgrimage to Mecca.

“From all the foregoing you will see that the Government of Israel keeps a watchful and solicitous eye over all the Moslem holy places as well as over all the holy places belonging to the other religious communities.”

67. Only lack of understanding of Jewish reverence for Jerusalem and Jewish respect for religion and human rights could create any doubt whatever that the Government of Israel is guided in its policies and actions by its concern for the welfare of the city and its inhabitants and by the determination to give full recognition and protection to the universal interests in it.

68. During the two years since Jerusalem was restored to life, and freed from the nightmare that had enveloped it for

19 years, the scars of tragic division have been removed, holy places, desecrated under Jordanian occupation, have been resanctified, freedom of access and worship have been granted for the first time to adherents of all religions, and coexistence between Arab and Israel has been proved possible.

69. For two decades Jerusalem had been a frontline town under the mercy of Arab guns, its peace menaced and violated at the whim of the Jordanian invader, its economy stultified by artificial barriers, its majesty trampled by hate, hostility and fratricide. It was a grim and joyless city, its eternal glory sadly tarnished, its natural splendor mutilated.

70. Today, the city is free from the chains of division, destruction and desecration. Its people again enjoy the fulness and integrity of their metropolis. They can live and work in peace; at least they can think of co-operation, not of constant hostility and warfare.

71. The Jordanian Government would have it otherwise. Jordan would rather have a city torn apart and permeated with enmity, stagnation and tragedy as in the 19 years of its occupation. Jordan is obviously motivated not by concern for Jerusalem's welfare but by continued belligerence against Israel. Perhaps this should not be surprising. Those who would not shirk from inflicting further ordeals on the Holy City and more sorrow on its people have their hands soaked in Jerusalem's blood. They are the ones who turned the city into a battlefield in 1948. It was their artillery that in June 1967 unleashed the merciless bombardment of Jerusalem's residential quarters, causing numerous casualties among the civilian population and deliberately damaging one of the foremost holy places, the Church of Dormition. The Jordanian attitude callously disregards the basic precepts of international law and morality. Jordan occupied the eastern part of the city in a war of aggression. Its occupation had never been recognized by any Government, not even by the Arab States, as constituting more than a military presence. The Jordanian attitude is in violation of the rights of the city's population. Jerusalem is inhabited by more than 200,000 Jews, 60,000 Arabs and 5,000 persons of other nationality. It is evident that the great majority of the city's population categorically rejects any Jordanian claims or attempts to intervene in its life. This applies obviously to the Jewish inhabitants. It also applies to the other non-Arab inhabitants. Even as far as the Arab citizens are concerned, as I have already observed, Jordan can hardly claim to represent them merely because it happened to be the occupying Power for 19 years.

72. Naturally there are some who still act on behalf of Jordanian interests. There are still some who foster discord and hostility. They are the ones who would object to slum clearing and to the construction of new housing by Israel even if carried out in accordance with Jordanian town-planning projects. They are the ones who would like Jerusalem today to have at least as many demonstrations, incidents and arrests as during Jordanian rule. They are the ones who cannot accept the thought that today's situation is no worse even for the Arab inhabitants and generally much better than before the reunification of the city. These people, however, are not representative of the Arab minority of Jerusalem.

73. A recently published sociological study, "*The Administration of United Jerusalem*", expresses this as follows:

"Under the Jordanian régime, about 40 members and ex-members of the Jordanian Parliament lived in and around Jerusalem, together with ten Cabinet Ministers and ex-Ministers, as well as many religious leaders. This group has now lost most of its influence . . . With the blow to its standing, there is also a deterioration in its financial status. On the other hand, the man in the street, on passing from Jordanian to Israeli rule, suddenly feels that he is important, that he is somebody. He sees free competition in every walk of life, and he begins to realize that, if he is talented and hard-working, he may one day reach a social eminence that he never dreamed of under Jordanian rule. He begins to doubt whether his former leaders should be followed blindly in their hostility to Israeli rule."

74. In any event, the generally accepted principles of human rights and political democracy cannot be suspended in the case of Jerusalem. A small minority, in fact a group of foreign appointees and agents, cannot impose on the majority demands contrary to reason and justice. Jerusalem's unity and integrity will never again be upset by wanton hatred and hostility. Jerusalem will forever be united. Its citizens can look to the future with confidence and calm. Its friends, the world over, can rest assured, Israel will maintain and protect the city's growth, welfare and security: Israel will make certain that Jerusalem, holy to so many, remains a source of light and pride to all religions.

75. Let us, therefore, turn our thoughts to bringing to Jerusalem bliss, not grief. Let us address ourselves to the wishes of its population, not to the designs of foreign Governments. Let us strive for peace and understanding within its walls, not chaos and discord. Let us repeat after the Prophet:

"Rejoice ye with Jerusalem,  
"And be glad with her, all ye that love her;  
"Rejoice for joy with her . . .  
"That ye may drink deeply with delight on the abundance of her glory."

76. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

77. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): The applause we have just heard from the gallery does not seem surprising to my delegation, at least, because those invitees have come for a purpose, and the speech was aimed more at the audience than at this august body.

78. At the very outset, lest there be confusion on this score, I should like to mention, to reiterate and re-emphasize the one single issue I am presenting to the Council. What is before the Council is the resolution adopted by the Council and defied by Israel, together with the continued defiance and the further violations that have been committed. We have come to the Council to say: What are you going to do about that defiance? That is the issue, that is the complaint of Jordan.

79. Certain points, however, do relate to Jerusalem and I feel they should be answered, I shall take them up not in the order as presented by Mr. Tekoah, but rather in the order which I think is consistent with the issues embodied in the complaint.

80. Mr. Tekoah said that the majority of the people of Jerusalem were Israelis. That is not true. I have the statistics from the Survey of Palestine prepared by the Secretary of Information for Palestine of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry, a British-American body. They speak about the censuses of 1922 and 1931, when there were 56,346 and 34,431 Jews. At the same time they give the figures for the total settled population in Jerusalem for the end of 1944, when there were 140,532 Arabs and 100,200 Jews. Those are the figures of the Palestine Anglo-American Committee and they are embodied in the *Palestine Year-book* for 1947-1948. So it is not true that the majority consisted of Israelis. What the Israelis did after their invasion and illegal occupation of Jerusalem is something else.

81. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the unity of the city. I think it is a settled principle, a recognized principle, that naked acts of annexation through military occupation amount to usurpation and confer no rights on the Israelis. They cannot be camouflaged as "unity". When the forces of Zionism take Jerusalem by force, they cannot come here and say that by the use of force Jerusalem became united. This is exactly what Hitler said. When the forces of nazism occupied Czechoslovakia and Poland, what did Hitler say? These are his exact words: "Now our unity has been accomplished". That is what Hitler said. But the members of the world community said otherwise; they said: "Unity by force, annexation by force confers no right but imposes a duty." The world community said that Hitler's occupation of Czechoslovakia and Poland and the so-called unity did not confer any title or give any rights, but conferred instead a duty on the world community to see to it that the aggression should come to an end. And this is the same thing: the Israelis, through the use of force, took Arab Jerusalem. This Council, in its resolution 252 (1968), stated expressly that "acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible". Those are your words, the words of this Council, adopted in resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968. You said no to annexation, no to force, no to military occupation, no to usurpation. This is the issue before you. I come before you with your resolution, telling the Council with all due respect, that the Israelis have defied the will of the world community and that some action has to be taken to save the prestige, the great imagine and the effectiveness of the machinery of this body, the Security Council.

82. Mr. Tekoah spoke about unity. This is unity by force, unity by aggression. This is aggression, this is not unity, and aggression calls for action by the Security Council. Mr. Tekoah said that everything was sweet and nice and beautiful between the Israelis and the Jordanian citizens in occupied Jerusalem. He stated that what I had said had been fabricated in Amman. But I do not recall having cited a single quotation from one Arab source. Yet Mr. Tekoah had the nerve—I shall not use another word, I shall not follow his example—to say that what I had said had been

fabricated in Amman. Every single quotation presented by me was taken from Israeli sources, either the *Jerusalem Post* of 2 June 1969—that is this month—or the official *Jewish Yearbook* of 1968-1969. Those are not Amman authorities nor Amman newspapers nor the official *Yearbook* of the Government of Jordan. The *Jewish Yearbook* is the Government Yearbook: it is an official document of the Israeli Government.

83. With respect to the relationship between the Israelis and the Jordanians in Jerusalem, if Mr. Tekoah does not believe his own sources, Israeli sources, let me quote from an American source, the *Christian Science Monitor* of 21 May 1969, which is last month. I shall quote what the Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Kollek, said about the relationship between the Israelis and the Arabs in Jerusalem. This is a quotation from the *Christian Science Monitor*, a respectable newspaper. According to Mr. John K. Cooley, Mayor Kollek had told several foreign reporters recently that perhaps there should be, after all, two 'separate and equal cities—an Arab one and a Jewish one'. Then the Mayor said—and here comes the expansionist design, that vicious design aiming at more expansion, acquiring more land and displacing more people: "Both the completely Arab and the completely Jewish cities should be ruled by Israel." He started all right, but he ended by saying that both should be ruled by Israel. Why on earth should a completely and purely Arab city—and by Arab I mean Christian Arabs and Moslem Arabs; I speak on behalf of both, since they are Jordanian citizens—not be part of the Arab homeland? Why should it be part of Israel?

84. "Oh", it is said, "we are better guardians." I have already in the past made clear who it is that is not for freedom of access to the holy places. I have mentioned before in the Security Council that we offered to the Palestine Conciliation Commission in November 1949 an undertaking that we would permit free access to every individual from Israel, provided that Israel did the same thing. Let Mr. Tekoah state right here whether his Government did do the same thing. It is the Israelis who have been refusing to do that, and we know what the purpose has been: complete annexation. They had in mind expansion by stages, and what is happening to Jerusalem is a typical example of what has been going on vis-à-vis the rest of Palestine. Let us make a comparison. What was the plan at the beginning? Let us look at the past, for it will guide us in seeing what the Israelis are aiming at now and for the future. Did they not meet in 1897 to say, "We want only a national homeland"? Did they not ask for only a homeland and get a promise in 1917? Did they not proceed from there to a call for a State at a later stage? Did they not come here in 1947 and say, "Well, all right, partition is what we want"? But the following year did they not expand? And where are they now? Are they not occupying part of the United Arab Republic and part of Jordan and part of Syria and all the Gaza Strip?

85. And with respect to Jerusalem, did not the very same thing happen? Did they not come before a British Tribunal—and I should like Lord Caradon to correct me if I am wrong—a Tribunal appointed by Britain and consisting of three members, a jurist from Switzerland, a jurist from Holland and a jurist from Sweden? Did those jurists not go to

Jerusalem to hear evidence? What was the evidence? What was the claim of the Jews at that time? Dr. Eliash was representing the Jewish Agency and Jewry at large. He said to the Tribunal that they claimed no title. In its verdict the Tribunal emphasized that the "Jews do not claim any proprietorship to the Wall or to the pavement in front of it". They came before the Tribunal and they said: "We are not claiming any title to the Wall or anything near it". They simply said that they would like the right to visit, just the right to go there. That was the first stage. What was the second stage? Did they not claim the Wall itself after the creation of the State? We now hear about something called restoration and we now see bulldozers destroying Moslem shrines and houses, calling them a threat to public safety. They are called a threat after two years of occupation—although those houses have been standing for 600 years, since the thirteenth century. They speak of the temple now, but tomorrow they may discover that another temple was in Iraq. The whole thing may end up with the idea: From the Euphrates to the Nile.

86. Israeli manoeuvres today cannot possibly mislead anybody. After the occupation of the west bank and Sinai and Gaza and the Golan Heights, they cannot now appear as that little oppressed State looking for peace. I think the big lie is now clear and that more effective measures are needed to put an end to Israeli arrogance.

87. Mr. Tekoah said that the structures were not inhabited. We know that the journalists who were talking to the inhabitants were subjected to rough treatment by the Israelis; they were not permitted to go near the people to talk to them and then they had to go and submit a protest to the Israeli authorities about that treatment by the Israelis. And why is this done? Because the Israelis want to maintain a blockade against the penetration of truthful information, because the penetration of accurate information would reach the fair-minded American, would reach other areas and places, and would belie every statement by Mr. Tekoah. This Security Council unanimously requested Israel to accept a commission that would investigate, look into, and see the conditions of the people in the occupied areas. If the Israelis really want to convey the truth, why are they saying no to our investigation in Jerusalem, to the sending of a visiting mission to the Holy City of Jerusalem? But they keep saying no so that they can maintain this information blockade, and so that Mr. Tekoah can distort the truth in any way he deems fit.

88. Mr. Tekoah said something about the explosives in Jerusalem. I do not know anything about the explosives except what was stated by the Israeli authorities to the press and information media. But I do know one thing—one thing which expressed a human feeling: "When you destroy my house, I may react in any manner I deem fit. I may resist you. It is my God-given right to live in my home." So if those people who lost their homes—and I mentioned the figures earlier—were kicked out and their houses bulldozed and razed to the ground, I think it is only legitimate for them to resist. This is a defensive measure, a God-given right, not unique to the people of Jerusalem: it has been experienced by all occupiers. It continues to be the case, because occupation and resistance go together. Occupation, as I said earlier, brings oppression, and oppression brings

resistance. We have no apology to make to the Israelis if the people resist them. The answer lies in getting out. And this, by the way, is what was intended by the Security Council when it adopted a unanimous resolution calling for a cease-fire.

89. What does the cease-fire mean? I do not think the Council meant the cease-fire to give Israel the right to destroy part of the Holy City. That is not a cease-fire; that is a violation of the cease-fire. I do not think the council intended by a cease-fire to give Israel extra rights and privileges. A cease-fire means a cease-fire; and the only movement after a cease-fire is movement back to where they came from. This is something the Security Council should emphasize. This is our understanding of the cease-fire. It means cease fire. We should not move troops into the houses of 17 families and say, "We are putting them there for security." The movement must be back to where they came from. That is not only my understanding but also the understanding of the Security Council, as this question was raised by Mr. Iyalla, a member of the Council at that time, who explained what a cease-fire was. Luckily, a distinguished colleague, the representative of a permanent member of the Security Council, Lord Caradon, confirmed that understanding by another member of the Council. This was the understanding of the cease-fire, stated very clearly by Mr. Iyalla:

"A cease-fire, as we understand it, must mean that the guns must be silenced and that the troop movements must be halted wherever they are. Any attempt to gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation must therefore be deplored." [1357th meeting, para. 176.]

Then he said:

"I have one last point. In the course of the debate this evening, a new phrase has gradually come into circulation, that is the phrase 'cease-fire line'. Lest it be accepted merely by default, let me say, for my delegation at least, that we do not understand that there is a cease-fire line. There are Armistice lines. There is the cease-fire order which means that troops should stay where they are and that any movement, north, south, east or west, except such movement as to return from the scene of battle to one's own home ground, is a violation of the cease-fire." [Ibid., para. 177.]

Any movement—east, west, south, north—if it is not a movement back to where the Israeli troops came from, is a violation. What can it be called when they move to destroy and bulldoze Arab homes and Moslem shrines in the Holy City? I beg members of the Council to ponder this. If their movement is to destroy Arab homes and Moslem shrines, is this not a violation not only of Security Council resolution 252 (1968)—your resolution—but also of the cease-fire? Luckily, Lord Caradon agreed with Mr. Iyalla. He said at the same meeting:

"... I entirely agree with the important point which he has put to us. It is well, I think, to refer back to the actual words of the agreement reached by General Bull. I refer to the record of yesterday; the actual words of

General Bull were: 'I proposed a cease-fire together with no further movement of troops to be effective at 1630 hours GMT, 10 June . . .'. [Ibid., para. 204.]

90. I need not dwell on these points, but I wished to clarify them. The issue is very clear; it is very simple: the question of defiance of the Council's own resolution. Violations continue, more acts of aggression are committed, and we come here to ask for effective measures. Those were the points I wished to present at this stage, reserving my right to speak again in answer to any other point which I have failed to cover this afternoon.

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Israel wishes to make a statement.

92. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is strange that the representative of Jordan should insist on portraying the Arab acts of sabotage committed in Israel and in Israel-controlled territory as being carried out by allegedly wronged local inhabitants, when his own Government disseminates communiqués of terror through organizations financed, organized, harboured and trained by it, operating from Jordanian territory, organizations which take full credit for these wanton acts of murder for murder's sake. It is even more strange that the representative of Jordan should come before the Security Council to pride himself on such assaults against innocent men, women and children.

93. Jerusalem is, however, too sacred, and its happiness too precious, for me to be drawn into a verbal skirmish over it with someone to whom Jerusalem appears to be merely another instrument of hostility toward Israel. I am quite content to leave it to history to pronounce judgement on the nightmare of Jordanian occupation of part of the city and on its reunification by Israel.

94. To the representative of Jordan I shall say only one thing: the difference between us is that you uprooted the tombstones of Jewry's most ancient and most holy cemetery in Jerusalem to construct latrines and pave roads for a Jordanian army camp. We allowed a monument to be constructed in Jerusalem to the Jordanian Army's fighting men who fell in the 1967 war. There is another difference between us: you destroyed Jerusalem; we shall rebuild it.

95. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Jordan to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

96. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I shall be very brief. I do not wish to abuse the patience of the Council. I simply wish to say that acts of terrorism have never been part of our tradition. If there is resistance, it is imposed by the continued acts of aggression and the continued crimes committed against our people. As I have said, it is not a unique thing in the history of mankind for an occupation to be resisted. The Israelis were the first to present this picture, when they came from Europe and invaded the land, using all kinds of terrorism. I will not refer to many cases. I will not quote statements from any sources but Israeli sources. Here is what was stated by Mr. Uri Avnery, a one-time member of the Irgun terrorist gang, in his book

*Israel without Zionists*.<sup>1</sup> He said that when he was interviewed for membership in the Irgun terrorist gang he was asked whether he hated the Arabs. That was the first qualification for anyone wanting to join the terrorist organization. That was the first question: "Do you hate the Arabs?" He said that he almost flunked the interview because he answered no. On page 11 of the same book Mr. Avnery writes:

"Our company commander, and architect whom we admired and imitated, joined Stern, the extremist leader who believed that we should make common cause even with the Nazis and Fascists in order to overthrow British imperialism."

97. So terrorism was started by the Israelis. The invasion started when they invaded the British positions and attacked them in all kinds of ways, and they continued this practice until they displaced the Palestinians. If the people resist today, it is a movement of the people, and it becomes stronger every day, because it stems from determination and from the belief that they should have their place as equals, as a people. To say that the Government of Jordan is doing this is to be blind to the facts. Mr. Tekoah sometimes likes to ignore the facts. The resistance in Tel Aviv itself yesterday could not be a government-planned act. The continued attacks in Gaza—which, as you know, is surrounded by land occupied by the Israelis—cannot be called Jordanian. The same applies to other areas. It is easy for Mr. Tekoah to find pretexts, but facts are stubborn. Falsehood flies on very short wings but it soon falls on the rock of truth. Truth is a stubborn thing.

98. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to inform the Council that in the course of this meeting I have received three requests—from the representatives of Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Morocco—asking that they be permitted to participate in this debate without the right to vote. If the Council agrees, I propose to invite the representatives of those three countries to take the places which have been reserved for them in the chamber, on the understanding that when they wish to take the floor they will be invited to take a place at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) and Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.*

99. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table.

100. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Council, for granting me permission to participate in the debate on this question.

101. There is a proverb from King Solomon which says: "In all labour there is profit, but the talk of the lip tendeth to penury." How does this proverb apply to Jerusalem? The General Assembly addressed itself to the question of

Jerusalem and took a decision on it by unanimous vote. The Security Council did the same. There was no labour on the part of the Security Council or the General Assembly, for that matter. It was only lip service in so far as the question of Jerusalem is concerned. Hence "the lip tendeth to penury".

102. Are we bankrupt in the United Nations? Is the Security Council paralysed? Shall we pass more resolutions that are not implemented? Of course, we know why they are not implemented. I am not going into the technical reasons. I see that Mr. Tekoah is not here, but I hope that he will read my speech. Mr. Tekoah said that the Arabs in Palestine were backward, they they lived in slums, and that if Israel demolished certain buildings in the Holy City of Jerusalem it was to give the people better habitation, to see that they obtain social welfare services and jobs. Again I have to go to King Solomon. He had a proverb for this situation. King Solomon said: "The poor is hated even of his own neighbour but the rich hath many friends." If the Arabs were not as rich as those European Zionists who invaded the country, it is not a cause for shame. The Zionists have the Rothschilds behind them, the Oppenheims, the Readings, the multimillionaires of Western Europe, and also the bounty of the Christian world that was brainwashed by fundamentalistic interpretations of the Bible. But the Arabs have been emerging from under the yoke of European mandates that were foisted upon them by the Treaty of Versailles—a perfidious act after Mr. Wilson, the President of the United States, had enunciated his fourteen points, amongst which was the principle of self-determination. But King Solomon foresaw what might happen in communities, not to speak of nations. Again, he said: "He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth, but he that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he." What mercy have the Zionists extended since they set foot there?

103. My colleague from Jordan mentioned the Irgun gang, the Stern gang and many other gangs which, as I have said before, caused all this trouble in the Holy Land. Those European Zionists came to occupy the land and chase out its indigenous people. And here they say that they want to resuscitate Judaism. But they do not heed what King Solomon said. But before King Solomon, in Exodus of the Bible—not the *Exodus* that sold a million copies in New York City to glorify the Jewish enterprise in Palestine—it is said: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house nor anything that is thy neighbour's." Those European Zionists do not covet the house, they destroy it, they expel the people from the houses. Remember, I do not say "Jews" but "Zionists".

104. We come to Jerusalem. Many think that "Jerusalem" is a Hebrew word. Of course, Jerusalem is a Semitic word, not a Hebrew word. The word "Uru" came from the Assyrians, who were also Semites, and the Babylonians. For example, we know that Abraham came from Ur of the Chaldees, Ur the City; and Jerusalem is derived not from Uru-Shalom, or Uru-Salaam. It is derived from "Uru-Salim", more akin to Arabic, the Nabataean Arabic, than it is to Hebrew. And to this day we have many people called Salim—Uru-Salim, Uru-Shalim, the city of peace and security. And again we go to Genesis—but Genesis is not the only source if we go to archaeological sources. According to

<sup>1</sup> Uri Avnery, *Israel without Zionists: A plea for peace in the Middle East*, New York, The Macmillan Company.

Genesis, Jerusalem, before the old biblical Israel was established, was ruled for hundreds of years by a King called Melchisedek. When did those European Zionists come to Jerusalem? We know that before the middle of the nineteenth century Jerusalem was still surrounded by its sixteenth century wall—that was after the Crusades; the Crusades had been liquidated by that time. It was not until after 1858 that Sir Moses Montefiore—I suppose he was knighted by Britain, otherwise he would not be called “Sir”—built a Jewish religious quarter. There had been no religious quarter to speak of. There were Jews living in Jerusalem, living like the Arabs. These were Arab Jews. The emphasis has been laid on this today by my colleague from Jordan; and rightly so because, after all, the Old City of Jerusalem was part of Jordan. But Jerusalem is not only an Arab city, Jerusalem is a Moslem city, and at one time the Christians thought it was a Christian city. It is the spiritual city of 600 million Moslems.

105. In Mr. Tekoah's arguments he used such hackneyed terms as “democratic processes” and “democratic procedures”. But democracy has been perverted since the days of Damocles. Even in Periclean days, democracy was for certain Athenians only, not for all Athenians. Everybody who lived outside Athens was called a barbarian. And here comes the West speaking about democracy—also other countries, although I do not think they use the term so much; they use new terms, since all sorts of ideologies have sprung up in the world, liberal or left or right or centre or conservative and so on. If we go by the democratic yardstick, there are 16 million or 17 million Jews in the world. May they increase and prosper: we have nothing against the Jews as such. They are prospering anyway, without us; they are prospering mostly in the United States of America; they have prospered before, in England; they have prospered in South Africa, where they have the diamonds and the gold. Well, good luck to them: as we say in Arabic, may they prosper even more, but at a little greater distance from us.

106. There are 600 million Moslems and there are about 1,000 million Christians. By dint of what logic, by what yardstick of justice, should a small segment of the Jews who started the Zionist movement say that because of their religious association with Jerusalem, Jerusalem should be the capital of Judaism? The Christians tried that argument before, during the Crusades, but the motivation behind the Crusades was economic and political. When Pope Urban II found that his vassals, who were the princes of Europe, felt they should be independent of him in temporal matters, and when Europe was at that time suffering from wars among those vassals, and because economically it was backward and underdeveloped, Urban II proclaimed the Crusades. Peter the Hermit was his propagandist. He said: “Why are you killing one another here in Europe? Go to the Holy Land and wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels.” And who were the infidels? The Moslems. And the people did not know that the most revered prophet in the Koran was Jesus. To wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels—and the motivation of the religious and temporal heads of Europe at that time was political and economic. It was a diversion from the national awakening of the princes, to get them to go and explore other lands and not to continue cutting one

another's throats. That is how the Crusades began—to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels; and there followed a series of wars and massacres, a period of turmoil and tribulation. And where are the Crusaders now? They are gone with the wind of history. The Zionists also, I dare say, will be swept away by the hurricane of the future. But the trouble is that if any miscalculation takes place, the whole world might blow up, because the Zionists, as I will show you presently, are indeed capable of blowing up this whole world. How? Through the influence they exercise all over the Western World. I dare say too that if the Soviet Union does not watch out, they will also exercise a great deal of influence inside that country. I do not know about Red China; we do not recognize Red China. Mr. Tekoah spoke of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Jordanians. He now rationalizes—not he, personally, but the authorities in Israel—by referring to the excavations that are being carried out by none other than great archaeologists. The names of illustrious people were recited by Mr. Tekoah, people who have been invited to Jerusalem to see how they can make a new city of it—I dare say a new Babylon. The Dome of the Rock has been considered by all architects—including Gustave Lebon, who was also a great psychologist and wrote *La psychologie des Foules*<sup>2</sup>—as one of the most beautiful of artistic achievements. It so happens that the Dome of the Rock is built on what was at one time Solomon's Temple. But who destroyed the Temple of Solomon? First of all, let us find out who built it: the Canaanites built it, the Canaanites from Lebanon. The father of King Solomon was none other than King David. David was a shepherd, and the Canaanites preceded those tribes that are referred to today as Jewish tribes. King Solomon was the son of David the Shepherd. Everyone belonged to a tribal society in that part of the world. I do not have to recall the jealousy of Saul because David played the flute. He was a shepherd and shepherds played the flute: that was the music of those days. King Solomon wanted to build a temple: he asked the aid of Lebanon and the cedars of Lebanon were cut down. Phoenician or Canaanite architects built the Temple of King Solomon. Did any Arab destroy the Temple of Solomon? The Romans destroyed the Temple of Solomon. Where did the Romans come from? They came from Europe. All the destruction in the Holy Land comes from Europe. Who destroyed Jerusalem? It was destroyed due to the intrusion of the Europeans into that part of the world. They do not leave us alone. And now come those European Zionists. Our Jews would never have thought of any such action. They were good Arabs. They distinguished themselves in Baghdad and they distinguished themselves in Spain. They wrote in Arabic. Many of them were scientists. The Arabs are proud of them. We did not hear of this Zionism until the early nineteenth century when Herzl, having been exasperated by the maltreatment of the Jews on the part of the Europeans, thought that the Jews should have a national home of their own. At one time, as I mentioned before, they thought of Uganda. But I do not have to go into all this history again. It is already in the record.

107. And our colleague, Mr. Tekoah, has the temerity to say that the Jordanians desecrated the Holy Land. He mentioned slums and latrines. I do not know whether the

<sup>2</sup> Paris, Alcon, 1895.

Zionists took some chlorine or some other disinfectant with them when they went there. I was in the Old City of Jerusalem in 1925. It was a very old city; it was as clean as any other old city. I did not smell anything foul in the air.

108. When the wall of a synagogue in New York or in any other Western city is plastered with an insolent sticker or is scribbled on with impolite language against Judaism, a hue and cry is raised and the whole world is astir: look at anti-Semitism. But when a revered mosque in Jordan is seized for allegedly civic purposes, it seems that the Arabs have no way of arousing world public opinion, because the mass media of information are in the hands of the Zionists. We all feel sorry when a place of worship is desecrated, I must say, whether it is a synagogue, a church or a mosque. I guess that Mr. Tekoah must be familiar with the New Testament, even though he does not believe in it, and I shall quote the following from it: "They see the thorn in their brother's eye, but they do not see the beam in their own eye." That is human nature. It does not apply only to the Zionists; it sometimes applies to the Arabs too. But here it applies to what is being done in Jerusalem.

109. Jerusalem is sacred to the Christians, to the Moslems and to the Jews. Let us forget that it is a part of Palestine. It is a Holy City to those three monotheistic faiths. Why should the Zionists make it their capital? If we follow democratic procedure, the Christians should dominate because they are the majority of the three monotheistic faith. But most of the Christians have become secular. Also, most of the Jews who live here in the New World have become secular, as well as most of those who live in Europe. They have become assimilated or, with respect to those who have not, the question of their religion is something between themselves and their own conscience. They do not make an issue of it. In France there are many Jews who are my friends, and one could not know whether they are Jews or Gentiles. What is the difference? They are good Frenchmen. By what yardstick of justice should Jerusalem be the capital of Judaism, when the first Kibbla in Islam—the Kibbla, for the information of members, is where the Moslems face in prayer—was not Mecca or Medina, but Jerusalem, aside from the subsequent associations that Islam, religiously or spiritually, had with Jerusalem?

110. I am willing to wager anything that before the Israeli question came under the focus of world attention there were not more than 3 million or 4 million Jews who thought that they should go back to Jerusalem. The Jews became citizens of various countries. Why should 2 million or 3 million Jews under the banner of Zionism consider that they have an inalienable right to Jerusalem? Why? Because the Christians, after the Crusades, washed their hands of Jerusalem? All right, that was their business. If the Christians have washed their hands of Jerusalem and do not claim it any more, the Moslems have not done so—and there are 600 million of them. Let those Governments who sent instructions to you gentlemen ponder this fact: sooner or later, that dormant giant of Islam might be roused. And I hope it will not be wronged when roused, because the innocent will suffer, among the Moslems and the Jews alike.

111. Let us talk dispassionately and detachedly and objectively on this question, not out of certain political

arrangements. Mr. Tekoah talks of discrimination. I have in mind a very good book; he has probably purchased it already. I recommend it to everyone, I wish the author success, and I hope that his publishers will not make more money. It is a Jew who wrote that book—a very objective Jew. His name is Barnet Litvinoff, of Russian origin, British by adoption but I believe he is cosmopolitan in attitude. I was amongst the first to read his book. The title is "A Peculiar People"<sup>3</sup> meaning the Jews. And I want to quote freely from Mr. Barnet Litvinoff, a very honest author. Mr. Tekoah speaks of discrimination. Listen to Mr. Litvinoff:

"In fact, the Oriental Jews of Israel constitute a more perplexing social problem than the Arabs. They too have made the rueful discovery that equality as a constantly proclaimed theory need not guarantee equality in practice." That is from page 275.

Here is another quotation from Mr. Litvinoff:

"The citizens of Oriental origin"—he does not say whether they are Jews or Gentiles—"felt they were discriminated against, for the best jobs, the key positions of influence, the good residential areas and the richest farm lands were in the hands of Europeans."—discrimination.

112. When the Arab Jews lived amongst us, they had banks; they had buildings; they lived amongst us; our neighbours were Jews. We did not say they were Jew or Gentile: we do not discriminate in our part of the world. If there was a tolerant people it was the Moslems and the Arabs towards the Jews, because we considered that they worshipped the same God. Jews are people, and there are good ones amongst them as there are amongst the Gentiles, and there are bad ones amongst them as there are amongst the Gentiles. But how can you help but discriminate when some of their religious leaders insist that they constitute an exclusive society, claiming that they are the "chosen people of God", and that they should never be assimilated—or, if assimilated, that they should not identify themselves wholly with the people of the country of adoption or even the country of birth?

113. The Talmud states that a child born of a Jewish mother and a Gentile uncircumcised father may be considered a Jew—you see, they forgot that the Moslems are circumcised and did not take the Moslems into consideration—I repeat: a child born of a Jewish mother and a Gentile uncircumcised father may be considered a Jew, but not the child of a parentage in the reverse order. What more discrimination do you want—what more exclusivity? But many Jews do not believe in all those antiquated traditions. We have our antiquated traditions ourselves. The younger generation is shedding them away. And remember that the Talmud was written by 2,000 scholars and rabbis during nine centuries. So the Zionists draw not only on the Bible but also on the Talmud when it suits their purpose; and they are more secular than I am. I am religious in my private life, but I am secular when I am sitting here and talking strictly from a detached and objective point of view.

<sup>3</sup> New York, *Weidenfeld and Nicolson*, 1969.

114. But let us examine why all this trouble is still with us—and Palestine is only part of the trouble. I want to be frank with my colleagues sitting around this table, especially three colleagues, who sit alphabetically next to each other: the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I happened to be present at Lake Success in 1947 when the partition of Palestine was voted. At one time the United States and its Western allies had thought that placing Palestine and Jerusalem under a joint American-British-French trusteeship would appease Arab fears and allay Zionist suspicions until a workable solution could be found for the Palestine question. But when it was whispered at Lake Success that if Palestine were to be made into a Trust Territory there was nothing to deter the Soviet Union from asking to be a co-trustee, the Western allies regarded such a contingency as a catastrophe—that was at the beginning of the cold war—because the Russians would then succeed in getting their foot in the door of the Middle East. Communism in those days was a political taboo in Western countries, and worse than the plague for Western interests abroad. So Senator Austin—and I dealt with him personally—the representative of the United States, toyed with an interim solution based on a joint trusteeship over Palestine and Jerusalem—a special arrangement for Jerusalem, in fact. But it was feared that that would lead to a sanguinary conflict and Senator Austin withdrew the idea, on secret instructions from Mr. Truman, the then President of the United States. Instead, the partition plan was revived, under pressures which the Zionists exercised on the White House. All of you can read Mr. Truman's memoirs: I do not have to cite them chapter and verse.

115. After the partition plan was announced by Senator Austin as the best solution, Mr. Gromyko would not be checkmated by the Senator from the hoary mountains of New Hampshire, who had no choice but to carry out the imperious instructions of Mr. Truman, an erstwhile Senator from the Middle West—from Missouri, I believe. This was in contravention of the knowledgeable advice of the experts of the State Department, specialists on the Middle East. To the surprise of all of us at Lake Success—and, as I have said, I was sitting there—when the partition plan was submitted to the vote, Mr. Gromyko acquiesced. None of the gentlemen present in this Council were there. I think Mr. Bunche was there. I was there, and I can tell you what happened. The Western Powers had put their heads together to keep the Soviet Union out of the Middle East, by spiking all solutions short of establishing a Zionist State. Mr. Gromyko, with his cryptic smile, went along with them, no doubt chuckling in private at the naivety of the Western leaders in thinking that they could bar Russia from having a stake in the Middle East. Ten years later, I was present and our Secretary-General was present too. Some of you at least were present in 1956. I am not reading from books: I am citing facts. Ten years later Mr. Krushchev, supporting the Arab case, articulated his famous threat in the United Nations General Assembly to destroy those States that committed aggression against Egypt in collusion with Israel. Were it not for the wise policy of Mr. Dulles in those days the world might have been blown up through some miscalculation and we would not be here.

116. Mr. Gromyko had proven himself the winner in the game on the chequer-board of international power politics.

The door which Mr. Truman and others had hoped to slam in the face of the Soviet Union fell away from its hinges, and one does not have to look with a microscope for the Soviet presence all over the Middle East. Soviet warships are in the Eastern Mediterranean, in the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, and some Russian sailors, I am told, have been enjoying cruises on the *Shat-al-Arab*, the confluence of the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Soviet military, economic and technical assistance in most Arab countries has outpaced assistance from the West. But that is not all. The northern tier of the Western defences in the Middle East has crumbled. The Soviet Union had developed friendly relations with its southern neighbours of the Middle East. All of them happen to be Moslem States bound by brotherly ties with Arab Moslem neighbours. The Russians no longer have to do any leap-frogging, as it was called, over that northern tier. They are in the Middle East. They strolled easily and they are navigating in the waters surrounding the area. If Mr. Gromyko were familiar with Mr. Robert Browning's famous poem, *Rabbi Ben Ezra*, he would gleefully recite: "Grow old along with me; the best is yet to be."

117. Unabashedly, certain Western Governments still support this artificial State in our midst which caused all this trouble. They allow themselves to be swayed by Zionist pressure, and I am sure that the Western Powers would not take exception to seeing the whole of the Arab countries go up in flames in order to light the cigarette of Israel. Mr. Truman and his allies wanted to keep Russia out of the Middle East. Mr. Gromyko is no longer smiling cryptically as he had done at Lake Success, where a Russian success was scored by a vote for the partition of Palestine. He must be laughing wholeheartedly these days, to himself, if not in public, and he who laughs last laughs best. But the situation in the Middle East is not a laughing matter. Who knows? The situation may deteriorate and it may ignite the spark that will blow up the whole world. Zionism will then have succeeded in destroying mankind in the style of the infuriated, blind Samson, who flourished and perished in the land of the Biblical Philistines—the Philistines who gave their name to Palestine. This is no laughing matter. We sit here and read statements and receive instructions from our Governments, but the stakes are high in the Middle East. The balance of power is not very stable. With the lethal weapons of today, God knows what may happen tomorrow: there will be no more Jews or Gentiles left to weep. This is a serious matter. Do not take it lightly. The four Powers meet. One of their representatives is familiar with our area: Lord Caradon. The others know about it by hearsay and the reports of experts, but here comes a man from the area who has been seized of these problems for the past 49 years to tell you time and again of the danger, and you dismiss what he is saying as nothing to merit serious thought.

118. Why? Because we do not exercise power. But if those who exercise power do not heed the lessons of history they will fall, and their fall will be great. What irony it would be if Jerusalem, the City of Peace, were to ignite the spark that would blow up this world. Why? Because the Middle East is at the crossroads of three continents. It is the gate from the West to the whole continent of Asia. As if we did not have sufficient warning from what has gone on

in the eastern gate of Asia—at one time in Korea and now in Viet-Nam. If giant Asia, the Asian people, that dormant giant, becomes conscious that it has been maltreated by Westerners throughout the last few centuries, who knows what the consequences may be?

119. How is it that this small State of Israel, a European State with which the Arabs are not only at loggerheads but engaged in perpetual conflict—which is deplorable because it involves the loss of life, quite often the innocent lives of Jews and Gentiles—a State established by a handful of leaders from Eastern and Central Europe, can lord it not only over the Arab Middle East but over the the whole world? Again I am not going to read from the pages of history. I will cite facts to you because I have lived here in the United Nations for 23 years with this question.

120. After the Second World War two world Powers emerged, the United States and the Soviet Union, and we are caught in the power politics between those two giants. Again we go back to what Mr. Truman did after the British threw the Palestine question into the lap of the United Nations. Mr. Truman counted on the United States Jewish vote to win the election in 1948. No wonder that, aside from the pressure he exercised on foreign Governments that needed United States financial assistance in the wake of the Second World War; he was the first Chief of State to recognize Israel before Israel declared its independence through Mr. Weizmann. But more important than all of this: during his four years in office—I am talking of those years between 1948 and 1952 because he had served as President after Mr. Roosevelt's death in 1945—at the time when the Israeli population did not exceed 1 million, Mr. Truman disbursed to Israel from the so-called Point Four and other economic programmes as much as that for five Arab States put together, namely, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, in assistance from the same source, from the United States, although the aggregate population of those five Arab countries was more than 45 times that of the artificial Jewish State.

121. But that is not all. Israel was bolstered financially with subventions exceeding \$1,500 million—and that is a conservative estimate—by none other than the United Jewish Appeal of America. Is it any wonder that the United States has developed such an adverse balance of payments? The hard-earned money of the taxpayers is bountifully distributed so that Palestinians—and I mean by Palestinians the indigenous people of Palestine—should continue to be usurped of their homeland. Philanthropically the United Jewish Appeal of America erodes the value of the dollar by exporting millions upon millions of dollars to Israel whilst the United States Government is continually endeavouring to adopt stringent measures to ameliorate its balance of payments. Only last year Mr. Johnson's administration was seriously thinking of placing restrictions on travel abroad in order to restrain the relentless outflow of dollars from this country. The American people were exhorted to discover the beauties—I mean the scenic, natural beauties—of their own country, to help their own balance of payments. This is precisely what the British are doing, patriotically. Each traveller abroad is not allowed more than £50. An old lady I have known for the past 40 years was sick and had to go to Lugano. She is a British citizen. She asked me if I could

lend her a few pounds—she is in her eighties—until the department in charge of tourism in London could approve her request for more funds to be converted into Swiss francs so that she might continue to get medical care where she was staying.

122. But what do the American Jewish agencies do here year in year out? They export millions upon millions of dollars abroad and further weaken the purchasing power of the at-one-time mighty dollar. It is not so mighty any more. In 1939 I could purchase with a quarter what I have to pay one dollar for today. The American taxpayer is continuously burdened with the assistance that is being lavishly proffered to Israel officially and the taxpayer's dollar is being relentlessly eroded by the ever-flowing stream of munificent contributions made to Israel. The result of all this is that the situation has got so far out of hand that American banks are borrowing Eurodollars abroad at usurious interest rates—at 10 or 11 1/2 per cent; the latest quotation, a week ago, was 11 1/2 per cent—to bring those dollars back home from abroad. Those dollars have been swiftly flowing out of the country for the purpose, *inter alia*, of keeping the usurping State of Israel solvent in the Middle East. At whose expense? At the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine, who were robbed of their right of self-determination. Certain States are accused of squandering thousands of millions of dollars to land on the moon and explore other planets in our solar system. But it is their business if they wish to do so, and such expenditures, exorbitant as they are, can be considered as falling within their own national jurisdiction. But when those self-same States make available a great splurge of funds for Israel—Israel, which is still lording it over the Arab population that has been trodden underfoot—I think I may be permitted to say that this question does not any longer fall within the domestic jurisdiction of States. He who abets the aggressor or usurper should be deemed equally responsible.

123. This question of aggression is a most intricate subject. One might say it is a vicious circle of cause and effect, or an interminable chain of action and reaction. But if you go to the genesis of the Palestine issue, you will find that the cause of the aggression in Palestine came from outside the region, namely from the Judaized Chazars or Ashkenazim of Eastern and Central Europe—Europeans—supported by Zionists in all Christendom, especially those in Western Europe and in the United States and other parts of the New World. Hence, the main cause, nay, the whole cause of the trouble stems initially from Europe.

124. You see the parallel between Zionism and the Crusades now? Both are European movements. Palestine under the banner of Zionism is the source of the tragedy. These Europeans were Ashkenazim, not Sephardim. The Sephardim are our own people; they are Jews, but our own people. You, Mr. Tekoah, you Zionists, are Ashkenazim. European Ashkenazim intruded into Palestine under the banner of Zionism just as centuries before the Christian European hordes swarmed over Palestine by land and by sea, mostly from Western Europe, allegedly—again I must say this—to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels. The infidels were those indigenous people of Palestine, many of whom had originally been Jews. Those

infidels considered Jesus one of their most revered prophets.

125. All this incidentally, was when America belonged to the Red Indians. I am talking of the era of the Crusades. And where are the Red Indians now? Mostly in reservations. Before he left office Mr. Johnson, the former President of the United States, appealed to the American people to contribute generously to improving the lot of the Red Indians, whose standard of living is far below that enjoyed by the white population. Other voices, official and unofficial, have been concurrently raised for the amelioration of the economic, social and cultural conditions of the Negro population of this country, of our host country. All this clamour is as it should be and deserves our praise. But all those ardent and vociferous appeals made on behalf of the Red Indians and the Negro Americans are being made when hundreds of millions of dollars have been systematically siphoned off from the New World into the Zionist State which was foisted upon the indigenous people of Palestine. What a sad commentary on Mr. Wilson's principle of self-determination formulated at the Versailles Conference in 1919. What a sad commentary too on the principle of self-determination that was enshrined in the United Nations Charter in 1945.

126. In 1919, the indigenous people of Palestine constituted 94 per cent of the population of that land. And what does our colleague Mr. Tekoah speak of here? He speaks of the "discrimination" of the Arabs against the Jews. Ninety-four per cent of the indigenous people of Palestine driven out, most of them, from their homes—is this not discrimination? And where do we find the natives of Palestine now, the natives who have been usurped of their homeland? They are huddled together in camps as refugees, kept alive on a paltry daily ration amounting to six or seven cents per person. I think the Red Indians fare better in their reservations. I think that here a person who has an income of \$3,000 a year is considered poor. But for the Arabs, six or seven cents a day is quite enough. The irony of the whole sad situation is that the biggest share in keeping those refugees alive is contributed by American and Western Europeans. They are being kept in a perpetual state of claustrophobia, cooped up as they are in miserable camps.

127. Why do they not go and bundle up with their other Arab brethren? Why does not Germany take Austria? They are both ethnologically the same—they speak the same language. The Austrians do not want to be absorbed. The Germans tried to absorb them during the *Anschluss*. The Palestinians have a personality of their own, like the Syrians, like the Lebanese, like the Egyptians, like the Iraqis. It is their land. We have no right to tell them to go and live with their cousins. Why do not some of the States of the new hemisphere, for example, Canada, say that there should be a union between Canada and the United States? The Canadians are Canadians. Most of them speak English and most of them came from Europe, as did most of the Americans. In your area, Mr. President, why could not Honduras, for example, say to El Salvador, or Costa Rica say to another State, "Come let us bundle up together and lose our nationalities"? That would be ideal if one day it came to pass. Then there would be unity among us. But we

have not arrived at that stage yet. Why do you want the Palestinians to go and bundle up with the Arab States? Is it just to make room for the European Zionists who came and exploited the land? What logic is there in that argument? And who foots the bill for Israel's adventure, which is glorious to the Zionists and perfidious to the Palestinians? Who is actually footing the bill for this adventure, or misadventure? For indeed, whether it is glorious or perfidious is beside the point. Who is footing the bill? It is the European and American taxpayers who, although considered affluent by world standards of living, are burdened by interminable debts and live under constant fear and tension, to such an extent that thousands upon thousands in the Western world today hope to escape from their plight by resorting to addictive sedatives, sedative drugs, whether obtained by prescription or from pushers.

128. Leave us alone: we are evolving our own traditions and customs in the Middle East. Why do you want to intrude upon us from the West, or from America or from any part of the world for that matter? And who foots the bill for all this imbroglio in the Middle East? It is also the people of the Middle East who are footing the bill, and they are suffering in trying to expel this extraneous Zionist element from their midst, as they did centuries ago in trying to get rid of the European marauders, not necessarily by slaughtering them but by assimilating the remnants that did not return to their native lands. Many remnants of those crusaders were Arabized. They forgot even their native tongues.

129. We do not have to define aggression in the Sixth Committee to see who is to blame for the trouble in the Middle East, of which Jerusalem is now the focus. We do not have to go into the dialectic of cause and effect or any obscurantist arguments in searching for a peaceful solution for the Middle East problem. The cause is simply the incursion of a European Zionist element in the body politic and body social of the Middle East. The effect has been a strong reaction to that cause. What happened to the Crusaders? They were swept away, as I said before, by the winds of history. If Israel persists in its aggression in Jerusalem and elsewhere, it no doubt will be blown up as a State by the hurricane of the turbulent future. Many Jews and Arabs will perish in the holocaust, but short of a war that may bring about total annihilation, the surviving Jews and Arabs of Palestine will have no choice but to live with one another as brothers under the common flag, not of Israel but—if they do not want the name "Palestine" because it was associated with the word "Philistine"—of humanism. Humanism is the only true "ism". All the other "isms" are suspicious. Today the world can afford only one "ism": humanism. Even patriotism is now considered as the refuge of scoundrels. Humanism is the only solution.

130. I have a brief word to say not to my Jewish friends but to the Jews who have written to me. They have written me many letters which I have received in my office. I want to draw their attention to a matter so that one day they may not be made the scapegoat in any society that may run berserk—not because of the Jews, but because of tensions and greed and the scramble for economic advantages among nations to the extent that millions are sent like sheep to the slaughter houses. In the year 1903 at the time when the

United Kingdom was worried about the Zionist movement—I am speaking of 1903 and not 1917—when, after the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, none other than Balfour, had appointed a Royal Commission on Aliens, he said in Parliament: “A state of things could easily be imagined in which it would not be to the advantage of civilization, of this country, that there should be an immense body of ‘persons’—parenthetically, I should say that the Jews numbered 250,000 of a population of 42 million in Britain in those days—“who, however patriotic, able and industrious and however they threw themselves into the national life, still by their own action remained a people apart and not merely held a religion differing from the vast majority of their fellow countrymen, but only intermarried among themselves.” That was a problem in 1903.

131. Fourteen years later, Balfour declared his scheme for a national home for the Jews in Palestine. Is that significant? I wonder sometimes whether the Balfour of 1903 was the same as the Balfour of 1917. I got that from British records, Lord Caradon. Maybe he wanted to get rid of those Jews; I do not know. But still, if you go back and think of things, Balfour was related to the Roseberrys, and I think the Roseberrys were the uncles of Balfour, and one of the Roseberrys was married to a Jewess, but he was more British, I think, than Jewish.

132. I said that I would quote freely from Mr. Litvinoff's book so as to bring home to my Jewish friends outside these halls, and also to those who think that Zionism has a case in the United Nations, that they should think twice and report to their Governments that the question is a very serious one. Mr. Litvinoff says: “The Jews as a whole are a peculiar people. Israel reborn is in many respects a peculiar State.” He then says: “Zionism was only one of the solutions, if the most obvious, put forward to cure the Jewish problem in the nineteenth century.” Did the Arabs create this problem? It is the Europeans who created the problem. Should we pay the price—we, the indigenous people of the Middle East?

133. But Mr. Litvinoff continues:

“The majority”—meaning the Jews—“preferred either assimilation or emigration to established States, or social revolution at home, as the means to give the Jews equality in the world. Their reasoning was in part logical, in part instinctive. They desired to break loose from religion, not to become enclosed by it, for the Jews were secularizing their society. One aspect of Jewish ghettoization was Jewish self-hatred.”

Nobody hates the Jews; it seems here that they hate themselves, sometimes. Litvinoff continues:

“After many centuries of inbreeding, of choking in confined places, of dressing, behaving, speaking differently from their neighbours, was it not time that the Jews ceased to be preoccupied with themselves and merged with peoples of the world?”

The Jews have been happy wherever they have gone because after the Dreyfus affair, and also after a lot of

discrimination against them, many laws were enacted in Europe whereby they were even given privileges, as if to wash away the guilt of past centuries when the Jews were discriminated against in Europe.

134. I am sorry that I have taken so much of the Council's time, but I want to show members of the Council how the Zionists operate and get that influence which they wield all over the world. I shall quote from liberal Jewish authors. Again, as I said, I have to depend on the latest book on the Jewish people—Litvinoff's book.

“The American Jewish Committee”—says Mr. Litvinoff—“threw itself whole-heartedly into the task of helping Israel without surrendering by one scintilla its view that Israel had no right to intervene in the affairs of Jewish America.”

Many Jews whom I know were embarrassed by the pressures exerted by Zionism on them.

“Blaustein was one of the few Americans of great wealth to back Harry Truman for the White House in 1948, though it was Eisenhower who sent him to the United Nations as a member of the United States delegation to the UN. Like the B'nai Brith, the Committee”—meaning the American Jewish Committee—“strongly took the stand in its early days that racial oppression . . . was a Jewish issue.”

I knew Mr. Blaustein personally: he was with me in the same Committee, the Third Committee. He was a most mild-mannered gentleman of very few words when he served his country, the United States, incidentally, in that Committee. I was told he was one of the wealthiest men in the host country, which explains why he was a man of very few words. His wealth spoke for him. Money is more eloquent than speech. No wonder the French have a phrase for it: “*L'argent fait tout.*” But I must say that Mr. Blaustein was not “stuck” on himself on account of his fortune: he liked art; but I think he made a mistake by donating that cock-eyed sculpture in front of the United Nations. My good friend Mr. Bunche told me there were pressures to consider it as a great work of art. I don't understand that cock-eyed sculpture. Maybe I am old-fashioned. Mr. Blaustein donated that sculpture.

135. But here again Mr. Litvinoff says:

“Such, too, is Jewish America, the young lions of the underground hipster Press loading LSD and taking sex as far as print will carry it while calling for revolutions all round”—that is on the one hand—“and the sturdy upholders of State Department Americanism waving their colours and shaking their fists at Communism in all its forms.”

These Jewish factions may fight tooth and nail among themselves but when it comes to rationalizing Israel's aggression they are all one. Of course, we Arabs do the same thing: we may fight like cats and dogs among ourselves, but when it comes to the invader—who happens to be Israel here—we are all one, too. This is human nature.

I am showing you why Zionism exerts such world influence. Again Mr. Litvinoff speaks:

“Every known publicity device blares to imply that by giving to the United Jewish Appeal a man is a better American and a better Jew. Israeli citizens, from the rank of cabinet minister downward, are brought over on speaking tours and at important meetings they are paired off with accommodating Senators, whose fees reach \$1,000 a speech.”

I think that is not much; I was once offered \$2,000 to speak, but I refused. And it will be known that all the Senator has to do—and this is my comment—is to scintillate his personality, dine and wine, and only read a speech which is written for him by a ghost writer, and the ghost writer most probably is a Zionist. Now, this is the United States, one of the Western countries that support Zionism—not only in 1947; we are talking about the present.

136. Let us see what Britain has been doing. Mr. Barnett Litvinoff, who is a British subject, says:

“Jewish representation in the House of Commons comprised 38 Labourites and 2 Conservatives in 1968. This was 9 more than the number of Catholics, who are 14 times as numerous in Britain.”

Is it any wonder they exercise a great deal of influence on the Government of the United Kingdom, a Western country? But here is the upshot of it all. On page 161 Mr. Litvinoff says: “The reason why the Jews of Britain do not choose to live in Israel is that in general they are happy where they are.” These are good Jews. I suppose that some of them can enjoy non-Kosher breakfasts of bacon and eggs without being watched—aside from their prosperity from the department stores and chain stores they own, like Marks and Spences, and being exclusive dealers in gold bullion and finance. More power to them. Why not? They know their business. But these people stay in the United Kingdom. They do not pester us in our part of the world.

137. Now I going to do some leap-frogging across the Channel to France. Mr. Litvinoff says “Politicians in France have astonishingly started to woo the Jewish vote.” Of course this was after General De Gaulle stepped down. But why should I always quote Mr. Litvinoff? Why not quote a very respectable newspaper, *Le Monde*? *Le Monde* wrote that in six months, a committee to raise \$2 million for Viet-Nam has collected just over \$250,000 and considered that a success; but in three days the Jewish Solidarity Fund for Israel had passed the \$2 million mark. The best rally for peace in Viet-Nam, which had been in preparation for six months, had brought together 3,000 delegates from all parts of the country. On 31 May, there were some 30,000 people gathered before the Israeli Embassy in Paris, although this meeting had been improvised 24 hours before. How can we Arabs expect that you will render justice to the people of Palestine, when the Zionists are so influential in your own countries? We are wasting our time here.

138. Now I want to come to the Russians and the Soviet Union. I will start with Russia of the Tsarist days. Again we go back to Mr. Litvinoff. I happened to know the original

Mr. Litvinoff, the Foreign Minister, in Europe. He was a great Foreign Minister and, incidentally, he was a Jew. I do not know whether he professed Judaism. He was a great Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. I am quoting from Barnett, the British Litvinoff, not from the Foreign Minister. He says:

“The forces that first illicitly, and then openly, worked for the overthrow of the Czars found the Jews flocking to their ranks, and entire branches of the Communist Party were made of these Yiddish-speaking Yevketsias.”

That is from page 72. On page 74 Mr. Litvinoff goes on to inform us:

“If the Jews were in the main behind the Revolution, they were not always out and out Leninists. Some of them . . . considered the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of March 1918 to be a surrender to the capitalist world. They wanted the war against Germany resumed, and when they sought to assassinate Lenin it was a Jewess, Dora Kaplan, who volunteered to fire the pistol. The leader was wounded and never fully recovered.”

139. I wish the United States had not closed its doors to the European immigrants in 1924, for many of the Jews who considered themselves oppressed could then have come to this country. I remember that in the 1920s also Brazil, Argentina and many other Latin American countries closed the immigration doors in the faces of the Italians, and that produced Mussolini. They shut the door in their faces in the big continent and then helped them to colonize. The United States shut the door in 1924 in the face of the Jews and it supported them in 1947 in the colonization of Palestine. Even Stalin wanted the mass of Jews concentrated in Leningrad, Moskovia and Odessa to be far from the centres of influence, which explains his launching of the project for the Jewish Republic of Biro-Bidjan. All this happened after Zionism was launched in the early twentieth century, and we have to pay the price. Not only the Palestinians, the whole Arab East is in turmoil, and the whole Middle East may yet suffer. This is very significant in showing how our American friends who are of Jewish faith look upon this experiment of Israel. Mr. Litvinoff again speaks:

“Of the many thousands of American Jews who have visited Israel, few decided to make their homes there, but when an Israeli comes to America, either to work or as a tourist or as a student or even perhaps as a Zionist emissary, it is by no means certain that he will return home.”

Many Jews consider that this is their promised land, not the biblical one. America is the promised land, not Jerusalem, not Palestine. Why do the American Jews come back? Because they have a better life here. Zionism is a European movement not too dissimilar from the Crusades, but I submit it is an anachronism.

140. The Soviet Union is being blamed for supplying arms to a number of Arab countries. The Arab countries would not have needed any arms had there not been a State of Israel in their midst. Let us see how this arms game works. I

am preparing myself on the arms game so that I may address myself to the question of disarmament in the General Assembly's First Committee next fall. These are stray notes, but here are some more facts that should be noted. We find that Britain sold to Israel 250 Centurions, and all of Israel's naval vessels were bought from Britain. Until 1967 Edmond de Rothschild, the French banker, supplied or financed Israel with arms purchased from France. It took a courageous man like de Gaulle to say that this arms race would finally plunge the whole Middle East into flames. I read in the newspapers now that France is considering supplying arms to Israel again. In 1956 Israel used twenty-five P-51 Mustangs in their war against Egypt, bought from a very neutral State, Sweden, a Western State. From February 1965 to February 1966 the United States sold arms secretly to Israel while professing to be neutral. But that is not all. West Germany has sold American arms through the back door to Israel since 1960 when the late Chancellor Adenauer met with Mr. Ben-Gurion secretly and when we Arabs were at peace with Germany. "We are going to be neutral in this case" the Germans assured us but they were meeting secretly with Israelis and making deals through the back door. That is the Western world. The Germans sold arms to the tune of \$80 million, including 200 tanks. All of this, I repeat, was done secretly and at the instigation of the Government of the host country.

141. Do you want me to reproduce the origin of those facts? It is too late at this hour to reproduce the origin. I have no secret agents. There are Americans who are fed up and make documents available to us, just as some British friends made documents available to us about the Balfour Declaration when I was researching the question in the 1930s in Chancery Lane, where the British archives are kept. Certain documents were not made available to me because at that time 50 years had not elapsed. Baroody is not speaking off the top of his head: he has been seized of this problem for about half a century.

142. I never thought of the Germans as being hypocritical—because they were apt to be blunt even before Hitler. If the Germans like a person they tell him they like him: if they do not like him they may even tell him, "We hate you." But they learned from other Western countries how to justify or rationalize such help given to Israel. The Germans labelled the assistance to Israel, namely selling arms secretly, as a moral debt. And their industrialists were coming to our part of the world and saying, "How we feel for you in all this intrusion, this invasion of Zionism into your midst". How can we believe anybody any more?

143. I do not think that there is any rancour or hatred in my heart towards the Jews, or for that matter any hatred or animosity against the Israelis, because, after all they are human beings. But it is the law of life that when somebody aggresses against somebody else, the one who is aggressed against should react in self-defence. Now Israel is drunk with the glory of its achievements, not only in war but in its technical achievements at home—because, after all, the Zionists came from a different area to ours.

144. But what shall we do here in the Council? Shall we pass another resolution? Shall we engage in longer deliberations? Shall we keep talking—I have cited the proverbs of

Solomon—when talk means penury and action is needed? Are the big Powers prepared to take matters into their hands and see that justice is done? Or shall we be false witnesses, as we have been for several years, in the era of the United Nations, about what is happening in the Far East, as if that part of Asia were outside the scope of the United Nations? Shall we hold sinecure jobs representing our respective Governments, attending cocktail parties, being dined and wined? Our diplomatic corps consists of conscientious persons who sometimes unfortunately have to act against their own conscience because of strict instructions from their Governments.

145. If I have taken the floor today it is because I feel myself responsible not only towards the Government I represent, but also towards this Organization which I have served in my humble capacity. Nobody wants to kill the Jews or the Israelis, and I am sure that the Jews of Israel in their innermost heart feel that they would be guilty if they were to kill more Arabs, because they, the Israelis were the original intruders.

146. What shall we do? I repeat what I said before. I hope that the leaders of Israel will come to their senses and realize that they cannot continue in this manner to defy—not the United Nations; they have too many friends in the United Nations—to defy a 100 million Arabs, on the one hand, as far as Palestine is concerned, and 600 million Moslems, on the other hand, as far as Jerusalem is concerned. If I were a Jew myself I would let the better part of wisdom rule my judgement.

147. But it is only natural that the Zionists, drunk as they are at present with power, would heed no advice, especially from someone who hails from that area. The leaders of Israel are European. I know, for one thing, that many Jews now living in Israel would like to see things work out in a different manner; they would like to forget about this ideology imported into the Middle East and, even though some of them may be from Europe, live with their Arab neighbours as brothers if they so choose—not necessarily under the Palestinian flag, but as people who are prompted by religious sentiments. They would like to live side by side with the Arabs, in cantons, or in a bi-national State, until perhaps there occurs a re-evaluation in these climactic days when moral values are being redefined, not necessarily outside the context of the monotheistic religions but in a manner that will keep abreast of the social and economic developments of the world. For it is only then that there will be peace in Palestine, only then will peace return to the Holy City of Jerusalem. Otherwise, I am not sure that the City of Jerusalem will not be destroyed, just as it was destroyed before by other Europeans: I refer to the time when the Temple of Solomon was razed to the ground.

148. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As I have no further speakers on my list I now propose, with the consent of the Council, to adjourn this meeting.

149. Before doing so, however, I should like to add a few words. First, a few words of explanation, although I realize they may perhaps be unnecessary. Nevertheless, I prefer to make the point explicitly. I invited the representatives of Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Morocco to

take the seats reserved for them in this chamber solely because there is not enough room at the Council table for all of them to be seated there at the same time. In doing so, I have followed the precedent established by long practice in the Security Council.

150. The following words are of a personal nature. A few hours from now the period during which I have had the honour and responsibility of presiding over the Security Council will come to an end. I wish on this occasion to express my sincerest thanks to each and every member of

the Council for the unreserved co-operation I have been given in the discharge of my duties.

151. The next meeting of the Council, to continue the consideration of the item we have discussed today, is scheduled for tomorrow, Tuesday, 1 July, at 3 p.m., under the presidency of the representative of Senegal, who will be President for the month of July.

*The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.*