



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SIXTH YEAR

1580th MEETING: 16 SEPTEMBER 1971

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1580)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 13 September 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10313);	
(b) Reports of the Secretary-General (S/8052, S/8146, S/9149 and Add.1, S/9537, and S/10124 and Add.1 and 2)	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.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 16 September 1971, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Toru NAKAGAWA (Japan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, China, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1580)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 13 September 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10313);
 - (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (S/8052, S/8146, S/9149 and Add.1, S/9537, and S/10124 and Add.1 and 2).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 13 September 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10313);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (S/8052, S/8146, S/9149 and Add.1, S/9537, and S/10124 and Add.1 and 2)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken this morning [1579th meeting], I shall, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Jordan, Egypt and Israel to take places at the Security Council table in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: I have just received a letter dated 16 September [S/10321] from the representative of Mali in which he requests to be invited to participate in the current discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, and with the consent of the Council, I would suggest that, in view of the limited seating at the Council table, he be invited to

take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite the representative of Mali to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. Traore (Mali) took the place reserved for him in the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will continue its discussion of the item on its agenda. The first name on the list of speakers for this meeting is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

4. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, allow me to express to you my delegation's highest respect and best wishes in your high office.

5. In the dark ages, when Europe was still covered with primeval forests and marshes, when superstition was rampant and the law was in the hands of robber-barons, the Jewish people, conquered by foreign invaders and uprooted from its homeland, found itself dispersed in various lands where Jews became bearers of an ancient but advanced civilization, forerunners of medicine, science and finance. In those days when disasters of war, flood, famine or plague befell the local population it was not unusual for rulers to try and divert the grief and wrath of the populace by directing them against the Jews in its midst.

6. It seems that the Hashemite Kingdom is not averse to resorting to such retrograde methods. Apparently its rulers believe that their internal difficulties—the bloodshed which has engulfed the land, the conflict with other Arab States, the armed clashes with the Syrian Army, the closing of borders and the severance of diplomatic relations—can all be offset by a show of hostility towards Israel. This is an old, primitive method; it has never succeeded in concealing the real problems and calamities. It has always brought only disrepute upon those who resorted to it. The Jordanian Government can hardly expect that a frivolous complaint against peace and progress in Jerusalem would camouflage the malaise Jordan finds itself in at present.

7. From atop the Judean hills, Jerusalem has watched and lived 3,000 years of history; it has known peace and war, destruction and rebuilding; it has seen a multitude of conquerors pass through its gates and settle within its walls. Throughout all times, however, it has been the centre of life of only one nation—the Jews. It has been the capital of only one State—the Jewish State. There would have been

no Jewish people without Jerusalem; no Jewish culture or religion without Jerusalem. There would have been no rebirth of Israel without Jerusalem. Equally, there would have been no Jerusalem were it not for the Jewish people. Eventually the City acquired a spiritual sanctity for Christianity and Islam. With its Holy Places it became the seat of numerous churches and mosques and other religious institutions. However, only in the history of the Jewish people has it held at all times an unrivalled national and religious primacy, making Jewish life inseparable from Jerusalem.

8. Throughout history Jerusalem has preserved its unity and integrity. Except for the transitory occupation of its eastern sector by Jordan, it has always been one: in its fate, in its glory and in its sacredness. In an existence encompassing millenia there were 19 years—only 19 years—of forced, tragic division. They are gone, a grim, painful episode in the life of the Eternal City. Once ended, that dark episode of warped langour can no longer overshadow the City's natural state and its normal life. Jerusalem is its true self again. It is for this Jerusalem that Israel stands; it is of this Jerusalem that I speak.

9. Universally revered for its Holy Places, Jerusalem is at the same time a living city. It is the home of close to 300,000 inhabitants, three-quarters of whom are Jews. These citizens are following the proceedings in the Security Council with understandable wonderment. Indeed, it is a cause for amazement that the State which brought so much suffering upon the City should find it possible to try and harass Jerusalem again. Jordan—which invaded Jerusalem in 1948, in violation of the Charter and United Nations resolutions, seized its eastern sector, destroyed the entire Jewish Quarter of the Old City and uprooted all its inhabitants—is now trying to invade the City's right to normal existence, to reconstruction and development. Jerusalem's citizens categorically reject this intrusion.

10. No one can question their right to natural growth, to the clearance of slums and the construction of new housing—especially not an aggressor State guilty of grave crimes against the City. Jerusalem's citizens are not pawns to be trifled with in a game of international belligerency in which the welfare of their City and the rights of its population are cynically brushed aside. They will not be sacrificed on the altar of Jordan's internal political squabbles. The men, women and children of Jerusalem have the same rights as the citizens of any other city in the world. They refuse to have their lives tampered with and dissected by those who mercilessly trampled them into dust.

11. They do not regard the Security Council or other organs of the United Nations as forums appropriate for the examination of questions concerning the City's life. The United Nations, its General Assembly and the Security Council have displayed singular disinterest in Jerusalem's welfare at the most trying and crucial moments. When the Arab States invaded Israel in 1948 and besieged Jerusalem, the United Nations abandoned them to their own resources and left them to fight for their lives alone. When Jordanian and Egyptian guns rained fire and death on the City, endangering the very existence of its Holy Places, the Security Council did not evince much concern. And it

remained silent when the Jordanians eliminated the Jewish population of the Old City and razed to the ground all its Jewish houses of worship and institutions of learning.

12. The Security Council did not lift a finger when the ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives was defiled and destroyed and its tombstones carted away for the construction of sidewalks and latrines in Jordanian army camps. Where was the Security Council when, during 19 years, Jordan, in breach of its explicit international undertakings, prohibited access to the Holy Places of Judaism and barred Israeli Moslems from sites holy to Islam? Where was it when the Jordanian troops of occupation subjected Jerusalem to a reign of terror, repeatedly opening fire and killing innocent residents and visitors in its western sector? Where was the Security Council when in June 1967 Jordan used the occupied part of Jerusalem to launch an assault on Israel? There were no Security Council meetings to prevent or stop Jordan's crimes against Jerusalem's peace, sacredness and integrity. There was no Security Council action to protect Jerusalem's citizens from armed threat and attack.

13. Now that the city is no longer divided by barbed wire and minefields, now that it is secure and peaceful, the Security Council is mobilized in an attempt to advise Jerusalem to stop healing its wounds, to bar progress, to stifle growth.

14. For generations Jerusalem's Jewish majority and its Arab minority lived side by side—for generations. Since the removal in 1967 of the barriers which had separated the two communities during the period of Jordanian occupation, Jews and Arabs are again living and working together. Arab and Jewish labourers are employed in the same enterprises. Thousands of Arab workers have become members of the Israeli Labour Federation—the Histadrut. They are no longer exploited as they were under Jordanian rule. Joint Arab-Jewish commercial and industrial ventures are being launched all the time. There are joint cultural and sports clubs, joint artistic performances. Jewish and Arab citizens alike participated in the municipal elections of 1969. The number of Arab voters was three times larger than in the elections organized by the Jordanian authorities.

15. There is freedom of the press to a degree unknown in the Arab States. Two Arabic dailies are published in East Jerusalem. In Arabic schools, the pupils have the choice of preparing themselves for Jordanian or Israeli matriculation examinations.

16. The Qadi, the Moslem Religious Justice, of Ramallah, a town on the west bank in the vicinity of Jerusalem, reacted on 27 May 1971 to the Jordanian attempts to distort the situation in Jerusalem. He declared:

“Doesn't the Jordanian Government realize that Jerusalem is practically a united city, that commerce is flourishing and Arab businessmen make a lot of money, that thousands of Arab workers work in Israel, apply to Israeli courts and join the Histadrut?”

17. An impressive reflection of the situation in Jerusalem is to be found in the number of tourists who visit the city

annually. In 1967, 291,000 visitors to Israel toured Jerusalem; in 1968, 432,000; in 1969, 410,000; and last year, 437,000. Moreover, there are tens of thousands of Arab tourists from neighbouring Arab countries who come to Jerusalem. This summer the number of Arab visitors to Jerusalem from Arab States was more than 100,000.

18. Is this a situation that threatens international peace, as alleged by Jordan? Could there be an allegation more baseless?

19. As in every large city, especially one with a heterogeneous population, Jerusalem has its occasional public security problems. These however are rare and the measures adopted to cope with them most infrequent and limited, as compared with police measures in other parts of the world, or with Jordan's recent actions against its own citizens, and with the extreme acts of repression which the Jordanian authorities were in the habit of carrying out before 1967 to maintain order in the all-Arab population of eastern Jerusalem. Thus, for instance, since 1967 nine Jordanian agents who have tried to encourage and organize violence have been ordered to leave the city and join their masters in Amman. The last time such a step proved necessary was two years ago. Two of those nine persons have in the meantime been allowed to return to the city. Nine houses used as terrorist bases have been demolished in accordance with laws in force since the British Mandatory Administration. The last demolition took place in May 1969 and none have occurred since.

20. The Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem still remember the treatment meted out to them by the Jordanian occupation forces. They remember for example how the Jordanian authorities handled the frequent strikes and demonstrations. They have not forgotten how in April 1963 the Jordanian army and police dispersed a demonstration by killing 11 and wounding 150 residents, including 17 girl-students. They remember how in another demonstration, on 24 November 1966, at least 20 were killed and many more wounded by the Jordanian forces. They know that the Jordanian authorities regarded themselves as occupation authorities and acted, throughout the entire period, brutally and mercilessly. They are of course aware of the fate of their brethren in Jordan today.

21. Jerusalem is a living, throbbing metropolis. It cannot be cordoned off from the world. Its natural growth, its municipal needs, its economic dynamism cannot be artificially garrotted. Its normal development cannot proceed in some fields and be unnaturally arrested in others. City planning and city construction are a normal and indispensable element in such development. They are proceeding in several directions. Essential services such as sanitation, public health, electricity, water, roads, and so on have been assured to all parts of the city. Slum reconstruction has begun, with tenants receiving in each case new housing or compensation adequate to acquire new housing. The concern for the social and aesthetic attributes of the city is not confined to slum clearance. The minefields which used to divide Jerusalem have become attractive parks. Under Jordanian occupation eastern Jerusalem did not have a single park, not a single playground for children. Today it has six parks and four playgrounds.

22. As for building activities, the most important work is that of the reconstruction of the Jewish Quarter destroyed by the Jordanians. The Quarter had always been inhabited by Jews. At the beginning of this century approximately 15,000 Jews lived in it. None remained after the Jordanians occupied it in 1948.

23. Abdallah el-Tal, the commander of the Jordanian forces that captured eastern Jerusalem, described its fate in his memoirs, published in Cairo in 1954. He stated: "The Jewish Quarter was destroyed. . . . For the first time in more than a thousand years not a single Jew remained in it."

24. The Catholic Archdeacon of Oxford, C. Witton-Davies, wrote in *The Tablet* of 12 June 1971:

"It was the Arab Legion that advanced on the Old City. . . . What followed? The senseless and shocking destruction of Jewish houses that could have been used temporarily for Arab refugees, and the obscene desecration of Jewish synagogues, some of them of great historical value and sanctity, simply because they were Jewish".

25. Now, were the Israeli authorities to leave this revered area in a state of ruin and degradation? In the name of what principle, on the basis of what law was the barbaric ravage of the Jewish Quarter to be preserved?

26. The ruins of the Quarter and the slums that had grown upon it, including the Moghrabi houses, have been cleared. The Arab tenants affected were offered new housing and compensation. All of them without exception have as a result of that relocation improved their living conditions. In letters to the Municipality they have expressed their appreciation of the manner in which that was done.

27. The area contained more than 60 synagogues and numerous religious institutions. Some of them were not only ancient but magnificent in their architecture. Their restoration is an act of manifest merit and propriety.

28. Second only to the reconstruction of the Jewish Quarter in historic, cultural and humanitarian significance comes the reconstruction of the Hebrew University campus and the Hadassah Hospital on Mount Scopus. When Jordan invaded Jerusalem in 1948 and occupied a part of it, it failed to dislodge Israel from Mount Scopus. Under the General Armistice Agreement of 1949 Israel retained possession of the Mount, which dominates the eastern district of the city. Jordan undertook to ensure free access to the humanitarian and cultural institutions on Mount Scopus and the resumption of their normal activities. The Jordanian Government refused, however, to implement that undertaking. The university and the hospital remained skeletons of structures guarded by Israeli units. Today those institutions are functioning again. The buildings have been restored. Some new ones have been added. The hospital will have 700 beds and will serve the entire Jewish and Arab population of the eastern and north-eastern part of the city.

29. Now, in accordance with Jordan's international obligations that should have been the situation even in the period

preceding 1967. Are we to be told that, now that Jordan's violations of its international obligations can no longer interfere with the normal operation and development of the university and hospital on Mount Scopus, Israel should nevertheless keep that area in a state of devastation and neglect? Jordan has proved over nineteen years its contempt for learning, for science, for medicine at the service of humanity. Is anyone at all to give serious regard to views sanctioning that contempt—views opposing the establishment of a new hospital wing, the construction of housing for doctors and nurses, professors and students, the creation of the International Truman Peace Center? How far should disregard for human values be allowed to run wild?

30. The third area of eastern Jerusalem in which building activities are taking place is Neve Yaakov. This Jewish-inhabited district was over-run by the Jordanian forces in 1948 and turned into an army encampment. Jews are now returning to it, building new houses, constructing new roads.

31. Then there is the construction of housing for Arab residents who lived in slums or in the ruins of the Jewish Quarter. Some of them have found housing in existing buildings. Others are settling in newly constructed houses. Under Jordanian rule there had been no public housing in eastern Jerusalem. Today several projects are under construction. One is under way in Wadi Joz, where a number of Arab families have already settled. Another is about to begin in the Beit Hanina district. The contractor and the architect are members of distinguished Arab families.

32. Other projects are destined to accommodate the growth of Jerusalem's population, Jewish as well as Arab. For that purpose 4,402 acres have been acquired in the last four years by the Government and the municipality. That was done in accordance with the Land (Acquisition for Public Purposes) Ordinance No. 24 of 1943, which has remained in force since the British mandatory period. A parallel law was in force under the Jordanian rule—the Land (Acquisition for Public Purposes) Law No. 2 of 1953.

33. Of the owners of the land thus acquired, 1,180 were Arabs and 2,140 Jews. The Jewish owners were actually affected more than the Arab owners. Though special care was taken to acquire land that was completely vacant, nevertheless there were on it 270 structures owned by Jews, as compared with thirty-five Arab-owned structures. The latter were in a deteriorated condition. They were inhabited by forty Arab families numbering about 240 persons. The Jewish structures were occupied partially by 485 Jewish families consisting of more than 3,000 persons and partially by stores, garages and workshops which provided living quarters for an additional 300 families. The owners of the land, Arabs and Jews, are being paid full compensation. The tenants are being relocated.

34. It is to be observed that housing construction is pursued largely on the basis of plans elaborated by the British administration during the Mandate period and suspended after the Jordanian invasion of 1948. However, contrary to the Jordanian allegations, there is no master plan. Construction is carried on in the conviction that

following the termination of Jordan's invasion the development of Jerusalem must once more proceed on its normal course, interrupted by war and the subsequent bisection of the city.

35. In view of the universal interests in the city the Mayor of Jerusalem has invited an international group of outstanding individuals in the fields of theology, architecture, art and letters, philosophy, archaeology, social sciences, and law to form an advisory board to aid the Municipality of Jerusalem and the Government of Israel in planning future development and especially housing construction. It was named the Jerusalem Committee.

36. The original 34 members of the Jerusalem Committee first met in Jerusalem in July 1969 and by December of that year the founding group had swelled to about 70 members. The discussions were lively, and the first statement published by the Committee stated, among other things:

"We found the city already deeply engaged in rehabilitation and reconstruction work as well as in archaeological exploration, with people of all ages from all over the world, contributing their knowledge and their energy to the task. . . . Our visit to Jerusalem convinced us that much of the work to be done is long overdue. To delay any longer the rehabilitation of the Wall, the clearance of slums and the protection of sites would do irreparable harm. The many essential values involved require immediate study and prompt action.

"The preparatory work of the authority is both valid and farsighted. . . . We believe that we must not succumb to the temptation of using the extraordinary wealth of tangible reminiscence of the past to make the City a museum or a stage set. Jerusalem must be kept a living city. . . . We suggest that the Municipality of Jerusalem be empowered to create an office of co-ordination to reconcile the divergencies and implement whatever plans it adopts. Past mistakes, such as the construction of a hotel on the top of Mount Olives, the construction of a hospital on the ridge of Mount Olives and the construction of a church which blocks the beautiful view of the Kidron Valley from the bridge (all three took place during the Jordanian administration of East Jerusalem) are sad examples of building in the wrong location and should help us to prevent similar mistakes in the future. Now that Jerusalem is, at last, freely accessible to all, we call upon all cultural and spiritual groups throughout the world to come here as we did for meetings and exchanges of views and join in the challenging and great adventure which lies ahead."

37. Among the founding members of the Jerusalem Committee were: Pasteur Marc Boegner, Past President, World Council of Churches; Reverend W. G. M. Brandful, President, Christian Council of Ghana; Professor Jacques Courvoisier, theologian and former rector, University of Geneva, Switzerland; Professor Oscar Cullmann, former rector, Basel University, Switzerland; His Eminence Diangienda, *Chef Spirituel de L'Eglise*, Kinshasa, Congo; the Reverend T. M. Hesburgh, President, University of Notre Dame, United States; Mr. Jorge Amado, author, Brazil;

Mr. Oskar Kokoschka, artist and author, Switzerland; Mr. Jacques Lipchitz, sculptor, United States; Henry Moore, O.M., sculptor, United Kingdom; Mr. Isamu Noguchi, sculptor and landscape architect, United States; Mr. Thomas Hoving, Director, Metropolitan Museum of Fine Arts, in New York; Mr. John Pope-Hennessy, Director, Victoria and Albert Museum, United Kingdom; Dr. Willem Sar 'Jberg, former Director, Municipal Museums of Amsterdam, Netherlands; Lord Goodman, Chairman of the Arts Council of Great Britain; Mr. Ernesto Sabato, author and philosopher, Argentina; Mr. Ignazio Silone, author, Italy; Mr. S.N. Tagore, author and political thinker, India; Mr. Luis Borges, author, Argentina; Mr. Geoffrey Bawa, architect, Ceylon; Professor Torgny Segerstedt, Rector Magnificus, University of Uppsala, Sweden; Mr. Manuel Aguilar, publisher, Spain; Maestro Pablo Casals, Puerto Rico; the Honourable Carlos Garcia, former President of the Philippines; Sir Robert Menzies, former Prime Minister of Australia; H.E. Vittorino Veronese, former Director-General, UNESCO, Chairman Italian Committee for Human Rights.

38. The town-planning sub-committee includes: Buckminster Fuller, Sir Philip Hendy, Louis I. Kahn, Isamu Noguchi, Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, Luigi Piccinato, Moshe Safdie and Bruno Zevi, and many other luminaries of architecture and town planning.

39. A declaration adopted on 10 June 1971 at a Conference of Catholic, Protestant and Evangelical leaders of the United States described the construction projects in Jerusalem as follows:

"Our inquiry into the question of public housing in the Old City and environs has convinced us that the construction of these buildings is a legitimate effort on the part of the Israeli Government to effectuate a renewal of certain slum areas of the City, to rehouse in new apartments Arabs from these quarters, to provide living space for a Jewish population increased by immigration, and to re-introduce a Jewish presence into the Old City from which it had been forcibly barred after the war of 1948. The development plans are in no sense designed to oust the Arabs, nor to 'suffocate' the Christian and Moslem population. While we are concerned about the sacred character of the City, we believe that this housing is sufficiently removed from the Holy Places to avoid the charge of diminishing the sanctity of the City."

40. In addition to housing projects carried out by the authorities, Arab private building as well is proceeding on a considerable scale. Thus it is estimated that since 1967 more than 300 housing units have been constructed by private Arab builders without assistance from the authorities. There could be no better evidence of the fact that housing construction is taking place in accordance with the natural needs of growth and development in the City.

41. The Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Abba Eban, declared in the Knesset on 30 June 1971:

"... the city's development will be planned with an eye to all the inhabitants and taking into consideration the urgent requirements of a lively, variegated and increasing

population which is absorbing additional residents in a city whose rate of natural increase is among the highest in the world, and particularly high among the Arab residents. The city is open to the constructive initiative of Jews, Christians and Moslems the world over in the furtherance of its development, especially of its cultural and spiritual assets, and in increasing the number of institutions and enterprises testifying to the city's historical uniqueness and special mission of promoting faith, progress and peace.

"Should Christian and Moslem circles, to whom Jerusalem is dear, manifest initiative of their own, it will be welcome and they will benefit from Government support, just as they have been benefiting up to now."

42. The Government of Israel addresses itself with special respect and consideration to the universal religious interests in Jerusalem.

43. This could have hardly been said of the Jordanian authorities which, in addition to their infamous destruction of Jewish sacred places, have left behind a record of anti-Christian actions. In fact so callous had their disregard been for religious and historic values that even venerated Moslem sites have not escaped desecration by them.

44. On 27 June 1967, the Knesset passed a law for the protection of the Holy Places. On the same day, the Prime Minister made the following declaration to the religious leaders in Jerusalem:

"All the Holy Places in Jerusalem are now open to all who wish to pray in them and to the faithful of all religions without discrimination. It is our intention to place the internal management and arrangements for the Holy Places in the hands of the religious leaders of the communities to which these places belong."

45. In pursuance of this policy the Waqf is responsible for the management of Al Aqsa, the Dome of the Rock, and all the Moslem institutions, cemeteries and mosques. The Chief Rabbinate has jurisdiction over the Western Wall and other Jewish Holy Places, synagogues and Jewish cemeteries. The various Christian communities maintain jurisdiction over their respective Holy Places and religious institutions, according to the accepted tradition.

46. Israel has concluded and carried out compensation agreements for war damage with all church institutions. This refers to damage sustained from 1948 to 1967 as a result of the wars initiated by the Government of Jordan and other Arab Governments. Such compensation has been paid to 17 Christian institutions, to the amount of 6 million Israeli pounds. The Government also encourages pilgrimage by the faithful of all denominations to the Holy Places. This welcome movement takes place in an atmosphere of peace, freedom and safety. Christian and Moslem pilgrimage grows from year to year. Many religious leaders have borne positive witness to this policy.

47. In addition, the Israeli authorities and the municipality of Jerusalem have aided churches and Christian institutions in the furthering of spiritual activities, art and culture,

and for the promotion of strong and efficient construction. Institutions benefiting from administrative, material or technical assistance include: the Armenian Patriarchate, St. Peter in Gallicante of the Assumptionist Fathers, the Sisters of Zion, the Franciscan Order, the Greek Catholic Patriarchate, the White Sisters, the Knights of Malta, the Evangelic Lutheran Church of Reformation at Beit Jolla, Notre Dam de Sion and St. John's Monastery in Ein Karem, a new Roman Catholic Church and community centre in Beit Hanina, and the American Institute of Holy Land Studies.

48. A Roman Catholic Ecumenical Research Institute, the first of its kind in the entire world, is about to be completed on a hill near Jerusalem, following an idea put forward by Pope Paul VI. Father Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame in Indiana and Chairman of the World Union of Catholic Universities, is in charge of the project. Professor Charles Moeller of the University of Louvain, Belgium, will be the first dean of the Institute. As envisaged by the Pope, the Institute will bring together the great theologians of all Christian churches and persuasions in researching the history of schisms in Christianity.

49. A Greek Orthodox Church just outside the Old City walls, which had stood unfinished for years under Jordanian rule, has now been completed by the community. Half a million Israeli pounds have also been set aside for repair work on the Rockefeller Museum.

50. Since the reunification of the city, repairs and renovation work have been carried out on the Armenian Church on Mount Zion, on the Monastery of the Cross, and on the Armenian Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The foundation stone has been laid for a new Armenian Theological Seminary in the Old City. Christian churches benefit from reductions in matters of taxation.

51. The right of every religious community to maintain its own schools and, unlike the situation under Jordan's rule, to set its own curricula, is also guaranteed and preserved.

52. The Moslem Holy Places, houses of worship and religious institutions enjoy similar conditions. The situation since 1967 was described as follows by Mr. Ghazi Alam El-Ain in an article published in the Arabic daily of east Jerusalem *Al-Anba* on 8 August 1969:

"The Islamic Waqf Bureau continued to supervise all Islamic places of worship in the Holy City, and especially the Haram e-Sharif compound which includes the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa, remaining in charge of the preservation of its holiness and cleanliness.

"The Waqf Bureau carried out repairs and renovations necessary to maintain the buildings of the holy Haram compound. It also undertook the repair of all Islamic Holy Places which were damaged as a result of the June war. All this was financed by the Islamic Waqf funds and with no outside help. Among the places which the Bureau repaired was the minaret, Bab al-Asbat, the Tribes' Gate, which was damaged during the fighting. It also repaired the Dome of the Rock, which was then slightly damaged. The Bureau also repaired the main gate of the blessed

Aqsa mosque, restoring it to its previous condition. The Bureau carried out and supervised all these repairs.

"Entrance to the venerable Holy Place is controlled by guards appointed by the Bureau. These guards stand at all gates leading to the courtyard of the Holy Place except at Al-Maghariba Gate. The Bureau pays salaries to all the guards appointed by it from the Islamic Waqf treasury. The Islamic Waqf Bureau levies entrance fees from tourists visiting the venerable Haram compound at all the gates leading to the courtyard of the Holy Place. It is forbidden for non-Moslems to enter the venerable Haram e-Sharif on Fridays, and the regulations regarding this are applied. With the help of Arab and Jewish police, the guards appointed by the Waqf Bureau enforce the regulations and orders prohibiting non-Moslems from entering the holy compound. Posters which set out rules concerning behaviour in Holy Places are displayed at conspicuous places.

"The Egyptian architect, Abdel Munim Abdel Wahab, supervised the repair works of the noble Rock and its Dome. Repairs have been carried out in the galleries of the domes, the minarets and all areas of the Holy Places damaged as a result of the war. The damage at the blessed Al Aqsa mosque itself principally affected the main gate and some of the windows, including the artistic colored glass. The Waqf Bureau believes that it is necessary that the same architectural office undertake this repair work. The Waqf Bureau did not hesitate to work on repairing the central gallery of Al Aqsa mosque straightway after the war, thus avoiding the dangers that might have threatened the building itself as a result of the penetration of rain water. As a result, every Moslem can enter the Haram Sharif and freely perform his religious rites. Moslem circles in Jerusalem believe that it is the duty of every Moslem to obey the call of the blessed Al Aqsa mosque, so that it is filled with worshippers at the five daily prayer times, at the Friday noon service and on other blessed Islamic religious occasions.

"There are a large number of mosques and Moslem places of worship in Jerusalem. The number of mosques, in addition to the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa, is 34; 27 of them are within the wall in the Old City, and seven are outside the wall, in the modern part of the city; a small number of these Mosques are no longer in use. There are also 11 small mosques, prayer rooms, in Jerusalem, into which the pious, the strangers on Moslem pilgrimage and the orthodox belonging to different sects may retire.

"Moslems have many cemeteries in Jerusalem, of which some were used in the past, and, with time, have become obsolete; others are still in use. There are 20 such Islamic cemeteries.

"In Jerusalem there are not a few Islamic public fountains, built by Moslem kings and sultans hundreds of years ago. Owing to their great age, they have suffered some damage. However, the Waqf Bureau renovated them, at its own expense, after the June war. The Waqf Bureau took heavy costs upon itself in rebuilding and repairing these public fountains, because of meticulous

and lengthy technical work which was required as is the case with any archaeological monument.

"The Waqf Bureau carried out repairs at other buildings owned by the Waqf, which were damaged as a result of the June war, especially the buildings on Salah ed-Din Street.

"No radical change has occurred in the administration of the Holy Places during the period of Israeli rule as compared with the situation under Jordanian rule.

"As to the Islamic Museum adjacent to the blessed Al Aqsa mosque, it is still as it has been. Foreign tourists and other visitors frequent this museum and view its collection of Islamic antiquities. The museum receives visitors throughout the week, except Fridays, against an entrance fee."

53. It is to be noted that the damage caused in 1969 to the Al Aqsa mosque by fire is being repaired by the Moslem authorities. A new mosque was built earlier this year on the Mount of Olives. Another was dedicated recently in the Silwan district of the city.

54. Particular regard for Jerusalem's spiritual attributes is reflected also in the archaeological excavations which aim at revealing the ancient history of the city. These excavations center today in the area to the south and west of the monumental wall built by King Herod the Great in the latter part of the first century B.C. They are conducted in an area in which there are no cultural or historic monuments.

55. Captain Warren, of the Palestine Exploration Fund, commenced these excavations some 100 years ago. They were continued under Jordanian rule by the British archaeologist, Miss K. Kenyon, and by the French scholar and archaeologist, Père Roland de Vaux.

56. Not only has there been no damage to Moslem cultural property but these excavations have unearthed, *inter alia*, interesting Moslem Umayyad remains. Arab workers are employed in the excavations; Arab students join the volunteer workers who assist the archaeologists, and Arab visitors to the excavations include members of the Moslem Council in Jerusalem.

57. The excavations present no danger whatsoever to Moslem religious buildings. Subsequent to the six days war some dilapidated houses near the excavations' site were pulled down, for safety reasons, but they included not one historical or cultural building. No demolition of any Moslem cultural building or monument has been, or is being, contemplated. The excavations are conducted in a most scientific and careful manner and will undoubtedly contribute much to our knowledge concerning Jewish, Christian and Moslem culture of many centuries.

58. Similar care is also undertaken in the clearing of refuse and debris which have accumulated through the centuries under the arches built by King Herod to support the bridge connecting the Temple Mount to the Western Wall. The clearing of the refuse stops at the level of the pavement in

front of the Wailing Wall. Already Charles Wilson of the Royal Engineers discovered over a hundred years ago the original construction which today bears his name—"Wilson's Arch". Scholars have been anxious for years to continue the exploration of this monument and, as late as 1966, Professor William F. Stinespring of Duke University Divinity School conducted archaeological excavations in this very area. No danger whatever exists either to this monument or to the buildings above it.

59. UNESCO's Commissioner General for Cultural Property, Dr. Karl Brunner, in a letter addressed to Mr. R. Maheu, Director-General of UNESCO on 6 October 1970 stated, *inter alia*:

"The excavation of Professor Mazar has not threatened the safety of the temple area and he is now working in a direction further away from the mosque complex."

60. Dr. H. J. Reinink, UNESCO's Special Representative entrusted with reporting on the compliance with The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict,¹ declared in a letter addressed to the Director-General of UNESCO on 13 April 1971:

"It is important that you should know the exact character of the work done by the Ministry of Religions in subterranean Jerusalem. There is no question of excavating in the ordinary sense of the word. No new tunnels are being made that could threaten the safety of the buildings above, but constructions that were built hundreds and thousands of years ago are being cleared of ancient debris and cleaned. Every precaution is taken to protect the subterranean areas and the streets and buildings above.

"Everyone who hears of the extensive works that are being done under an important part of the Old Jerusalem must think that great risks are taken; that many buildings, streets, market places, and especially the monuments, are threatened. This is, therefore, the place to remind everybody concerned that already a hundred years ago archaeologists especially the renowned Charles Wilson in circumstances very much more difficult than exist today, uncovered part of the original construction, particularly the celebrated Wilson Arch. As late as 1963 and 1965 and 1966, Professor William F. Stinespring of Duke University Divinity School conducted archaeological excavations in the area.

"The present clearance is being done in close collaboration with the Israel Institute of Technology and the University of Haifa, by an expert engineer, Josef Schonberger of Darmstadt. Furthermore, the Ministry of Religions is not being allowed to engage in any form of archaeological exploration and excavation. The engineer-architect of the British School of Archaeology, Mr. Archibald Walls, declared in the presence of the Director of the School, Mrs. Christal Benett and of the famous archaeologist Père Roland de Vaux of the Dominican Ecole Biblique de Jérusalem, that in his opinion, this part of the work done in the center of Jerusalem does not bring with it any risks of damage for the buildings above."

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 249 (1956), No. 3511.

61. Information disseminated by certain elements, according to which there has been in the last four years a diminution of the Christian and Moslem populations of Jerusalem is not in accordance with, and is even opposed to, facts. On the other hand, there is also no truth whatever in the Jordanian allegations contained in the Jordanian complaint that Israel contemplates the extension of the city's municipal boundaries to include neighbouring Arab towns and villages and their populations. The private bill to which the representative of Jordan referred earlier today was submitted by a single individual member of the Knesset and has long ago been withdrawn.

62. The phenomenon of Christian emigration from the Middle East has existed for over one hundred years. This process, with regard to Jerusalem, intensified during the 19 years of Jordanian occupation. Since 1967, however, it has ceased. It intensified during the Jordanian occupation. It has ceased since the reunification of Jerusalem. What is actually occurring is the normal process of exit and entry in conjunction with the disappearance of the tendency to emigrate from Jerusalem.

63. The best illustration of the situation of the Christian and Moslem communities in Jerusalem is to be found in the statistics relating to the growth of the population. There was a sharp decrease in the number of Christians in Jerusalem under Jordanian rule, which followed the Jordan occupation in 1948. The figures are as follows. In 1948 the number of Jews in Jerusalem was 100,000; the number of Christians, 25,000; the number of Moslems, 45,000. In 1967 the number of Jews was 195,000; the number of Christians dropped from 25,000 in 1948 to 10,800 in 1967; the number of Moslems increased to 54,963. In 1970 the number of Jews was 215,000; the number of Christians, 11,500; the number of Moslems, 61,600.

64. It appears then that the heavy emigration of Christians during the Jordanian occupation—about 14,000 left during this period—ceased as of 1967. It also appears that the Moslem population has actually increased since 1967.

65. The gratuitous and malicious nature of Jordan's assault on Jerusalem's right to lead a normal life, to grow and to develop is illustrated by the charge that the city's character is being changed, that Jerusalem is being "Judaized". The significance of the charge is clear. Jerusalem may be the centre of the Jewish people's existence, civilization, unity. Jews may have constituted the majority of the city's population for generations, but Jews, according to Jordan, should not be allowed to supply the town's municipal services, Jews must not beautify the city, Jews must not build, and Jews must not multiply.

66. There is a sinister echo in this attitude. We still remember Hitler's maniacal campaign against the so-called "Judaization" of German life. We have not forgotten how this campaign developed into the genocide of 6 million of our brethren.

67. Does the Jordanian Government, or for that matter any other Government, believe that it is possible to revive the spirit of the anti-Jewish laws and to establish a "*numerus clausus*" against Jews, in Jerusalem of all places?

Does anyone expect the Jewish State to become party to anti-Jewish prejudices and pronouncements?

68. The Israeli authorities can be expected to ensure—and will ensure—that the universal religious interests in Jerusalem are meticulously respected and that the city's life and development are carried on in an orderly manner. They cannot be expected to lend themselves to Arab belligerency and to impose anti-Jewish restrictions on the city that has throughout history been the heart of the Jewish people's existence.

69. On what does Jordan base its claims and charges? From what does it derive its pretensions? Jordan's association with Jerusalem was of one kind only—through its invasion of 1948, in violation of the Charter and of United Nations resolutions, and through the subsequent illegal occupation of the city's eastern sector. That occupation does not accord Jordan any rights, especially now that it has been terminated. It had never been recognized by any of the States Members of the United Nations. It cannot serve as a basis for invoking international conventions and instruments. Obviously, it cannot be used as a lever to oppose Jerusalem's integrity and development.

70. While firmly rejecting any claims based on aggression against Jerusalem and the city's former illegal division, Israel will continue to be guided by the legitimate rights and interests of Jerusalem's citizens irrespective of nationality and faith and will scrupulously ensure the sanctity of the Holy Places, freedom of access to them and the jurisdiction of the various religious communities over them. And in pursuance of this objective Israel maintains a constructive and detailed dialogue with representatives of universal religious interests.

71. The inability of the United Nations to deal impartially with the Middle East situation by means of public debate and resolutions is a matter of record. This is due primarily to the structure and voting procedures of United Nations organs. The world is aware of the fact that Israel's case cannot receive a fair hearing in our Organization or be judged here on its merits.

72. Israel, however, cannot forego its rights simply because the Security Council, the General Assembly or other organs are inherently weighted against it. The merits of its position cannot be affected by the fact that it is a small nation, solitary in its Jewish civilization and Hebrew heritage, a nation that does not belong to power blocs which dominate the outcome of voting, and that, consequently, it is outvoted time and again. Being a minority is not new to Jewish experience. The Jewish people's strength seems to lie in its success to preserve, through the ages, its values, ideals and traditions despite the hostility of others.

73. We have therefore come before the Security Council not in search of equity, for equity is denied here to Israel: we have come sharing in the general knowledge that discussions of the Middle East situation in the United Nations have become almost like rituals of acrimony and animosity, and that, whatever the rights and wrongs of the respective positions in the present debate, we face foregone conclusions and even a resolution formulated in advance.

We have come before the Security Council not to give sanction to this ritual, but to reiterate the truth, for truth has a life and a force of its own. "For Zion's sake I will not keep silence; for Jerusalem's sake I will speak out", says the Bible. So it shall be.

74. The PRESIDENT: I have just received letters dated 16 September 1971 from the representatives of Lebanon, Morocco and Saudi Arabia [S/10322, S/10323, S/10324], in which they request to be invited to participate in the current discussion, without the right to vote.

75. In accordance with the usual practice, and with the consent of the Council, I would suggest that, in view of the limited seating at the Council table, they should be invited to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to sit at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon), Mr. M. M. Zentar (Morocco) and Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

76. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Egypt, on whom I now call.

77. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Today is the anniversary of one of the holiest Moslem days. It is the anniversary of El Israā, the journey of the prophet Mohammed, mystically linking Mecca with Jerusalem and symbolizing in our minds the universality and unity of God's revelations to man. We should have been praying today, a holy day. But what better prayer than to try to defeat evil, and we pray that, with this Council's help, right will be asserted and peace based on justice will prevail.

78. Mr. President, my delegation is indeed grateful to you and to the members of this Council for giving us the opportunity to participate in this resumed debate on the situation in the city of Jerusalem.

79. The Council last convened more than two years ago, in July 1969, to consider the illegal measures imposed by the Israeli forces occupying Jerusalem. You have appealed to us, Mr. President, to confine our discussion today to the question which is the subject of this resumed debate. I shall try to do so. I shall not stray or try to confuse things by speaking about anything but the issue before the Council.

80. The Council on that occasion—in July 1969—censured in the strongest terms all such illegal measures taken by Israel and called upon Israel to rescind them forthwith and to refrain from any further similar actions. The Council demanded that the Israelis inform it of their intentions with regard to the implementation of that unanimous resolution. The Council further determined that, in the event of a negative response or of no response from Israel, it would reconvene—as it has today—in order to consider what further action should be taken in the matter.

81. The Israelis' response has been brazen in its clarity. They have simply no intention of being in the least affected

by any resolution, past or potential, of this Council. That has just been affirmed. They have neither rescinded their past measures nor refrained from further more serious measures. On the contrary, the Israeli authorities have proceeded to apply these measures to an ever-widening area of the other occupied Arab territories in the west bank of the Jordan. Whole Palestinian villages have now been engulfed within the borders of the so-called greater Jerusalem.

82. All we have from Israel are the arrogant statements of its officials. The annexation of Jerusalem, they shout, is irrevocable and not negotiable. So, we must conclude, is the annexation of the large areas brought since 1967 within these new "municipal boundaries of Greater Jerusalem". On 1 June of this year, 1971, the Israeli Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban, declared to his Knesset:

"No power on earth could change the 'new' status of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel in the municipal boundaries which it enjoys today."

83. A few days ago, on 31 August, the Israeli representative to the United Nations was quoted by *Agence France Presse* as saying: "Israel will not participate in the show prepared by the United States and aimed at the discussion of the Jerusalem question in the Security Council." He went on to say: "The member States of the Council have been warned of this." He also assured the correspondent of the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* that "the discussion by the Council of the Jerusalem question might only delay, to some extent, the measures for the development of the Israeli capital." Seeing the representative of Israel at this table participating in this "show", we may hope—even if it is only a thin ray of hope—that perhaps his other arrogant declarations will prove to be as baseless as his threat not to participate in this "show".

84. Well, the Council has been warned. Clearly and loudly it has been told that all it may achieve from this present "show" might be a "delay, to some extent" in the execution of the premeditated operation by which the Israelis seek to build their new Jewish Jerusalem on the debris of the one that we have all revered and held sacred for 1,971 years—an operation described by the Israeli Minister of Housing himself as an operation with a Hebrew goal, a Zionist exhibition. No one, certainly not a Moslem speaking on the day of Israā, would deny that the Jews have a place not only in Jerusalem but in the history of the monotheistic religions. We revere the whole history of Jerusalem, the 3,000 years of it. However, what is proposed now is something that can be illustrated by an interview given by the Minister of Defence of Israel, Mr. Dayan, to an Israeli newspaper. In the *Haolam Hazeh* of 10 August 1971 he is quoted as saying:

"I prefer to see the wall of the temple as it was in the days of the second temple. All the rest of the sides could be photographed and eliminated, because they are concealing and preventing us from seeing the perfect picture."

85. The paper does not leave us in doubt. It asks "What is the perfect picture?" and then says "The perfect picture,

to Dayan, is Jerusalem of the Temple of David, without any unnecessary additions. All the archaeological proofs of the holiness of Jerusalem in the eyes of Christians and Moslems would be a fog."

86. Our stand is, therefore, that we have held Jerusalem sacred for all its 3,000 years. The stand just set forth by the Israeli representative is that Jerusalem ceased to be sacred when Christ was born; the only part of its history and its culture which is sacred is the Jewish one. The Israä which we celebrate today, tells us that there is continuity, that the sacredness of Jerusalem has continued throughout its 3,000 years.

87. There is no question of what Israel's response to the Council's resolution has been and promises—or rather threatens—to be. We have the reports of the Secretary-General, enumerated in our agenda, which all give us the same reply: Israel has declared that it will simply ignore any resolutions by this Council on this subject.

88. Hence, there is ample evidence before us of the degree of Israel's respect for this Council and for the Charter which guides its work: Israel has none. Hence, there is ample evidence before us of the extent to which Israel has complied and in the future intends to comply with this Council's resolutions: utter and complete disregard.

89. The United Nations is built on the basis of the Charter, which stems from the determination of the peoples of the world that war shall not pay. The Israelis, on the other hand, clearly build their policies on the validity of the notion that might makes right; that the conqueror shall reap the fruits of his conquest. The Zionists live by the totalitarian ideas which dominated their world in Europe, before they elbowed their way into Palestine. The fact is that they cannot bring themselves to believe seriously in our Charter or in the reality and the effectiveness of the determination of the peoples of the world to live by justice and in peace.

90. The principle—vital to the United Nations—of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory as a result of war is, therefore, obviously incomprehensible to the present Prime Minister of Israel. Very recently she told Marsh Clark, a correspondent of *Time* magazine—and I quote from the 30 August 1971 issue of that journal:

"There is something else which is absolutely immoral, because it has never happened in human history—the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force. How many around the table of the Security Council can really stand up and swear they have never done it?"

That bold confession mocking the principles of the Charter was, as I have said, contained in the 30 August 1971 issue of *Time* magazine.

91. In the imperialist Europe of the nineteenth century the Zionists saw violence and wars paying dividends in colonies and expanded frontiers. Herzl, the Zionist pioneer, therefore established his "Imperial Bank" and sought some imperial licence or other to form a Zionist colony with the intention of expanding it as far as possible. General

Assembly resolution of 1947 partitioning Palestine [181 (II)]—the only resolution which the Zionists deem to be of any use to them—was apparently considered by them to be such a licence. Having obtained it, they do not wish to be bothered any more by the United Nations. Since then, the United Nations, its Charter, its Councils and its resolutions have all been without value in the eyes of the Israelis—nothing but empty, impotent words. Of themselves they carry no compulsion or coercion and are therefore without any effect on the Israelis; they command no respect by the power-worshippers of present-day Israel. Those are the simple facts of the Israelis' present political philosophy and actions.

92. The Council is bound today to consider one question: what "further action" must it take in the face of Israel avowed contempt for and utter disregard of its resolutions, in particular in this case its resolution 267 (1967)? Basically, what is the Council to do about this obvious incompatibility of Israel's reactionary philosophy with the ideology on which our Charter is based?

93. The Israeli operation in Jerusalem only follows the pattern set by all their actions in our area: to acquire a semblance of a right from one document or another—in this case the Security Council cease-fire resolution; to acquire support, implicit or tacit, from one great Power or another; then to create "facts" in the face of any and all objections and to confront the world defiantly with a *fait accompli*, cynically confident that the world will not react effectively. This was the Zionist strategy which we witnessed during the forties, fifties and sixties in our region. Once again, today, this is their strategy in the Arab lands which they invaded in June 1967: on the struggling west bank of the Jordan River, in the Syrian Al Golan, in Sinai and in the Gaza—and although this larger basic question is not before the Council today and I have promised not to depart from the subject of Jerusalem, the Council surely realizes that the Israeli operations in Jerusalem are only part of a larger, more threatening whole. The ruthless ambitions of the Zionists are not by any means limited to Jerusalem. But our delegation reserves its right to speak on that subject on another occasion, before too long and before it is too late.

94. It has been suggested that Israel, by its actions in Jerusalem, is depriving itself of peace. I think our colleague the representative of Jordan alluded to a quotation to that effect. I suggest that perhaps the reverse is true: Israel does not want peace; Israel, under its present leadership and with its present expansionist, racist policies, cannot afford peace. One of its leaders told a London audience, two years ago, that the State is now only 16 per cent complete—meaning, I guess, that it will not be complete until all those who believe in God and worship according to the Judaic religion, all the Jews of the world, are brought into it and under its rule. The Israeli authorities are intentionally undermining all the roads to peace, afraid that peace would put an end to further expansion and to further acquisition of territories by virtue of the so-called right of conquest, to which Foreign Minister Eban alluded in his statement to the General Assembly in 1967. If, therefore, illegal changes in the status of Jerusalem put peace another step further away, so much the better for the present rulers of Israel.

95. The question again before the Council is what course this Council is to take now. What is the Council collectively, and what are its members separately, to do? What, besides deploring or censuring or condemning?

96. Our delegation would like to present, in five points, what in its conception effective action by the Security Council should now be.

97. First, the Council should certainly reiterate the complete inadmissibility and illegality of all past, current and future actions aimed at altering the status of the City of Jerusalem, whether by expropriation of land, forced displacement of population, destruction of buildings, or indeed by any other so-called laws or other measures aimed at changing the character of the City of Jerusalem, holy to half of mankind—holy throughout its entire history, to this day.

98. Secondly, the Council should call upon all Member States to declare the illegality of the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem and to refrain from any act of support or recognition of all illegal measures undertaken by the Israeli forces of occupation.

99. In an analogous situation, the International Court of Justice, on 21 June of this year, gave its Opinion on the question of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.² In paragraph 118 of that Opinion the Court stated that "South Africa . . . is under obligation to withdraw its administration from the Territory of Namibia". It further stated:

"By maintaining the present illegal situation, and occupying the Territory without title, South Africa incurs international responsibilities arising from a continuing violation of an international obligation. It also remains accountable for any violations of its international obligations, or of the rights of the people of Namibia".

In paragraphs 119 and 120 the Court stated that:

"The Member States of the United Nations are . . . under obligation to recognize the illegality and invalidity of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. They are also under obligation to refrain from lending any support or any form of assistance to South Africa with reference to its occupation of Namibia . . .

" . . . it is for the Security Council"—the Court said—"to determine any further measures consequent upon the decisions already taken by it on the question of Namibia".

That Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is certainly applicable to the situation arising from the illegal occupation of Jerusalem and, indeed, of all other parts of the Arab territories invaded and occupied by Israel.

² *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

100. Thirdly, the Security Council should seek to deny Israel the means of its continued defiance of the Council. We should deny Israel the means by which it defies this Council and the Assembly.

101. Only yesterday there was a story in *The New York Times* from Tel Aviv about the Israeli war industry, to the effect that it is at present bent on producing all sorts of weapons, with some capable of carrying nuclear warheads. It is obvious from the same story that this war preparation can be carried out only with the huge active financial and technical assistance of other States Members of this Organization. When Mr. Eban boasts that "no Power on earth" can get the Israelis to change their internationally deplored and censured position on Jerusalem, he is obviously confident because of the United States Phantom jets and other military weapons which his Government has obtained and expects to obtain in the future.

102. The Council should, therefore, call upon all Member States faithful to the Charter to stop all aid, military and financial, to stop the supplying of all arms and other military equipment, to stop all support which enables the Zionist State to continue its arrogant defiance of the United Nations and to pursue its expansionist racist policies. The permanent members of this Council will remember their strong, even stern, advice to my country in the middle of May 1967 not to be the first to attack. Both the Soviet Union and France, under Presidents de Gaulle and Pompidou, have been logical and fair since the Israeli assault in June 1967. They have abstained from giving Israel any weapons with which it could consolidate its occupation and resist efforts to end that occupation and to reach a just, acceptable settlement. The Israeli conquest was facilitated because the Arabs were restrained by their respect for the Charter of the United Nations and for the permanent members of this Council and by the advice of those permanent members. The example of France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should indeed be emulated by all Members of the United Nations.

103. Fourthly, the Council has obviously now exhausted the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter. More than four years have passed with Israel adamantly and flagrantly disregarding all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and efforts, whether about Jerusalem or about the situation as a whole. The last stern warning of this Council to Israel, contained in its resolution 267 (1969) of July 1969 was met only with declarations and actions of defiance and contempt.

104. I listened carefully for any phrase or reference in the statement of the representative of Israel indicating that Israel may consider implementing that resolution or giving the Secretary-General the information that he has so far failed to get from them. Of course, there was no such reference.

105. It is then time for this Council to consider Chapter VII of the Charter in dealing with this situation, and to impose on Israel the sanctions enumerated in that Chapter.

106. Fifthly, and lastly, in view of this utter contempt of the United Nations—and I need only refer to the last part of

the speech just made—and in view of the fact that Israel has opted for a might-is-right morality in lieu of that of the Charter, it must be concluded that Israel does not care to remain a Member in good standing of this Organization, faithful to its signature to the Charter and ready to carry out its obligations.

107. The representative of Israel has just said that Israel is used to being a minority. It does not want to be part of the majority. It does not like our procedures. It does not like our composition. The Security Council should therefore act to accept this virtual Israeli resignation and recommend to the General Assembly the appropriate measures provided by the Charter.

108. This Council and the world community must now take such positive actions in dealing with Israel. The world cannot stand by and wash its hands of this matter. Such a stand would surely amount to aiding and abetting Israel in its new, twentieth century, crucifixion of Jerusalem.

109. The people of the whole world, their hopes embodied in the Charter, await the result of this Council's deliberations. I know the people of Egypt and of the whole Arab and Moslem world are eager to learn whether the Charter is still alive, or whether the law of the jungle will again blacken the face of the earth. They are entitled to know whether they are to live by the Charter or by the sword.

110. Are the people everywhere, and especially in our part of the world, to look forward, as they hope, to an era of justice, order and peace, or are they to resign themselves to a world where might, developed or borrowed, can enforce its will on a futilely protesting world? Those are the questions. The answers are now for this Council.

111. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

112. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Since the representative of Egypt has referred to a number of matters extraneous to the item under consideration, I regret I have no alternative but to allude to them also.

113. I listened very carefully to his statement, and in particular to his expressions of concern for Jerusalem and for the welfare of its Arab inhabitants. Indeed, Egypt's concern for the welfare of fellow Arabs and fellowmen in general has earned it international renown in Yemen, in the Sudan, in Gaza. Egypt's feelings towards Jerusalem have been expressed in a manner that leaves no room at all for any doubt. In 1948 the Egyptian armies advanced on Jerusalem, together with the Arab Legion of Jordan, laid siege to it and joined in the indiscriminate shelling of the city, disregarding its Holy Places and sites and its Arab and Jewish civilian inhabitants. That was an expression of Egyptian love for Jerusalem. Hundreds were killed. Houses of worship and institutions of learning and private homes were destroyed. Mr. Abba Eban, then Israel's representative to the United Nations, implored the Security Council to save Jerusalem. At the 305th meeting of the Council, on 26 May 1948, he said

"Corpses are piled up unburied in the Old City, historic synagogues lie in ruins, centres of education and culture have been laid waste."³

"History never forgets anything which happens to Jerusalem, and it will have an unenviable place in its gallery for this modern destroyer of Jerusalem's buildings and shrines, and for all who are associated with him . . . in that sacrilegious adventure."³

114. What was Egypt's reaction to that plea to stop the savage destruction and carnage in Jerusalem? It was Mahmoud Fawzi, the present Prime Minister of Egypt, then representative of Egypt to the Security Council, who replied, "The Egyptian Government cannot abide by a recommendation of the Security Council to cease fire". History never forgets. Neither will Israel forget what Egypt wrought on Jerusalem.

115. Twenty-three years later the partners in the destruction of Jerusalem in 1948 are partners again in battling the peace, the progress and the happiness of Jerusalem. The sanctimonious words we heard today from the Egyptian representative can impress only the very ignorant or the very gullible. The representative of the United Arab Republic charged Israel with disrespect for the Charter. He attempted to claim that his Government is peace-loving. Indeed, Egypt's respect for the Charter and Egypt's attachment to peace is as evident as Egypt's concern for the well-being of fellow Arabs, or for that matter of its own citizens, and as real as its interest in the welfare of Jerusalem.

116. In addition to the wars in Yemen and in the Sudan and the participation in civil wars in various countries of Africa, it is Israel that has throughout the years been the primary target of Cairo's lust for bloodshed. When Israel was invaded in 1948, it was Egypt's Azam Pasha who on behalf of the Arab League informed the United Nations, "This will be a massacre reminiscent of the Mongolian massacres". It was Egypt that, soon after the signing of the Armistice Agreement terminating belligerency, barred, in the name of belligerency, freedom of navigation. It was Egypt that in flagrant violation of the Charter and the Armistice Agreement launched a war of terror and murder against Israel resulting in the Sinai campaign of 1956. It was Cairo that throughout the ensuing years openly proclaimed its intention to destroy the State of Israel, a Member State of the United Nations, and actively prepared itself to execute that design. It was Cairo that in May 1967 announced that the time was ripe for the final assault on Israel, unceremoniously chased the United Nations Emergency Force out of Sinai and Gaza, moved huge armies for attack on Israel and, in an overt act of war, blocked international waterways.

117. It was Egypt which after the six-day war instigated the Khartoum Declaration rejecting peace, recognition and agreement with Israel. The United Arab Republic was the one to reject in March 1968 Ambassador Jarring's proposal to meet in a conference with Israel. It was the United Arab

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 305th meeting*, pp. 51 and 50.

Republic which in March 1969 repudiated the Security Council cease-fire and opened a war of attrition against Israel that lasted till last August. It was Egypt which violated the cease-fire and standstill agreement of August 1970 by moving missiles into the standstill zone. And it was Egypt which prevented progress in peace-making efforts by insisting that Israel withdraw to the vulnerability and chaos of the lines established in the Armistice Agreement although....

118. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak on a point of order.

119. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): This morning, Mr. President, after the Council had adopted the agenda for our work, you made an appeal. Unfortunately, I do not have the exact text of the appeal. But I remember well that it was to the effect that we should confine our deliberations and discussions to the item on the agenda we had adopted, namely, Jerusalem. It seems to me that in the unending diatribes of the Israeli representative he has wandered far afield from the problem which we are discussing, to which we have been asked to confine our deliberations. I respectfully request the President, if he finds it convenient to do so, to remind the Israeli representative to confine himself to the subject under discussion.

120. The PRESIDENT: As President I wish to appeal once again to members of the Council to limit their remarks to the matters raised in the letter of the Permanent Representative of Jordan and in the reports of the Secretary-General which were mentioned by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

121. I call on the representative of Israel.

122. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, I remember very clearly your statement earlier this morning, with which I associate myself fully. As I explained at the opening of this statement in right of reply, I have no alternative but to allude to those matters included in the statement by the Egyptian representative to which I am replying.

123. May I also add an observation that representatives around this Council table, even if they do represent countries which have very little knowledge of what freedom of speech is, should allow representatives of sovereign Governments, Member States, to proceed and complete their statements without interruption in accordance with some of the more fundamental principles of the Charter, like that of the equality of Member States.

124. I was about to say—in reaction to the accusation voiced here by the representative of the United Arab Republic that Israel holds only disrespect for the Charter while Egypt is respectful of the Charter and attached to peace—that it was Egypt which prevented progress in the peace-making efforts by insisting that Israel should withdraw to the vulnerability and chaos of the lines established in the Armistice Agreement, although the latter provided specifically that those lines are not to be construed as final borders and although Security Council resolution 242 (1967) does not call for withdrawal to such lines. Indeed, the Security Council rejected in 1967 all proposals

that would have stipulated withdrawal to the old lines. As far as Israel is concerned the doors to understanding and agreement remain open. It is for Egypt to go through them in good faith, in a genuine desire for peace, in a real willingness to seek accommodation and understanding. Agreement remains possible and we hope that it will be achieved. However, agreement can be attained only through quiet diplomatic efforts. If Egypt decides that instead of pursuing these efforts with patience and constancy, it would turn to scoring points in public acrimony and one-sided resolutions unacceptable to Israel, Egypt may very well find that it has by its own actions blocked the doors to settlement.

125. Once before, Egypt made such a mistake. There were many possibilities and opportunities during the period between 1949 and 1967 to terminate the war and to conclude a peace agreement with Israel. Egypt at that time refused and instead concentrated all its efforts on the pursuance of belligerency and on the tug-of-war in United Nations organs. The result was a series of one-sided resolutions reflecting the known numerical preponderance of Arab States, but bringing no progress whatever in the direction of a solution of the conflict. The consequences of that policy are a matter of history.

126. Today Egypt must ask itself in all candour, does it prefer the continuation of the conflict, adorned perhaps by United Nations resolutions which draw Israel and Egypt farther apart, or will it sincerely seek to end the conflict and to reach agreement with Israel? If it is the latter course that it chooses, then it is not at this table that the representatives of Israel and Egypt should be exchanging their views.

127. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Mali. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

128. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for having authorized me to express very briefly the point of view of my Government on the matter on the agenda of the Council.

129. The cease-fire which occurred in the Middle East after very difficult negotiations, its extension by the parties—a difficult thing for them to do—had led us to hope that no initiative would be taken to create *de facto* situations which might undermine the necessary trust without which any peaceful negotiation would be uncertain if not impossible.

130. The Government of the Republic of Mali fervently hoped for the speedy return of a just peace in that part of the world, with which our country has deep links of technical and cultural co-operation. This well-known position was affirmed throughout discussions on this problem in the Council and in the General Assembly or its main Committees. The Head of State clearly defined this position on 1 May 1970 after his trip to the United Arab Republic. This position is predicated essentially upon the search for peace. We know that negotiations for peace are lengthy and delicate, but we also know that it is because they are

delicate that they are undermined from the outset by any unilateral action. As peace itself is indivisible, any isolated act weakening it contains in itself the seeds of its own destruction.

131. It was therefore not necessary to add to the serious differences born from the conflict of 1967, at a time when delicate negotiations are being carried out, other troubles which are of paramount interest to the conscience of millions of faithful for whom Jerusalem symbolizes the eternity of their faith, Catholic, Jewish or Moslem. This faith is, of course, built upon tolerance, and the love of one's brother and is contrary to any act of domination based essentially on the fate of war. A victorious people is obviously the one which knows how to conquer hearts, the one which avoids to trouble consciences and add them to the vicissitudes born of war. Scrupulous respect for faith is a sacred duty for any State, and the greatness of a nation resides in the care with which it keeps in good repair the Holy Places of these faiths.

132. The latest events in Jerusalem are a matter of concern to us for many reasons. The members of the Council will probably recall the deep emotion felt by the Moslems of the whole world at learning of the tragic fire at the Al Aqsa Mosque. This was not an isolated incident. Prior to that, the General Assembly had expressed its concern at the measures and steps taken by Israel and likely to alter the Holy Places in Jerusalem. We are in duty bound to recognize that no account has been taken of that emotion.

133. The Security Council, seized of this matter anew, had to recognize, in resolution 252 (1968), that Israel had taken other new measures contravening relevant resolutions, and that the Council:

"Considers that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including appropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status."

134. This warning by the Council certainly remained a dead letter since on 3 July and 15 September 1969, the Council had to meet again and adopted resolutions 267 (1969) and 271 (1969), the provisions of which are more or less the same as those of resolution 252 (1968), with one important difference, that paragraph 6 of resolution 271 (1969) states: "that in the event of a negative response or no response, the Security Council shall convene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter."

135. If those resolutions had been heeded, or if measures had been taken not to disturb the conscience of millions of faithful, the representatives of 26 States would not have met at an Islamic conference, from 22 to 25 September 1969, in Rabat to warn the world against infringements upon the "spiritual, moral, social and economic values of Islam" in Jerusalem. This warning was taken lightly, since in the report of the Secretary-General to the next session of the General Assembly mention is made of excavations around the Moslem Holy Places threatening their very existence.

136. The Middle East is sufficiently troubled for seeds of religious troubles to be sown there. The status of Jerusalem, consecrated by international agreements, cannot be changed unilaterally. Otherwise, moral and spiritual values would be made dependent upon a temporary imbalance of forces resulting from armed confrontation. No account would be taken either of Charter provisions recommending negotiation for the settlement of international disputes.

137. The explanations given by Israel to justify the measures and steps taken to change the universally recognized sacred nature of Jerusalem are that they are of an administrative nature and apply to populations or sites whose legal status is allegedly strictly within its sovereignty.

138. Together with the Secretary-General, we ask ourselves what the status of sites specifically under our Organization should be, and the silence of Israel is ever more heavy and disconcerting.

139. The Council purposely wanted to limit the present debate to the question of the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. In the view of the Mali Government, this must then be the logical sequence of previous debates and at the end of these meetings the Council must logically adopt measures which could in no case be weaker by nature and the obligations flowing therefrom than those that I mentioned a few minutes ago.

140. Jerusalem is only one of the aspects of the conflict in the Middle East. Any measure, any provision contrary to relevant provisions of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly would, in our view, create a climate of mistrust that would later make impossible any negotiation in conformity with the spirit and the provisions of the Charter.

141. The Government of Mali is convinced that the Council is well aware of this elementary fact. The provisions it has already adopted, which have remained a dead letter, proved that the road followed until now does not seem to be the best to settle the crisis in the Middle East. My Government is opposed to any acquisition of territory by war. It considers that force cannot settle the future status of Jerusalem. That is the price of peace, and this price is so high that once again we ask the Council, at the end of this debate, to take measures to ensure that Jerusalem will remain a haven of peace and love in the Middle East.

142. Once again, my Government is a sincere advocate of peace, but we also co-sponsored the final statement of the Islamic Summit Conference,⁴ in which our Heads of State and Government reaffirmed their devotion to peace, but in honour and justice.

143. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969, document S/9460.

144. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Council, for allowing me to participate in the debate on the item before the Council this evening. I shall concentrate strictly on the question of Jerusalem. I have not lost hope, after 25 years in this Organization, that the Council this year will see its way to doing something constructive rather than abdicating its powers, as it did in 1967 when it referred the whole question to the General Assembly, knowing very well that questions of security and war are the prerogative of the Security Council, whereas the General Assembly has only recommendatory powers.

145. I have to say this, because we have been going round in circles on this question, whether it has been the larger question of Palestine or the specific item before us, which is Jerusalem. We have been going round in circles for too long—since 1947. If the Council is going to be a platform for propaganda, if some members—in particular the five members having the right of veto—continue, as they have done since 1967, to resort to the consensus at the expense of small Powers, I say let this Council negate itself and refer everything to the larger body of 127 nations, which would make recommendations. The Council is supposed to take action, but unfortunately on this question of Jerusalem in particular no action has been taken since the adoption of resolution 267 (1969), which is very clear. Two years have passed since the Council requested Israel to report on the question of Jerusalem.

146. What have the members, and especially the five permanent members, of the Council done? They have done nothing. That is why our colleague from Jordan was compelled, in view of the developments that have been taking place without let-up, to come to this Council with the hope that it will act. But if it does not act, I would ask it not to meet any more. What should it meet for, to be the laughing stock of the world community—not of one community or the other, but of the world community at large?

147. As a veteran of this Organization, I think I have had enough experience so that I can talk in these terms, without anger but with emphasis.

148. It is a paradox that the United Nations, which created Israel, and which did so erroneously, laying aside the principle of self-determination enshrined in the Charter, should be criticized by none other than that State which was artificially created at Lake Success, beginning with the partition of Palestine. And I witnessed the pressures. They are on the record. I do not have to enumerate them. Everybody can look up the record and see how that State, through pressures and manipulations, was created. And now in spite of the inaction of the Council, Israel, through its representative, throws invective. It is like the one who curses his mother for having given birth to him.

149. I think the Council has been very lenient, sometimes in small matters but in matters which have great significance in showing how much influence this tiny State of Israel has in the international community. Our colleague Mr. Tekoah inscribed his name to speak in right of reply. I am not blaming you, Mr. President, but nobody raised the

point that usually rights of reply are relegated to the end of the meeting. Anything is possible when Israel asks for a favour. I had been waiting in the wings, waiting outside the Council chamber to speak, and then the Secretariat informed me, "Oh, incidentally Israel registered its name in the morning". No one can tell me that they registered their name in the morning to speak twice. I saw the slip requesting the right of reply, which is quite permissible. However, they preceded me and my brother from Mali. What kind of procedure is this in the Council? Mr. President, you are new among us. Do not think I am throwing any criticism at the President. But I have a right to draw your kind attention to what goes on in this Organization and to how sometimes favours are bestowed when order and procedure should be observed.

150. The subject before us is Jerusalem. I remember how, time and again in the past, in the late 1940s, in the 1950s and in the early 1960s, how those who preceded Mr. Tekoah used to say, "God gave us Jerusalem". And I would repeatedly throw the question at them, "Since when has God been in the real estate business to apportion land? Show me the title deed and the seal." Then I would remind them of what King David said in one of the psalms, "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof". He did not say, "The earth, a corner of it"—with that amendment—"is for the Jews, or the Gentiles . . ." or what have you.

151. Since then the Israelis have desisted from saying: "God gave us Jerusalem". But by implication they are still saying the same thing. They say Jerusalem was divided and it was wrested from them, especially after the last major Diaspora during the days of the Romans, and the indigenous population—which time and again I have mentioned—had been Jews who embraced Christianity or Islam. They say Jerusalem was wrested from them for 2,000 years and that in 1948 the prophecy of God came true. But the title deed giving them Jerusalem is cached somewhere; we have not seen it.

152. But I would remind my colleague from Israel that Jericho—which is a stone's throw from Jerusalem in the Dead Sea valley—was the first Canaanite city to be attacked by the Israelites: not the present Israelites but the Israelites who were our brothers and cousins; not those Khazars who are descended mostly from tribes that settled, in the first century A.D., in the southern part of what today is Russia and who, in the seventh and eighth centuries, were converted to Judaism because there was a sort of gentleman's agreement between the Christians of Byzantium and the Moslems who had gone north. But now let us keep our hands off these tribes. Incidentally, those tribes in the first century migrated from the northern tier of Asia. They are not of Indo-European origin; they are of Turko-Finnish origin—in language, in culture. Even archaeologically, we know where they came from.

153. There is nothing wrong in being of Turko-Finnish or Indo-European origin. Incidentally, the whole of Europe at that time, ethnologically speaking, became a projection of tribes that migrated from Asia.

154. The Moslems said to the Byzantines, and the Byzantines said to the Moslems: "Let us not have those pagan

tribes convert to Christianity or Islam", because then the balance of power would be upset. So there were some Jews who had migrated to what is called the Balkans—Sephardic Jews, our own Jews—and they could go and convert them as long as they worshipped the same God. But they did not want them to become either Christian or Moslem. And the whole problem is not from our Sephardic Jews. In good faith, they thought they had gained them to a monotheistic religion—to the worship of God.

155. And where did Zionism begin? Was political Zionism begun in Palestine by the Sephardic Jews—by our Jews, by the Arab Jews? No. It was begun by the descendants of those converted Jews who are no more Semite, except in religion, than I am a Buddhist or Ambassador Malik is, say, a Red Indian. That is a political movement, but the subject now is Jerusalem, and you have appealed to us, Mr. President, to concentrate on Jerusalem. Very well.

156. What is the origin of the word "Jerusalem"? Remember that I mentioned that Jericho was the first city in the Dead Sea valley—a Canaanite City; the Canaanites were Semites too—to be attacked by the ancient Israelites. That is in accordance with the account given in Joshua, one of the Books of the Bible—I am not citing some archaeologist—and the Bible is holy to the Jews. Christians also consider the Bible holy; we all consider the Bible holy.

157. There is no mention yet of Jerusalem. And Jericho, as I said, is very near to Jerusalem. What is the origin of Jerusalem? Certain letters engraved on tablets in Tel Al Marna in Egypt show that the name "Jerusalem" existed under the form of Uru Salim—meaning city of Salim; Salim is an Arabic word. It is a proper noun; many people are called Salim—in Jordan, in Arabia and in North Africa. It is an Arabic name. Our ancient brothers had the word "Shalom". "Salim" has many connotations in the Arabic language: Salim Al Niyah, good-hearted Salam. Anyone who is good-hearted likes peace. And then I would take you back in history to Ur of the Chaldees, where the patriarch of all those tribes, Abraham, came from. But where was Ur of the Chaldees situated? It was situated in what today is north-western Iraq. And who were the sons of Abraham? One of them was Jacob, who migrated southward. Go and read the thirty-second chapter of Genesis and you will know how they migrated from what is today Iraq and came down to the land of Canaan, and they have not yet reached Uru Salim. Ur of the Chaldees was the birthplace of Jacob. Jacob had twelve sons and Judah was the fourth son. The word "Judea" is derived from the name of the fourth son of Jacob. And Yehudi—meaning Jew—came, and sometimes they called themselves Hebrew. Abara, Ebraniyeen—Abara means to cross. They crossed from one place.

158. And you know how the land of Canaan was taken by the sword. Joshua was a great general in those days.

159. The city of Jerusalem existed before the sons of Jacob came—and the sons of Jacob are our brothers, or those descended from them are our brothers. But these are the Khazars. This is a European movement, using Judaism as a motivation for political and economic ends. Most of the leaders are secular. In fairness I must say that, like all leaders in the world, they are secular, but they use religion

as a motivation. They use the religion of Judaism. Their prophets are our prophets. But did our Jews, our brothers, create this political movement called Zionism? No. If poor Theodore Herzl had known what would happen he would not have let his dream be translated into a nightmare. He thought that because the Jews were persecuted in Europe they should have an enclave somewhere. They thought about Uganda. Then they said, "Jerusalem is ours." What about when it was not theirs, when it was Uru Salim, before Jericho was attacked? In relatively modern times, when I was 17, I demonstrated in the streets of Beirut and Damascus, when Jerusalem was made the seat of the Government of Palestine under the mandate given to Britain in July 1922, almost 50 years ago. This is why we demonstrated in the streets of Beirut and Damascus, those of us who were in the region. The British deceived the Arabs. Why did they do it? Because of the beauty of the eyes of the Jews? Some Jewish eyes are very beautiful, but so are Arab eyes. Why did they do it? They wanted a place astride the route to the empire somewhere and they thought they would make Palestine and Jerusalem a part of the Commonwealth of Nations. They sounded out the Rothschilds. The Rothschilds were an international family, in Frankfurt, Paris and London. I would not say they were mundane, but they were secular. But of course there is what we call in Arabic *asabiya*. They were Jews, of course, and they played on their sentiments. I knew some of those Rothschilds in the thirties and spoke to them. They did not seem to be so religious, but they would go to the synagogue. They were like many people who go to the church or to the mosque or to the temple. They were notables of their religion. So do not think that we can be fooled here by being told that Jerusalem was divided. These Khazars of the Balkans, descended from those tribes converted to Judaism, formulated a sort of new ideology which is naked colonialism. That is what it is—naked colonialism, using, I must say again, religion as a motivation for political and economic ends.

160. The ancestors of the Jews came from Ur of the Chaldees, and that was the land of Canaan. The others were Semites, but they were tribes warring one against the other. Let us assume a few things. Let us assume that Jerusalem is the spiritual home of the Jews. Let us do more than that. Let us concede that Jerusalem is the symbol of the Jewish religion. Is Bethlehem not the birth-place of Jesus? Is Jerusalem not the city where Jesus started his mission? Is Jerusalem not the cradle of Christianity? In Islam, Jerusalem is the first Qublah. There was no Mecca or Medina. The Moslems looked on Jerusalem. They were Semites—they were Khazars—and they worshipped. Therefore, if we concede that Jerusalem means a great deal to the Jews, equally it means a great deal to the Christians and to the Moslems. There are 16 or 17 million Jews. They have not increased very much. Perhaps there are 18 million. There are a billion Christians who consider Jerusalem their spiritual city. There are 600 million Moslems who consider Jerusalem very holy to them. By what logic should 16 million make a world problem? It is not the 16 million but a few leaders who are using this question in order to promote political and economic ends. Today we have had the best proof. Mr. Tekoah was speaking in terms of concrete and steel and buildings. I do not know whether he mentioned air-conditioning. Let me assure him that the

greatest prophets did not have to have edifices. They probably lived in tents, like many of us still do. People who love mundane things usually do not accomplish anything spiritually, because their instincts have to be satiated, with food and sex and luxury. The mind does not produce anything. Buddha, who was the son of a king—a prince—did not produce anything worth-while while he was a prince living in the palace of his father, who provided him with all that could be desired by a human being. But his mission not only gained credence but still has millions upon millions of adherents because he renounced material things and became a great teacher. He renounced the pleasures, the luxuries, the comforts, because he felt with the bulk of humanity. So did Jesus. So did the prophets who preceded Jesus. They were simple men in their instincts and desires. And the representative of Israel speaks to us today of what they have done in Jerusalem. They are building edifices. It is not New York City. The Jews built New York City. That is enough. All the skyscrapers are being built with the money of the Jews. Let them build more if they want, but then there will be so much congestion we shall have to move the United Nations from here. Mr. Tekoah mentioned that the Arabs are making money. He forgets what Jesus said, that you cannot worship two gods. God or mammon: you must worship one and leave the other. The white man's burden of the erstwhile colonial Powers should apply. A man with money and organization who can build should go to a place where the people do not have luxury or modern buildings and say, "Look, you are backward, and I am going to build on your land."

161. That was the colonial thesis, epitomized by the phrase "the white man's burden". White man's burden, my foot! They exploited the people, but that was the age of exploitation. And, in fairness to the colonial Powers, within a State people exploit one another. But that argument does not hold water. "Man does not live by bread alone"; how true.

162. Money, money, money! What is money? Is it a master or a servant? One day you will see all money floating as I saw it floating in Europe. Where is the mighty dollar? It recently became a midget. What about the Israeli pound? It started like the English pound. I saw the English pound being whittled down by inflation—from \$3, to \$2.80, to \$2.40; now it is \$2.42.

163. The mighty will fall if they are unjust. What is money? The Arabs are getting more money, money, money! What is money? Money should be a means to facilitate exchange instead of bartering, but it should not be worshipped. Two thousand years ago Christ himself warned us not to worship money. He was preaching also to us, the Semites of the area, not to the Jews only. You cannot worship two masters—God and mammon. You must worship either the one or the other.

164. The representative of Israel brought up the argument that they are building, clearing slums and modernizing the City. At one time John Rockefeller the eldest—and I am talking about millionaires at just the right moment because my good friend Ambassador Phillips has just sat down beside me. I know that he is busy with the Chinese problem. John D. Rockefeller, the grandfather—not

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, the Governor, or Mr. David Rockefeller, the banker, but *their* grandfather—when he could not use up the money had made from oil, in Pennsylvania, not in Texas, was once told by a gentleman named Mr. Reid: "You know, Mr. Rockefeller, you are the most hated man in America." Rockefeller said, "Why, what have I done?" He answered, "I don't know, but when people become rich they are hated or envied. Do you want to be liked?" He was the first public relations man in the annals of the United States. Mr. Rockefeller said to Mr. Reid, "Young man, you come to see me tomorrow in my office". Mr. Reid sold him the idea of the nucleus of the Foundation.

165. Why am I talking about all this—the Rockefeller Foundation, medical schools and so on? Because the Rockefellers then became involved in the restoration of Williamsburg. I think they spent some \$80 million in hard currency, not inflated currency, on that; they restored Williamsburg. They did not say the houses were old and they should be torn down. I have been there; it is a very charming town. What is Williamsburg compared with Jerusalem? All the Americans are infants in civilization; they were British only 200 years ago. Should Jerusalem, which is the cradle of Christianity and Islam and the symbol of Judaism—we concede that—be subjected to modernization, destroying houses, obliterating cobbled streets, so that it may have the cachet of modernism? Must apartment houses be built to settle hundreds of thousands in the future so that the dream of the Zionists may be realized: to have Palestine, with Jerusalem as its capital, as the place of the ingathering for all the Jews? What is this that you are modernizing the City? Who wants to modernize the City? On the contrary, it should be restored as much as humanly possible, just as Williamsburg was restored.

166. Here, in this young country, they seek out certain places and conserve the buildings. They do the same in England; in France: the Chateaux de la Loire, the Crillon—that is where I stay; they did not take away the façade and build ten storeys there; the Place de la Concorde, one of the most beautiful squares in the world: they did not destroy the Ministère de la Marine. The buildings are beautiful. They do things inside—a little here and little there—but the cachet of modernism does not interest them. You tell us you have been doing this to Jerusalem in order to modernize it. And perhaps you will want to build some industries around and pollute the air more than it is already politically polluted. Whom do you think you are fooling here with your argument? We do not buy that bill of goods of modernism. That is a fallacious argument. Today nations try to restore and conserve historical sites as part of their heritage, but you are doing the exact opposite. You have power.

167. Let us come to grips and grapple with the issue. You took Palestine and Jerusalem by force—a fait accompli—and rationalized that it was given to you by God. I say, God does not give land to any people. If I prayed to Him from now until doomsday He would not give me an inch. I have to work and buy land or encroach upon my neighbour and take his land. That was what you did—except that you did not really encroach upon your neighbours, because you

came from distant parts, from the Balkans, from Central Europe, from Eastern Europe. And you are always maligning the Soviet Union because it happens to have some 3 million Jews. You say: "Why don't you let them come?" "Let my people go!" Your people? There is not a Semitic Jew there; the Jews in the Soviet Union are Khazars. I want the Soviet Union to know that they are not our Jews; they are your Jews. I know what the game of power politics is sometimes.

168. If the Soviet Union should get irked with us one of these days, thinking we are flirting with another great Power, oh boy, they will send all the Jews in the Soviet Union to us—they will, if they see that some of us turn our backs on them.

169. And then you say that Christian and Moslem pilgrims are going to Jerusalem. What pilgrims? For your information—and I checked this, because I do not talk lightly; I may make you laugh in order to relieve the tension, but this is serious—no one from the Arab world is going to Jerusalem, only Christians or Moslems from outside the Arab countries; we know. Only the poor Palestinians who are in the occupied area, or who were in occupied Palestine—the whole of Palestine has been occupied by you—go to Jerusalem. Do you want to brag about it—that you allow them to go to the churches and the mosques?

170. Do not misrepresent things, my colleague Mr. Tekoah; you did something worse: the cemetery of Mamillah, which is considered sacred ground by the Moslems—you erased it. Some of the Moslems who had beaten the Crusaders were buried there. Do you want to build something over it? You will be haunted by their spirits. Yours is a policy of *fait accompli*, and you are confronting the United Nations,—and more particularly the Security Council—with that *fait accompli*.

171. And you five permanent members of the Security Council—so-called great or sometimes super-Powers—what have you done about it? In 1947 did you observe the principle of self-determination? I was sitting at Lake Success, and I told you what pressures were being brought to bear to partition Palestine. A prelate—I do not want to say of what sect he was—was sent to Latin America. Of course, now you know his sect. He was given money so as to bring votes for the partition of Palestine. He regretted it before he died. He said: "I did not know; I did that in good faith".

172. An Asian representative spoke against partition for two hours at Lake Success—Evatt was presiding—and the President of one of the mightiest Powers emerging in Africa told me that he had got in touch with the President of an Asian Power that had just emerged—I am not going to mention names, in order not to embarrass people here. He told me; he spoke for two hours against partition, and the President of that Power got in touch with the President of that Asian Power and told him: "If you want to receive American aid you have to cast your vote for partition". He said: "I cannot". So they brought the Ambassador of that Power from Washington to vote for partition.

173. I cannot remain silent here; I witnessed these things. This whole State was created artificially by Khazars, who happened to be Jews, from eastern and central Europe.

174. Why should you have such power? Well, as I said, at one time the British thought it was a good thing to have a foot-hold in the Middle East, "lest those Arabs get drunk with nationalism", so that there would always be a pretext to save the route of the British Empire. And our friends the Americans thought, "Oh well, now we have oil interests; maybe one day they will nationalize; we should always have a foot-hold to have a pretext".

175. Those are the power politics of nations. In fairness to the big nations, smaller nations do it too. And those poor Palestinians are robbed of their country and of Jerusalem; and Mr. Tekoah, who comes from Shanghai and who happens to be a Jew, recites chapter and verse from the Bible out of the context of the whole situation. Ask me. I come from the area. They say the Baroodies go back 1500 years. We know a little, I think. You Khazars from the Balkans want to tell us what the truth of the situation is on spiritual grounds because there are 16 or 17 million Jews. What about the 1 billion Christians? What about the 700 million Moslems? If it is on the basis of religion, the Christians should hold Jerusalem: there are a billion of them. The Pope of the Middle Ages, Urban II, tried. That propagandist was Peter the Hermit. The declaration of Urban II is quite clear. I am paraphrasing from memory. He said: "Why are you cutting one another's throats?" As you know, there was some national awakening in Europe at that time—1187 is the date. He said: "Why are you cutting one another's throats? Go to the Holy Land and wrest the Holy Sepulchre"—meaning the tomb of Christ—"from the hands of the infidel"—meaning the Moslems, who worshipped the same God. But it was politics, you see; the Pope was a political figure. Thank God, now he is a spiritual figure. But now the Zionists want to reverse everything; they want to make a nationality out of a religion.

176. You cannot do it. It did not work. The Europeans before the advent of Protestantism were of the same religion. They cut one another's throats. We Moslems, too—we who are of the same religion—cut one another's throats sometimes. You cannot take them as a people. You want to force this idea that the Jews are one people. They are not one people: they are different peoples. There are those who speak English, those who speak the American language, those who speak French, those who speak Yiddish. And our Jews speak Arabic.

177. Every now and then I get a call from an Aleppo Jew from Syria: "What are they doing to us, those *Siknesh*?" "*Siknesh*" is Arabic for "Ashkenazim"—those who are not Sephardic Jews—meaning, for your information, those who had been converted in the seventh century. "What are they doing?" I say: "Why ask me?" They say: "We want to know. We speak Arabic; our religion is the same." I say: "Go tell them; why do you tell me?" Only yesterday they called me. They said: "For heaven's sake, please, we have heard that some of our own Arab Jews may be mistreated." I said: "Never will they be mistreated." At one time a Jew who spoke Arabic was even pampered; he was a spy—

Cohen—and now they brag about him. They brainwashed him and he became a spy.

178. I have said all this in order to tell the Jews who are not Zionists to bridle their ambition—to curb their ambition—lest they become scapegoats. And you would be the first to suffer—because the bulk of the Jews are innocent. But your leaders are secular, playing on people's sentiments. We have seen what happened in Germany. Who is to say it will never happen again, against Jew and Moslem and Christian so long as bigotry has not been banished from the world?

179. I was on my way from Paris, and I saw something which bolsters my statement that one day you may become scapegoats and all of us—whether Jew or Gentile—would suffer to see the innocent suffer. And what would you do, you leaders of the Zionists? You would do exactly what you did in Nazi Germany—turn your heels to the air and leave your co-religionists there behind you. Schacht told something to a good friend of mine, an Ottoman prince—may God rest his soul; he died two years ago. He related this incident three or four times. And Schacht, remember, was not pronounced to be a Nazi. He was at Nuremberg, but he was absolved. He was Minister of Economy; before the First World War the Jews were highly respected in Germany. They wine and dined with the Kaiser. And then things changed. We shall not go into the historical ramifications of the post-war era. In the late twenties and thirties I was in Europe, watching things. And Schacht told this friend of mine after the war: "I cannot explain it; I used to send oral messages to the Jews, who were waging all kinds of campaigns against German goods. Of course, I was Minister of Economy, and I did not want our economy to suffer. We were living on *ersatz* to a large extent. And what did they do? The more I sent them word that Hitler was not to be fooled with"—he did not dare to put that in writing—"the more they intensified their propaganda against us. Time and time again I sent them word that their co-religionists would suffer. Did they care? No, they had a psychosis." Zionism is a psychosis. You cannot explain it in any other way. And we are developing a psychosis also, we Arabs: the psychosis of our nationalism. We have to, in order to fight a psychosis. We do not develop it willingly, but many of us will never make peace with the usurper.

180. And now I come to what I wanted to tell you about—a piece that appeared in the *Herald Tribune* of Paris, on 7 September. If you do not beware you will become the scapegoats. People are getting tired of both Jews and Arabs. But we do not care. We are 110 million and we are in our own area. But you are dispersed, and your money is out. And you will make victims and scapegoats of Jews. This item is from Pittsburg and appeared in *The New York Times* of 6 September, according to the source. It reads:

"The Zionist Organization of America yesterday allowed Rabbi Meir Kahane, head of the militant Jewish Defence League, to address a plenary session of the national convention. He called for Jewish emigration to Israel, and declared that the Jew is not liked in America".

Now, I am not saying that. If I did, you would say, "You are mischievous". No, he said it: the Jew is not liked. Now,

why? The Jew is a human being, like anybody else. There are many Jews who are good Americans. It is because the Zionists do not leave the American Jew, the British Jew or any other Jew alone. They tell them, "Your first duty is to Israel". Some reply, "We are Americans". "No, you are Jews first and foremost. Americans should be a source of Phantoms and money—billions. Your duty is to Israel." And whose Israel? The Israel of the ancient world? No. The Israel of the Khazars of eastern Europe.

181. I do not need to read the whole news item. If anyone wants to read it, I will send him Xerox copies. Incidentally, it was a very good Jew who organized the Xerox company, and he wanted to go to Israel. I do not think he will.

182. For heaven's sake, do not distort the facts and think people will be fooled for another twenty-five years. Twenty-six years have passed since this artificial State came into being. In fairness and justice not to the Arabs but to your co-religionists, who do not want to have anything to do with political Zionism, leave them alone. And leave us alone. If you want to live at peace with us as Jews of various cultures, you are welcome, but not under the flag of a usurping State.

183. In pre-war days we did not have the consciousness that "You are a Jew and I am a Christian and he is a Moslem". We never had that consciousness in our part of the world. You, the Khazars of eastern Europe, created it. And now you come and say Uru Salim is your city. You are fooling no one but yourself. To give it credence you have repeated this erroneous appraisal of the whole situation so many times that you believe it yourselves.

184. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Council, for having been so patient with me. I think I shall be more explicit in my next statement. It seems we have no recourse save to orations. The members of the Council must act—I started by saying that, and I end my statement not with a warning; I am speaking in a friendly manner; we know the difficulties.

185. The speech our beloved Secretary-General made today constitutes a textbook, a manual for future Secretaries-General and what they should do. But the onus is on the members of the Council. They should act and forget the policy resorted to at the time of the League of Nations, which I observed *ex officio* in the late twenties and thirties—the policy of the balance of power, the balance of spheres of influence.

186. Look at the painting in this chamber. Half the world is still submerged by injustice—and not necessarily political injustice. Our beloved Secretary-General enumerated the catastrophies, including famines, and we talk here as though we are squabbling, when the world is faced with such stupendous problems needing the attention of every human being regardless of nationality.

187. It is the prime duty of members—especially the five permanent members—to act, and to act with dispatch, lest things get out of hand and there is war and conflict and turmoil and suffering and bereavement. It is high time you, the members of the Council, put life into this Organization.

188. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Egypt in exercise of his right of reply.

189. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I am sorry to speak at this late hour, but I shall be extremely brief.

190. We have heard the Israeli representative exercising his right of reply, but not in the orderly manner of this Council. We heard this right of reply exercised in two sections with an interval between them. In the first one, as a lover of music I knew the beginning and I knew the end. This is an old statement, as I said last year, pre-cooked and frozen, waiting to be thrown in the face of anyone who dares say anything which is not to the liking of Mr. Tekoah. I need not go into that. The second section was an amazing reference to the efforts of this Council to settle the Middle East problem.

191. If Mr. Tekoah is speaking under instructions from his Government, I declare in the name of the Government of Egypt that we have no opposition to—nay, we welcome—a

full debate on this matter in this Council. But it would have to be conducted in an orderly way. It would have to be preceded by a final report from the Secretary-General of the United Nations and of his Representative, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring. Ambassador Jarring may then tell the story of his long and arduous efforts with us and of the 75 minutes which Mr. Tekoah has granted him since his Mission began here in New York.

192. The PRESIDENT: The representatives of Morocco and Lebanon, who have been invited to participate in the discussion, wish to speak at the next meeting.

193. I have also been informed that the representative of Jordan, in view of the lateness of the hour, wishes to defer his statement in exercise of the right of reply to a later meeting.

194. I shall therefore adjourn this meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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