

UNITED NATIONS



**SECURITY COUNCIL  
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

APR 22 1988

UN/SA COLLECTION

**2238<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 27 JUNE 1980

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2238) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966) .....	1

sp.

UN LIBRARY

APR 25 1968

UNISA COLLECTION

#### 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.

## 2238th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 27 June 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

*President: Mr. Ole ALGÅRD (Norway).*

*Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.*

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2238)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)

*The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the previous decisions [2233rd to 2236th meetings], I invite the representatives of Israel and Pakistan to take a place at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and I further invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Naik (Pakistan) took places at the Council table, Mr. Roa-Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq), Mr. Nusseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Halim (Malaysia), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. Laraki (Morocco), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Zowawi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Djigo (Senegal),*

*Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Alaini (Yemen) and Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bahrain, Somalia, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Saffar (Bahrain), Mr. A. M. Adan (Somalia), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) and Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. Mr. MILLS (Jamaica): The subject of this debate, the question of Jerusalem, has always been recognized as a component of special significance in the overall problem of the Middle East. Jerusalem holds a special place in the hearts of the adherents of three major religions, and is the subject of deep emotional attachments as the historical source and symbol of their cultural and spiritual values. The strength of feelings expressed in this debate is a testimony to that. It is therefore not surprising that developments affecting Jerusalem and its future should be viewed with such concern by peoples far removed from the region and in fact by the entire international community. From the time when the question of Palestine was first brought to the United Nations, it was recognized that because of Jerusalem's religious significance and symbolism, special arrangements were necessary to protect and preserve its heritage for Christians, Jews and Muslims alike.

4. Broader issues of a political and legal nature are involved in this question. Since the occupation of East Jerusalem by Israel in 1967, events have taken place which have given greater emphasis and urgency to those issues. Israel has taken a number of steps in pursuit of a policy of annexation. It has promoted the establishment of settlements, extended the boundaries

of the city and adopted administrative measures, all calculated to incorporate the eastern sector as an integral part of Israel. Further measures are being contemplated. It is reported that important Government offices are to be transferred to East Jerusalem and legislation is now pending in the Knesset to declare Jerusalem the capital of Israel.

5. All those measures are unacceptable on political and legal grounds. Israel's deliberate and persistent moves to consolidate its annexation of occupied territory must be rejected. Jamaica firmly stands by the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. We do not accept that any State has the right to acquire territory by military conquest. The annexation of East Jerusalem stands in clear violation of international law, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949,<sup>1</sup> and the Government of Israel should be left in no doubt that this is the firm view of the entire international community.

6. It is also very clear that the declared Israeli policy on Jerusalem is damaging to the prospects for achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The attempt to impose a unilateral solution as a *fait accompli* can only give rise to further tension, arouse distrust, anger and ultimately resistance. It will certainly not contribute to the creation of a climate propitious for peace. Jamaica continues to believe that the creation of such a climate can be greatly facilitated by a change of policy on the part of Israel. All the illegal measures which would have the effect of altering the geographic, demographic and historical character and status of Jerusalem should be rescinded and that should be followed by complete withdrawal from East Jerusalem and other territories occupied in the war of June 1967. Those are necessary steps which must be taken for an acceptable solution to be reached.

7. The Council has adopted a number of resolutions calling on Israel to take those measures. Others speaking in this debate have made reference to them and I need not dwell on them. We cannot but deplore Israel's continuing failure to abide by the Council's decisions. Its continued refusal to respect the resolutions of the Council and to co-operate with the United Nations in its efforts to reach a just settlement of the Middle East question increases the dangers of further conflict in the Middle East.

8. In recent months events have taken place in that region which have given rise to even greater apprehension concerning the future of the region and have heightened the level of confrontation. There is a growing consensus in the international community that outmoded approaches must now give way to more realistic ones. The recent declaration of the States members of the European Community at Venice [S/14009] seems to indicate a recognition on the part of those countries that the demands for justice in the

Middle East will have to be satisfied in order to bring about a durable and lasting peace. It becomes clearer every day that no one's interests are served by delays in facing the issues squarely and moving to resolve them—not the interests of the Palestinians, not the interests of Israel, not the interests of the countries of the region, or those of the international community.

9. I conclude by urging the Government of Israel to read in these events the need for a change in its policies and in its attitude to the United Nations and to the strongly expressed feelings of the international community. On the question of Jerusalem such a change is long overdue.

10. We hope that the Council's call on this occasion will not fall upon deaf ears.

11. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In recent months the Council has been giving virtually uninterrupted consideration to various aspects of the Middle East problem, and in particular the situation in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. The annexationist policy of Israel with regard to the Arab lands has been repeatedly condemned by representatives in the Council of the broadest possible segment of the membership of the United Nations. However, in spite of all the decisions of the Council, Israel is persisting in carrying out its annexationist policy and is giving further evidence of that practically every day.

12. Quite recently, on 1 March, the Council adopted resolution 465 (1980) calling upon Israel to rescind all the measures it had taken to change the physical character, demographic composition and institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. However, two and a half months thereafter, a bill was introduced in the Knesset which provided the proclamation of Jerusalem, with all its sectors and outskirts, as the capital of Israel. That so-called private members' bill was approved by the Israeli Cabinet and Prime Minister Begin frankly stated that his Government would not take any steps to prevent its adoption.

13. There are people who have attempted to claim that this is nothing but a bill and that it is still not known whether or not it will become law. The Begin Government, however, found it necessary to dispel any possible doubts and without even waiting for the formal approval of the bill, hastened to adopt a decision to transfer its headquarters to the Arab sector of Jerusalem. Adopted on the eve of the consideration of the question of Jerusalem in the Security Council, this decision by the Israeli authorities can only be viewed as an act of defiance of the Security Council and indeed of the whole United Nations.

14. In the light of those events, the Soviet delegation believes that the raising of the question of Jerusa-

lem by the Muslim States is extremely timely since the world is now confronted by the intentions of Israel to embark upon a new stage of its annexationist policy with regard to the occupied Arab lands, specifically to embark upon the process of its consolidation in law.

15. As the Council knows, since the aggression committed by Israel in June 1967 against the neighbouring Arab States, the Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly adopted resolutions condemning the actions of Israel designed to violate the status of the City of Jerusalem. Those resolutions contain the demand that Israel not take any steps in the occupied sector of Jerusalem which might have the effect of changing the status of the City, or which would be prejudicial to the rights of the inhabitants and the interests of the international community or to a just and lasting peace.

16. The adoption of those decisions by the United Nations was occasioned by urgent need, as Israel had, in the occupied Arab territories, embarked on a naked planned policy of arbitrary rule, violence and repression with regard to the Arab population, which had been dislodged from the homes that belonged to them, and the desecration of Muslim and other religious Holy Places and monuments of Islamic culture which are of value to the whole of civilized mankind.

17. Apart from the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, the Governments of many countries and many international and national organizations made demands that Israel cease systematically changing the appearance and status of Jerusalem. Israel's actions in Jerusalem were also condemned by UNESCO. However, to this very day, Israel is still stubbornly and defiantly continuing to flout the views of the international community and disregarding the decisions of the Council.

18. So the natural question arises, how are we to explain the fact that Israel for 13 years now has been violating with impunity one of the fundamental principles of international law, in accordance with which the appropriation of the territory of others as a result of military occupation is illegal, inadmissible and contrary to the Charter of the United Nations?

19. The answer to that question has already been given by many speakers in the Council. The reason for such a defiant attitude by Israel lies in the fact of the unreserved and comprehensive support provided to Israel by the United States. Over the course of many years, the United States has been providing Israel with the broadest possible political, economic, financial and military support, thus encouraging Israel to continue its policy of expansion and aggression against the Arab States. It is precisely the United States which has constantly been blocking the adoption by the Security Council of decisions confirming the inalienable rights

of the Palestinian people. A few days ago, representatives of the Carter Administration repeated that the United States would vigorously oppose the creation of a Palestinian State and did not intend to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization. It is precisely Washington that has been preventing the adoption by the Security Council of effective measures which might have an effect on Israel and force it to heed the demands of the international community.

20. But, in spite of the isolation in which it constantly finds itself on this question, the United States is stubbornly continuing to defend the expansionist ambitions of the ruling circles in Israel with regard to the neighbouring Arab lands and the Palestinian territories. This policy of the United States has found its most concentrated expression in the agreements which were concluded with its active participation, the separate Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli treaty. After the conclusion of those separate deals, Israel ever more intensively embarked upon the fulfilment of its expansionist plans with regard to the Arab lands. Under the cover of talks with Egypt on so-called administrative autonomy, which has been vigorously repudiated by the Palestinian people themselves, Israel has embarked upon a course of direct annexation of the Arab lands and the implementation of the plan for creating a so-called Greater Israel.

21. As a result of Camp David, the Middle East is today unfortunately further than ever from genuine peace and from a genuine and long-term political settlement. The situation in the Middle East is becoming ever more exacerbated because the major problems are still unresolved. Those problems are the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories they occupied in 1967, the guaranteeing of the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and the creation of its own State, and the ensuring of the right of all States in the area to a secure existence and development.

22. However, there are some people who are inclined to make appeals for patience, for us not to be in too much of a hurry in our efforts to attain a Middle East settlement, asserting that the difficulties that now lie ahead are connected with the forthcoming elections in the United States. That, they allege, also explains the pro-Israeli line of the United States Administration, and they claim that after the elections the situation will change.

23. Those arguments, however, fail to take into account the true strategic goals of the United States in the Middle East, which can be understood if we bear in mind the fact that the Camp David deal, according to certain estimates, is going to cost the United States, over the next few years, the sum of about \$15 to \$20 billion. These vast expenditures are designed primarily to perfect Israel's military machine and also to maintain the present régime in Egypt

and to enable the United States to create in the Middle East a wide network of its own military bases and other facilities necessary for the deployment of the American military presence in that area. As we know, military facilities in Egypt, Oman and certain other countries were already used by the United States for their military adventure in Iran. The so-called comprehensive solution provided for by Camp David is designed to transform the region of the Middle and Near East into a sphere of exclusive American influence.

24. These are the far-reaching goals of the policy of the United States, and in the light of this, today's discussion in the Council of the situation in the Middle East acquires particular significance, far transcending the limits of the concrete issue of Jerusalem, however great the importance of that matter. It is necessary fairly to call a halt to the intentions of Israel, which relies on the support of its foreign protector, to consolidate the fruits of aggression against the Arab peoples and juridically to formalize the annexation of the occupied Arab lands. Israel's naked ambition to confront the whole world with a *fait accompli* is fraught with the most serious consequences for peace and security in the whole of the Middle East. The decisiveness with which the Council reacts to this act of defiance by the Israeli authorities will largely determine the success of a just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

25. The Soviet delegation would like once again in this connection to confirm the position of principle of the Soviet Union in support of the just struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression and for a just settlement in the Middle East. It is precisely because of that position that the Soviet Union firmly rejected the Camp David accords and opposed separate understandings based on playing off the interests of certain States and peoples against those of others. The Soviet Union considers that the only correct approach to the attainment of a Middle East settlement is the approach of collective effort on the part of all parties concerned including, of course, the PLO.

26. In the Soviet Union, the Palestinian and other Arab peoples have had, and continue to have, a reliable, trusty friend and ally in their struggle to ensure of their national rights and to attain a lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of a just and comprehensive settlement.

27. Mr. GARBA (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): The Council is meeting once again to consider a flagrant case of violation of the very principles upon which the Organization is based. Israel has again defied the international community by initiating the legislative procedures for making the Holy City of Al-Quds its capital. This is another of those unpleasant surprises for which Israel alone has the knack. One may wonder whether a cult of insecurity and the taste

for adventure are on their way to becoming permanent features of Israeli political life. How else can one explain Israel's stepping up of reprehensible acts, each in its turn condemned by the international community? Are not the United Nations and, in particular, its organ for the maintenance of peace—the Security Council—being used by Israel to whet the aggressiveness and combative ardour of its people, qualities which in its eyes are indispensable for the realization of its sinister designs?

28. Indeed, since April, the Council has been almost continuously at work because of Israel's intolerable conduct and its attacks on the life, the rights and the property of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories. From the harassment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon by allied forces to the attempt at the annexation of Jerusalem, through the expulsion of some elected Palestinian mayors and assassination attempts on others, Israel has always followed the diabolical logic of using ever increasing provocations to neutralize the effects of Council resolutions.

29. These contemptible actions cannot be received with indifference by the Council, for they imperil the sacred values of the Organization and the life and liberty of an entire people. For that is truly what is involved. The future of Jerusalem cannot be dissociated from that of the martyr Palestinian people which has struggled for three decades to recover its rights over the land of its ancestors. Not satisfied with having usurped these rights, Israel has for a time been engaged in a systematic process of annihilating the Palestinian identity. Swearing irascible hatred for anything manifesting the Palestinian spirit, Israel, never changing, could not but take as the target for its expansionist aims Jerusalem, which symbolizes better than any other city in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories the immutable and indestructible character of the history of the great Palestinian people.

30. But Jerusalem is also a Muslim city, whose Holy Places are an integral part of the spiritual heritage of nearly 800 million believers. This is why the member countries of the Islamic Conference, which met last month at Islamabad, denounced unequivocally the annexationist process which is being pursued by the Israeli Parliament. The Niger, a Muslim and non-aligned country, has associated itself with those who spoke out at Islamabad and throughout the world against Israel's claims.

31. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, on behalf of the Islamic Conference [2233rd meeting], stressed, with the solemnity appropriate to such circumstances, the exceptional gravity of the Israeli actions which are, moreover, full of danger to peace in the region and to international security. The decision by the Israeli Prime Minister to transfer his offices to East Jerusalem, taken on the eve of the Council's meeting, makes the current situation in Jerusalem particularly acute.

32. The delegation of the Niger is convinced that the Council, at the risk of failing in its duty, must act firmly and quickly to take the measures called for by the gravity of the situation. Israel must be brought into line through the means placed at the disposal of the Council by the Charter. The application of the sanctions provided for in the Charter seems to be the only weapon capable of curbing Israel in its efforts at colonial reconquest.

33. We cannot believe that there still remain in the Council members who doubt the need to impose on Israel the verdict of the international community, not only to re-establish a reign of justice in the Middle East, but also to ensure a future for this body, the fruit of the bitter sacrifices made by the whole of mankind to save the world, and especially Europe, from the demons of fascism.

34. Human dignity is an indivisible whole which must not suffer any strain. Consequently, we cannot mount a crusade against human rights violations in one region while cultivating elsewhere the friendship of the upholders of zionism and *apartheid* who each day further stain the Middle East and southern Africa with blood. The security of nations and peoples knows no frontier. What was true yesterday for the European peoples, the victims of fascism—including the persecuted Jews of the Diaspora—is true today for the Palestinian and South African peoples who groan under the yoke of régimes based upon religious and racial exclusivity.

35. Our peoples have a right to the protection of the Council, even if it be only of gratitude for the lives they sacrificed to make possible the Council's creation. Those among us who paralyse the Council, preventing it from performing its salutary role in order to allow Israel and South Africa to trample underfoot the most elementary human rights are demonstrating unspeakable ingratitude and failing to recognize historical truth. They bear a grave responsibility for the deterioration of the climate of peace and harmony, for which we earnestly hope.

36. The Security Council must act to put an end to the desecration of the Holy Places of Islam and, above all, to save Jerusalem, that thrice Holy City which faithfully reflects the past glories of the Muslim world and mirrors the hopes of all believers.

37. Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): Once again the Council has been compelled to deliberate on the sensitive and explosive issue of the status of Jerusalem. We are meeting here because the internationally recognized status of the Holy City of Jerusalem is being threatened by the actions, policies and practices of Israel, which is the occupying Power. At issue is a frantic and relentless attempt at Judaizing Jerusalem through annexation and promulgating the occupied City of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Legislative procedures are being hushed in Israel to legitimize

an act of aggression and usurpation in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions.

38. The Israeli manoeuvres to annex Jerusalem and to change or fake its religious dimension and demographic composition are a struggle against established facts. They should also be seen as part of the intransigence of the Israeli authorities. Jerusalem is perhaps the best known Holy City in the world. Virtually all segments of the adult population throughout the world know Jerusalem as the citadel of various religious denominations and not as an Israeli colony. For centuries and even longer, the Holy City of Jerusalem was accessible to all worshippers until the time of occupation.

39. Our fears are that, since religion is a matter of faith and profound feelings, anything which adversely affects the Holy Places becomes a very emotional issue. That is why the international community should heed the timely appeal made at the Islamic Conference of 39 States held at Islamabad recently. In history, fratricidal so-called holy wars have been caused by religious frustrations. Zambia, for its part, does not want to witness yet another dangerous international conflict arising from the dispute over Jerusalem. If the Israeli authorities want peace, as their supporters claim, the road to peace does not lie through adverse attempts to alter the well-established international status of Jerusalem.

40. The problem of Jerusalem should be viewed in the context of the overall contemporary Middle East crisis. Jerusalem is intrinsically intertwined with other aspects of the Middle East crisis. It should therefore be borne in mind that the problem of the status of Jerusalem has serious international implications.

41. Since the illegal occupation of all of Jerusalem by Israel during the 1967 war, the Israeli authorities have hatched dangerous schemes which have adversely transformed Jerusalem. The Israeli authorities are not only attempting to politicize Jerusalem by juridically declaring it as the so-called capital of Israel but also continuing to impose Judaization on that Holy City. What has been done by the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories in the past decade has been as shocking to the conscience of mankind as it has been astounding to believers and non-believers alike.

42. The Israeli Government has long been known to harbour annexationist policies towards Jerusalem. As long ago as 1948, plans for the occupation of Jerusalem were already under way. In December 1949, the Israeli régime issued a statement purporting to declare Jerusalem as its capital. Attempts to implement this illegal proclamation by asking Governments to transfer their embassies from Tel Aviv have so far failed. The international community must desist and resist these cheap tactics.

43. It is a fact that the Arab population of Jerusalem, like that in all other occupied lands, is perpetually under pressure to emigrate, thereby creating more living space for Israelis. Religious freedom has been curtailed. Access to Jerusalem is highly restricted, contrary to whatever Israeli propaganda would want us to believe. In addition, the sheer physical structure of that city is being changed, and there are several United Nations reports and others attesting to this fact.

44. What has been equally ominous is that the Israeli authorities have embarked on mining holy shrines, such as mosques and other places of worship in the Old City. Several ancient structures have been demolished. Most of these actions are classified as excavations under the guise of archaeology. As far as we know, archaeology is an academic discipline for discovering truth; yet, in Israel, it is being abused as an indiscipline for destruction. It is significant that in 1968 a UNESCO resolution<sup>2</sup> called upon Israel to desist from archaeological excavations in Jerusalem, which, *inter alia*, contravene the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, done at The Hague on 14 May 1954.<sup>3</sup>

45. The international community cannot afford to remain indifferent to these dangerous developments. There are several resolutions which the Council has adopted whose aim has been to guarantee the special status of Jerusalem. We have in mind resolutions 252 (1968), 267 (1969) and 465 (1980), among others. It should also be recalled that Council resolution 271 (1969) condemned Israel for the arson at the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem on 21 August 1969. There was a universal outrage at that act of sacrilege in one of the most venerated shrines of mankind.

46. In our view, any act of destruction or profanation of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in Jerusalem or any encouragement to commit such acts or connivance in them could seriously endanger international peace and security.

47. There have also been several other administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem. These include the expropriation of land and properties, the transfer of populations and now legislation aimed at the incorporation of the occupied section. All these acts are illegal and invalid.

48. In conclusion, what has been said about the problem of Jerusalem is yet another warning signal of the escalating overall conflict in the Middle East. Appropriate international action must be taken now to arrest the deteriorating situation. Israel must be compelled to relinquish its occupation of Arab lands and to allow the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to rule themselves. Zambia is vehemently opposed to all forms and manifestations of colonialism.

49. The Council should ensure that its resolutions on Jerusalem are fully implemented. If Israel refuses to

comply, the Council should invoke the several Charter provisions to ensure the implementation of the demands of the international community.

50. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Islamic States have come to the Security Council because it has become known that Israel intends to include Jerusalem in the Israeli State and, in violation of international law, officially to declare Jerusalem the capital of Israel. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is entirely sympathetic to this recourse to the Council and shares the serious concern of the Arab and Islamic peoples.

51. Jerusalem is part of the territories illegally occupied by Israel. The numerous resolutions of the Council—resolution 242 (1967), for example—have called upon Israel to withdraw from those territories. The resolutions have repeatedly stressed the illegal nature of the acquisition of territory by force. What Israel is aiming at right now is nothing but the seizure of lands by cold-blooded annexation. What we have here is a new act of aggression on the part of the ruling circles of Israel which is an act of defiance of the international community. The arrogance of the idea of creating a "Greater Israel" is something that runs counter to international peace and security. What we are dealing with here is a new attempt to implement a colonialist policy, which has been intensified since Camp David.

52. I would recall here the acts of terror against the Palestinians in the occupied territories, in particular in the West Bank, the persecution of the leaders of the Palestinian population and the creation of so-called defensive villages in the occupied lands. As the report of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) shows [*S/13450 of 12 July 1979*], more than 90,000 Israeli settlers have occupied 30 per cent of the most fertile land on the West Bank and hundreds of thousands of the inhabitants have been driven out.

53. Obviously, the ruling circles in Israel consider the present time appropriate for the continuation of such actions. No doubt it is believed in Tel Aviv that, as a consequence of the exacerbation of the international situation by imperialist circles of the United States, the attention of world public opinion is being sufficiently diverted and the Israelis can count on the benevolent support of the Zionist lobby in the United States which, particularly at the beginning of the electoral campaign, is encouraging Israel to undertake further adventures. Or, perhaps, in view of the rising wave of condemnation of the aggressive policy of Israel throughout the world and even in Israel itself, and also in view of the increasing support for the just demands of the Arab peoples, in particular the Arab people of Palestine, the ruling circles in Israel are in a hurry to confront the world with a *fait accompli*.



54. But now one can no longer disregard those voices that are being raised throughout the world demanding recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; and the so-called plans for autonomy or other political or diplomatic manoeuvres no longer serve any purpose. It has now become obvious to everyone that the policy of Israel and the United States have failed to reckon with the realities of the situation, do not take into account the current trends, and are, furthermore, extremely dangerous.

55. This can be ascertained—as it has been by the Arab and Islamic States—from the example of Jerusalem. The States of the Non-Aligned Movement, at their sixth Summit Conference at Havana, stated unambiguously that the restoration of Arab sovereignty over Jerusalem was a *sine qua non* of lasting peace. In the light of the importance of Jerusalem for millions of believers in all continents, the adherents of the three major religions of the world should be assured access to their Holy Places and assured of being able to carry out their religious observances in Jerusalem without let or hindrance. A point of departure for solving the problem of Jerusalem has been and remains the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories, including Jerusalem. There is a direct link between the ensuring of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and a lasting solution of the problem of Jerusalem.

56. The German Democratic Republic holds the view, which is stated in the declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, that

“A lasting peace in the Middle East could have been established long ago. The road to such peace is well known . . . an all-embracing Middle Eastern political settlement with the direct participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestinian Arab people as embodied by its representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, on the basis of respect for the legitimate interests of all States and peoples of the Middle East, including Israel.

“Such a settlement requires the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the restoration of the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, including the establishment of its own independent State, and the safeguarding of the sovereignty and security of all States of the region.” [S/13948, annex II, sect. III.]

57. The Arab peoples looked in vain for a declaration of this kind from Venice. Even in Western Europe there are quite differing assessments of the results of the meeting of the Nine at Venice. The Munich newspaper *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, for example, wrote in its issue of 16-17 June:

“Caught between the warnings of the Americans and the Israelis against the Western European

initiative on the Middle East, on the one hand, and the expectations of the Arabs, on the other, the Nine have chosen a way out that is so typical of diplomatic summits—the drafting of a so-called balanced document, which will be destined simply to gather dust in archives.”

This is the view of that newspaper. But, for my own part, I should just like to state that half-hearted declarations cannot possibly bring closer a comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict.

58. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports the just demands of the Islamic States with regard to the measures of the Security Council to avert the annexationist designs of Israel with regard to Jerusalem. Should Israel fail to comply with these demands, it would be entirely justifiable to have recourse to Chapter VII of the Charter.

59. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Malaysia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

60. Mr. HALIM (Malaysia): Mr. President, I wish first of all to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to you and the other members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to take part in the current deliberations of the Council on the situation in the Middle East, specifically on the question of Jerusalem.

61. We have listened with great interest to the statements made by delegations since the start of the deliberations on this item on 24 June. The seriousness of the situation affecting the Holy City of Jerusalem makes it incumbent on us to participate in the current debate and to add our voice to the expressions of concern and indignation that have been voiced by the delegations that have already spoken.

62. Mr. President, my delegation is pleased to see you presiding over this meeting. We wish to extend to you our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. We are confident that, with your vast experience and wisdom, you will guide these deliberations to a successful conclusion.

63. The Council has already met on several occasions this year to consider important and urgent problems related to the question of the Middle East, and yet it is now meeting again to consider another aspect of the question—this time, the dangerous situation arising from Israel's latest moves to consolidate its illegal annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and its action to implement its decision to make the city its permanent capital. This series of meetings of the Council is but indicative of the deteriorating developments in the situation in the Middle East, of which Palestine is the core. The Council is all too familiar with the intransigent attitude of Israel, which has continued to ignore the resolutions of the Security Council and the

• General Assembly and to violate the principles of international law.

64. Most delegations that have addressed the Council in the past few days have enumerated at length the series of actions taken by Israel in occupied Palestinian and Arab territories in contravention of established principles of international law and in utter disregard of the opinions of the international community. However, at the risk of repetition, my delegation wishes to reiterate in the strongest possible terms its opposition to those illegal actions—the expropriation of Arab land, the building of new illegal settlements and the expansion of existing ones, the destruction and confiscation of Arab homes and property and the expulsion of their inhabitants, including elected officials—all of which effectively deny the people of Palestine exercise of their inalienable rights as recognized by the General Assembly. Such action can only prolong the conflict in the Middle East, for the people of Palestine will never cease to struggle for the realization of their legitimate rights. On this occasion I wish to reiterate Malaysia's firm support for their legitimate struggle.

65. Despite the unequivocal affirmation by the Security Council through a series of resolutions of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the invalidity of all legislative and administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem, Israel has continued to take measures aimed precisely at changing the physical character, demographic composition and status of Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. Added to the list of actions to change the character of the Holy City of Jerusalem, the latest move by the Israeli Parliament to declare Al-Quds Al-Sharif the capital of Israel and the preparations to move the office of the Prime Minister to East Jerusalem are an affront not only to the Council but also to millions of Muslims throughout the entire world who hold the city sacred and to whom it is of special religious and spiritual significance. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in his statement of 24 June [2233rd meeting], and others who have spoken after him, have succinctly described the significance of the Holy City to all Muslims the world over. They have also conveyed to the Council the deep sense of indignation and concern of the member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference at the Israeli action.

66. As a Muslim country, and as a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, Malaysia joins in deploring the move to change the character of the Holy City. The decision to shift the office of the Prime Minister to East Jerusalem is not only provocative but will also destroy any prospect of a comprehensive, just and peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, which we all hope for.

67. In conclusion I wish to reiterate my delegation's firm opposition to any change of any kind in the char-

acter and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, whose historic and spiritual significance to our people is well known. We urge the Council to exercise its responsibility by taking the necessary effective measures under the relevant provisions of the Charter to ensure the compliance of Israel with the appropriate resolutions of the Council so that peace can return to the region. Failure to act quickly and effectively will only increase the danger of armed conflict, which could threaten the peace and stability of the entire world.

68. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

69. Mr. MUJEZINOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, may I thank you, and through you the Council, for having enabled me to state the views of the Yugoslav delegation on one of the most acute problems of international relations, which has reached a crucial phase in its evolution.

70. My country attaches great importance to this debate because on the way the Council acts and on what the international community does to prevent negative developments depends the further course of events not only in the Middle East region but also beyond that region. There is hardly any need to argue that the Middle East crisis has a universal character, both because of its dimensions and implications for the general world situation and because of the involvement of principles on which international relations as a whole are founded.

71. The Council is debating this acute crisis in conditions characterized by a deterioration of the international situation in the Middle East and, more widely, by the increased tension in international conflicts. The situation in the Middle East, in the Gulf and in Central Asia has further deteriorated as a result of the aggravation of the international situation in general owing to the ever more frequent use of force, military interventions, interference in internal affairs and various forms of onslaught on the freedom and independence of sovereign States within the context of intensified great-Power and bloc rivalries, the struggle for spheres of interest and the arms race.

72. The causes of the dangerous situation in the Middle East are known. They are embedded in the aggressive expansionist policy of Israel, which ignores all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and continues to deny the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the establishment of its national State. It has now undertaken yet another dangerous step: the annexation of Jerusalem. Israel is making full use of attempts to alter the character of the question of Palestine by recourse to various partial or separate solutions. These developments are bound to aggravate still further the situation in the region. They are conducive to the legalization of the policy of *faits accomplis* and consequently

they prepare the ground for conflicts of wider proportions.

73. Such a course of events, which directly threatens international peace and security, makes it incumbent on the Council to act in order to prevent Israel from carrying out its intentions and to create conditions for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution.

74. Yugoslavia has constantly devoted particular attention to the Middle East crisis, and especially to the question of Palestine, proceeding from the conviction that realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is an indispensable prerequisite for all steps leading to the settlement of the crisis. We have always done so with the intention of contributing to the eradication of all the consequences of aggression and of ensuring respect for the legitimate rights of all peoples and States to independent development and a secure existence. We have done so out of respect for the principle that every people has the right to free and independent life and development, because we are convinced that that is the only way likely to lead to the settlement of the crisis on the basis that the Charter recognizes for every people. It is our moral obligation to prevent the continued denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, whose right to national and religious identity, freedom and self-determination cannot be called into question by anyone. These inalienable rights include, of course, the right of the Palestinian people to elect its own representatives and bearer of national sovereignty, which is, in any case the Palestine Liberation Organization.

75. As a country which is situated in the wider geographic area of this region, Yugoslavia is directly interested in the elimination of all negative elements of crisis from it. This is an additional reason why my country has always, together with other non-aligned States, sought a peaceful solution of the crisis, expressing its solidarity with the just cause of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples and countries victims of aggression. My country has always strongly opposed all forms of demographic change in the occupied Arab territories and denationalization and deprivation of the people of those territories of their national identity, including Jerusalem and its inhabitants, with its ethnic, cultural and religious pluralism.

76. The question of Jerusalem is most closely linked with the substantive issues of the Middle East crisis and bound up with the fate of other occupied Arab territories. It has become a specific problem of the world community and of the Security Council in particular. The Council has dealt on several occasions with the specific question of Jerusalem and the positions taken with regard to this problem are well known. Since it has become—owing to its exceptional historic, cultural and religious importance—the symbol of the struggle of the Palestinian people for its national rights, and especially for its own State, Jerusalem has acquired

the special status of international demilitarized zone in which all demographic, institutional, physical, legal and religious characteristics are to be protected and preserved. The international character of Jerusalem is reaffirmed by all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council—resolutions 242 (1967), 252 (1968), 267 (1969), 298 (1971), 446 (1979), 452 (1979) and 465 (1980)—in which the acquisition of territories by force and all legal and administrative measures taken by Israel for the purpose of altering the status of Jerusalem are proclaimed to be null and void.

77. However, in spite of this, Israel not only continues to pursue its present policy of occupation of Jerusalem, but has taken a further step towards legalizing annexation. This is proved by the recent bill introduced in the Knesset, declaring unified Jerusalem as Israel's capital. This act is morally and politically inadmissible. It is prohibited under international law and is contrary to the fourth Geneva Convention;<sup>1</sup> it is directed against the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples, their religion and historic traditions. It is, at the same time, one more proof of the lack of readiness on the part of Israel to comply with the decisions of the United Nations on a peaceful and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis.

78. Yugoslavia believes that it is necessary to deal with this question as a matter of urgency, particularly within the framework of the Security Council, and to adopt measures likely to contribute to its solution and, in the first place, steps that will compel Israel to refrain from the implementation of the aforementioned measures of annexation, to respect and apply the principles underlying contemporary international relations and international law and to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly.

79. The positions of Yugoslavia regarding the settlement of the Middle East crisis as a whole, and the question of Jerusalem in particular, are known. They are based on the widely accepted principle of unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem; the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to establish its own State under the leadership of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; and the recognition of the right of all States and peoples in the region to independent and secure existence.

80. We are convinced that the Middle East crisis can be solved only on the basis of such a comprehensive approach, within the framework of the decisions of the United Nations, with the participation of all parties, including the PLO, on equal terms.

81. Finally, the world Organization, primarily the Security Council, must take urgent and effective steps with a view not only to protect and preserve the

specific status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, its characteristics and symbolism, but also to prevent its annexation. If the Council fails to do so now, there is a risk that the basis for a peaceful and political settlement of the Middle East crisis will be brought irreversibly into jeopardy. Should Israel persist in its designs to annex the Holy City and to declare it as its capital, the Council must proceed directly to action provided for under the Charter.

82. Yugoslavia will continue to exert efforts, with other non-aligned countries, for a peaceful, comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis, in all its aspects, on an internationally recognized basis, and will support every action taken by the Council towards that end.

83. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

84. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first to express to the Council the gratitude of my delegation for this opportunity to take part in the Council's work. I should also like, Mr. President, to express our sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Senegal shares with your country, Norway, an overriding concern for the principles and ideals of the Charter and is most pleased that this debate is taking place under your presidency.

85. This meeting of the Council obviously coincides with Israel's decision to reinforce its illegal annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and to declare it the capital of Israel.

86. The Islamic Conference, to which my country has the honour to belong, expressed in the Council, through its acting Chairman, its firm opposition to any attempt by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem and to legalize the annexation of the City.

87. That decision by Israel is really part and parcel of a long-standing policy of the Israeli Government. Since 1967 there has been a vast movement of wrongful occupation and expropriation of Arab lands on the West Bank of the River Jordan. This measure of annexation, therefore, is a new step in the Israeli escalation of its attempt to justify the illegal occupation of Arab lands.

88. How many hundreds of acres of land cultivated by generations of Palestinian families have been taken from their legitimate owners? How many villages in the area have been razed and their inhabitants forced to abandon them? On the pretext of "security reasons" or "basic necessities", the Israeli authorities have requisitioned the lands that they have wanted and reassigned them after a certain period of time to groups of civilian settlers. There has been much testimony from many reliable sources which

leaves no doubt whatsoever about the unavowed aims of those actions.

89. Israel has thus engaged in a massive displacement of Palestinian populations and has concentrated them in isolated zones which can easily be watched and which are therefore vulnerable. Since 1967, 87 settlements have been established and this trend, instead of slowing down, has in fact accelerated, especially since the assumption of power by the Likud.

90. The documents and maps which have been presented to the Council in its past meetings make it abundantly clear that Israel intends to confer a permanent character on these settlements. The former Prime Minister, Mr. Rabin, stated in January 1977 that the creation of settlements by Israel guaranteed its security and provided it with a firm basis for "its demand for peace within defensible frontiers".

91. Israel's intentions are therefore perfectly clear: they involve nothing more and nothing less than the establishment of a permanent presence on the West Bank in the name of an alleged security which they persist in bringing up in the course of any negotiations for a just and lasting peace in the region, while scorning the aspirations of the Palestinian people, who, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, want only to recover their inalienable rights.

92. The question of Jerusalem, which cannot in truth be dissociated from the Palestinian question as a whole, none the less presents special features. In fact, the Holy City, by virtue of the fact that it contains the Holy Places of three revealed religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—with more than 1 billion 200 million believers, occupies a privileged position in the hearts of the hundreds of millions of faithful. Jerusalem represents and embodies the greatest spiritual tradition in the world and the continuity of the divine message proclaimed by Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

93. In 1948—to introduce an historical perspective—the Palestinian Arabs owned about two thirds of the western part of Jerusalem, claimed as Israeli Jerusalem. Today, practically nothing of this part remains in their hands. Moreover, Israel, since 1967, has pursued its confiscation of lands in the eastern part of the City, which until then had been exclusively occupied by Palestinian Arabs. Since that time, Israel has tried for its own benefit to change the demographic, cultural and religious nature of the Holy City, and in this way a number of historic and religious sites have been violated and even destroyed. The Al-Aqsa Mosque is at present threatened by collapse because of excavation work taking place nearby. Mosques have been transformed into synagogues, and this is true in particular of the Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi Mosque of Hebron, to name but one.

94. In making still clearer its intention to Judaize Jerusalem, the Israeli Government had drafted a bill on the transfer of headquarters of foreign diplomatic missions from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Today, the Israeli Government, in defiance of world public opinion, is maintaining its insidious scheme to modify the status of Jerusalem and to destroy the historic and spiritual nature of the Holy City by wishing to transfer there its headquarters.

95. It will be recalled that the tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, which was held at Fez in May 1979, invited those countries which had diplomatic missions in Israel to oppose all pressures to transfer their embassies, consulates and offices to Jerusalem. In truth, this appeal by the Islamic Conference did no more than conform with resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in July 1967, at its fifth emergency special session, when it declared that all measures taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem were invalid. Further, resolution 465 (1980) of the Council said that

“all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, or any part thereof, have no legal validity and that Israel’s policy and practices of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in those territories constitute a flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East”.

96. It is therefore clear that the problem of Jerusalem is the question in which Israel may count on the least possible complicity on the part of the international community. In fact, even its most unconditional defenders do not yet dare to question the legal and international status of the Holy City.

97. Be that as it may, the international community is unable either to condone or to sanction such a state of affairs. Jerusalem must be a city open to the three monotheistic faiths, a city where Christians, Muslims, and Jews can and must live together in peace and with mutual respect for each others’ beliefs under the guarantee of the United Nations. In the view of the Islamic countries, to quote from the declaration of Lahore of 1974,

“No agreement, protocol or understanding which postulates the continuance of Israeli occupation of the Holy City of Jerusalem or its transfer to any non-Arab sovereignty or makes it the subject of concessions or bargaining will be acceptable.”

98. I am sure you will agree that the Council must forthwith take appropriate action to curb Israel’s settle-

ment policy in the occupied territories. Furthermore, the Council must induce the Israeli Government immediately to cancel the administrative and legal measures which it has taken to annex Jerusalem and destroy the character of the City.

99. The General Assembly has already put forward a number of recommendations pertaining to the situation in the occupied territories; unfortunately, however, those recommendations have not been implemented, owing to the fact that action by the Security Council has been systematically blocked. The members of the Security Council, who, systematically opposing any proposal to assure a just and lasting peace which takes account of the legitimate inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the struggling peoples of southern Africa, are in fact those truly responsible for the expressions of violence—which are, moreover, legitimate expressions, of peoples that are aspiring to liberty. If those members were really concerned about the rights of the Palestinian people—in a word, if they cared about justice—then they should take further cognizance of the recommendations of the General Assembly, which are at this moment the sole valid basis for a just and lasting solution in the Middle East.

100. Whenever the international community speaks of the State of Israel, it of course recalls the ordeals undergone by the Jewish people through the ages. But today, Israel has become the oppressor of the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples of the occupied territories, just as the racist régime of South Africa, with its policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid*, is an oppressor of the African peoples in southern Africa.

101. Senegal, which denounces the racist practices of the South African régime, condemns with equal forcefulness the denial of the rights of the Palestinian people. And it is with equal uneasiness that we express our growing concern with regard to the Middle East. A policy of violence cannot lead to peace, and Israel would do well to recognize that. There can be no peace in the Middle East so long as the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination continues to be ignored. In our view, the Security Council must take forceful action immediately so that Israel, pending its withdrawal, discharges its obligations under resolutions of the United Nations and the fourth Geneva Convention.

102. In conclusion, because of its 3,000 years of symbolism, Jerusalem must retain its identity for the benefit of universal culture. Senegal would hope that the Council will justify the continuing expectations of the international community by shouldering the responsibilities conferred on it by the Charter.

103. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Iraq. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

104. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) : Mr. President, allow me at the outset to extend congratulations to you for having assumed the presidency of the Council. I should also like to thank Ambassador Idé Oumarou of the Niger for the able and wise manner in which he conducted the Council's business last month.

105. The Council is meeting at this time pursuant to the decision taken by the eleventh Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers held at Islamabad in May 1980, to examine the serious and dangerous situation arising from the latest legislation proposed by the Zionist authorities, which would purport to annex and declare Al-Quds (Jerusalem) the capital of the racist Zionist entity. Iraq, together with the other Muslim countries, expects the Council to declare that legislation null and void. We also expect the imposition of sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter against that entity, if it persists in such a criminal and cynical endeavour.

106. It is imperative at this juncture to recall United Nations resolutions demanding that the Zionist occupation authorities cease all actions or activities which might alter the character and status of Al-Quds, the Holy City of Jerusalem, which is considered the heart of the Islamic world by 800 million people and which is holy not for Muslims alone, but for Christians also.

107. The Republic of Iraq strongly rejects any and all illegal measures adopted by the Zionists in Al-Quds (Jerusalem), including the present legislation aimed at the designation of Al-Quds as the undivided and eternal capital of Israel. The Palestinians, supported by the Arab people, are adamant in their determination to retain the Arab character of that city. In their struggle for that objective they are not alone. They have the full support of all Muslim peoples throughout the world, whose attachments and commitment to Jerusalem are embodied in their faith and practices.

108. The Iraqi Government considers the decision by the Zionist entity to annex Al-Quds and make it its capital null, void and illegal. Iraq will spare no effort and overlook no sacrifice in its endeavour to nullify that decision and supersede it. The Israeli decision represents a challenge not only to Palestinians, Arabs and Muslims but also to the world community as a whole, since it defies and contravenes resolutions of the United Nations on the subject. We therefore call upon the Council to declare the annulment of the decision and to impose against Israel the sanctions stipulated in Chapter VII of the Charter.

109. It is also pertinent to recall that the support given by the United States to the racist governing circles of Tel Aviv has resulted in an escalation of their aggressive policies and oppressive crimes against the Palestinian Arab population. The criminal policies of the Zionist occupation authorities in Al-Quds and its environs have altered and obliterated the national, demographic, physical, religious and

historical character of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The Iraqi Government holds the Government of the United States responsible for that. Without that country's military, economic, financial, political and diplomatic assistance to Israel, the Zionist entity would not have been able to implement those policies in Jerusalem and in other parts of occupied Palestine. The purpose of the current Zionist aggressive policies and practices in Al-Quds is to erase totally the Arab and Islamic character of the Holy City and its environs and to squeeze out the indigenous citizens of Jerusalem—Muslim and Christian Arabs alike. It is needless for me to say that such policies and practices by the racist Zionist entity are altering and obliterating the national and historical character of Jerusalem and contravene the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, as well as other principles and norms of international law. The Security Council, together with the General Assembly, has adopted decisions to that effect. Jerusalem is an occupied city and Israel, as the occupying Power, is prohibited from adopting such policies and implementing such practices. We consider that the redemption of Jerusalem can be achieved only through the immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Palestinian and Arab occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return and their right to self-determination and independence, on their national soil.

110. The Iraqi delegation expects the Council to adopt prompt and effective measures against Israel, including the application of Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure compliance with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations on this subject most crucial to the Palestinians, the Arabs, the Muslims and the world community at large. Anything short of that would undermine the effectiveness of the Charter, make a mockery of the prestige of the Council and its resolutions and encourage Israel in its continued defiance and contempt of the will and determination of the world community.

111. The Republic of Iraq condemns the United States policies, actions, declarations and stands, which have encouraged Israel's intransigence. We hold the Government of the United States responsible for Israel's ability to continue its defiance of the United Nations. For reasons dictated by the parochial, narrow and personal interests of its politicians over the national interest of the United States as a whole, the Government of the United States has, regrettably, supported Israel in its sinister designs. The United States Government is supporting by all means at its disposal the aggression by Israel against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. Because of that support, Israel has been able to defy the United Nations and to refuse to implement scores of resolutions on the Palestinian question. The latest disavowal by the United States of its vote on resolution 465 (1980) is a typical example of that fact. It is needless for me to point out the huge

amount of financial assistance, mostly grants, given to Israel. We have been witnessing and shall continue to witness for a few months to come the competition among United States presidential candidates and between the two political parties in making promises and commitments of support to Israel and of declaring animosity towards the Palestinians and their Arab brethren. We are confident that the price for the American policy of injustice, bias and one-sidedness will be very high for the American people itself.

112. The United States Administration succeeded two years ago in luring and pushing the Egyptian régime into a position against the rights and interests of the Arab world and to the conclusion of the Camp David accords. That attitude by the Egyptian régime has resulted in the intensification of Israeli aggression and the consolidation of its annexation of Palestinian territories. The heroic Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, is standing firmly against the Camp David designs, which, it has been proved beyond doubt, are doomed to failure. The Arab nation stands fast behind the decisions of the two Arab Summit Conferences, held at Baghdad and Tunis in 1978 and 1979 respectively, in condemning the Camp David accords, which are imposing the policy of the *status quo*, the Zionist occupation and the consolidation of the aggressor's conquests.

113. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him to make his statement.

114. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I do not propose to reply to each and every one of the speakers who have been mobilized to participate in this parade. I should like to confine myself to only one of them, the spokesman for the German Republic, which for some reason calls itself Democratic. I do so because of a simple fact: even more than any other intervention it was his that highlighted the degree of cynicism that has become the hallmark of the almost continuous onslaughts against my country, onslaughts which the Council has been harnessed to in recent months by the Arab opponents of peace in the Middle East and by their supporters outside the region.

115. What, in fact, are the qualifications which that spokesman of the Pankow régime brings to this debate, ostensibly devoted to Jerusalem? They are primarily three: first, the profundity of religious outlook for which that régime is so well known; secondly, the apparent nostalgia which he feels about the situation that prevailed in the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967, when that part of Jerusalem was *Judenrein*, an expression which the spokesman for Pankow is no doubt familiar with; and thirdly, the expertise of his régime in the sphere of divided countries and divided capital cities—after all, the Pankow régime has its seat in the divided capital of a divided country. Let me therefore assure the spokesman of

Pankow that we in Jerusalem do not wish to emulate the example set in Berlin.

116. None the less, his intervention was useful in that it clearly pointed out the true character of the alliance that exists here against my country and which seeks to exploit here the sanctity of Jerusalem for its unholy purposes.

117. I shall refrain from commenting on the utter and abysmal tastelessness manifested here when the spokesman for a German State deems it appropriate to use and abuse every occasion to vilify the Jewish State and to express himself in such a manner on issues affecting the fundamental rights of the Jewish people and the vital interests and security of the Jewish State. People of good will and decency around the world, including in his own country, have been watching this performance with the contempt and disgust which it deserves.

118. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply. I call on him.

119. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): The Council heard a distorted explanation or presentation of a concept—or principle—of an inalienable right when it was mentioned that a people is denied the right to self-determination. Well, I must admit that it is true that the Palestinian people in its totality under the British Mandate was denied that right, and this is an historical fact we all know about. But, frankly, what the Palestinian people are struggling for now—50 or 60 years after the Mandate—is to attain the exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination, a right that we conceive of only in our own country, Palestine.

120. It would be bizarre if a United States citizen of Irish origin, like Senator Moynihan, or of Polish origin, like Secretary of State Muskie or Mr. Brzezinski, were to insist on exercising his inalienable national rights, including the right to self-determination, in Ireland or in Poland. It would be even more bizarre if Senator Jacob Javits were to come before the Council alleging that he is denied the exercise of his inalienable right to self-determination because he is only a Senator in the United States Senate.

121. There has been a distortion of these things; inalienable rights are exercised in one's own country, and not at the price of denying the majority of the people—or any part of the people—their right to self-determination.

122. A bit of history may be illustrative. When the Balfour Declaration was drafted in 1917, there was one Jewish member of the British cabinet, Edwin Montague, the Secretary of State for India. He insisted that he should be regarded as a Jewish Englishman. Mr. Montague represented two groups: the Board of

Deputies of British Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Association, and he was striving for the enjoyment of civil and religious freedom by the Jewish community in the Holy Land; he said that the community should "receive equal political rights with the rest of the population and reasonable facilities for immigration". Thus, the idea at that time was that they should receive equal political rights, and this is why he insisted that there would be some objection to what he called the "recognition of Jews as a homeless nationality" and to the investment of Jewish settlers with certain "special rights in excess of those enjoyed by the rest of the population". It was this insistence that caused the following clause to be included in the Balfour Declaration:

"... it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice . . . the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country".<sup>4</sup>

So we can see that the rights of Jews anywhere in the world were there; if there were some Zionists who refused, and wanted special treatment, this was because of their racist concept of this right.

123. On another issue, we have heard the representative of Tel Aviv speak of the destruction of 58 synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem. It so happens that I am a son of Jerusalem: I was born and raised there, and the Council must believe me when I say that I do not recall that there were 58 large places specifically used as synagogues. I admit that there were a number—perhaps even more than 58—of chapels in buildings where people gathered to pray. If I were to consider them as being synagogues, then I would have to say that every Christian house in which there is an icon and an oil lamp was a cathedral and every Muslim house in which there is a niche was a mosque.

124. But let us reflect. Most of the property in which Jews lived in the Old City was the property of the Maghreb Arabs and Muslims. It was a religious endowment. Those buildings were demolished in 1967 when the so-called Israeli Defence Forces razed them. I should like to stress that we all know about the Rock of Moriah, which some people call the Sacred Rock and others Temple Mount; we all know about the Cave of Machpela where the bones of the Patriarch Abraham and Sarah lie. Those were abandoned sites until the Muslims came to Jerusalem and, out of veneration, erected the most gorgeous buildings, one of them the Al-Aqsa Mosque, which the present Zionists are planning to demolish. The press has left us in no doubt that it is indeed their plan to demolish that structure, which is both sacred and architecturally important. The Mosque in Hebron stands on the site of the Cave of Machpela in veneration of the Patriarch and not in desecration of any religion.

125. But this is not the issue before the Council at present. The Council is dealing with an attempt to change the status of Jerusalem.

126. I look around me in this chamber holding in my hand a list of the diplomatic representatives accredited to Israel. I see that some countries members of the Council have such representatives, but I also see that they maintain their embassies either in the Federal Republic of Germany, as in the case of Jamaica, or in Tel Aviv. No member has its embassy in Jerusalem. This is not because they do not like the climate in Jerusalem—I come from Jerusalem and I think that they would all love to be in Talbiyeh or Katamon or Rehavia or Talpiot or on Mount Scopus. Why are they not there? Simply because they do not recognize the sovereignty of Israel over Jerusalem; they are bound by and committed to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly, and that resolution does not grant to Israel any sovereignty over Jerusalem. I would go even further and recall—always willing to stand corrected should there be any new developments—that when I used to be in Jerusalem, from which I am now barred and to which I am denied the right to return, the consuls of the United States, the United Kingdom and France were fully independent both of the Israeli Foreign Ministry and of their embassies in Tel Aviv and Amman. They had a special, fully independent status.

127. What is the Council to do? The Council, faced with the possibility that the recognition and eventual transfer of embassies to Jerusalem will be imposed upon it, is called upon to prevent this possibility, and, since it has adopted the tactic of warning, to tell the forces in Tel Aviv that, if they persist in their position, the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter will be the reply to their misbehaviour.

128. The other day at Venice, the Nine stressed that they would not accept any unilateral initiative. The aim of the present meeting is to help those Nine to achieve a concrete political stand and to gain the political support of the Council.

129. What the Council is really concerned with is the destiny, not only of Jerusalem, but the destiny of a people, the destiny of the world, the destiny of peace and war.

130. The following are very recent quotations from the press. *Ha'aretz* of 26 May reported that

"At a seminar held by the Institute for International Relations at the Hebrew University . . . , Reserve General Aharon Yariv said that there are widely held opinions in favour of exploiting any future war situation in order to expel 700,000 to 800,000 Arabs."

The report in *Al-Ittihad* varies slightly:

"There are in Israel widespread views calling to seize the opportunity of the existing state of war in order to evict 700,000 to 800,000 Palestinians from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip."



131. We are drawing the attention of the Council in order that it should take immediate action so that Deir Yassin will not be repeated and that the Secretary-General will not have to create another United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. Otherwise, that would result in further bloodshed and violent resistance. Our aim here is to prevent, and, as they say: "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure".

132. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the German Democratic Republic, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

133. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): I do not intend to reply to the slander of the representative of Israel against my country. The anti-Fascist policy, the constructive

peaceful policy of my country is very well known. I should just like to point out that it is typical for the ruling circles of the aggressor State of Israel to have friendship with those who at one time or another were adherents of German fascism and to attack those who have selflessly struggled against Nazi tyranny.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

<sup>2</sup> *Records of the General Conference, Fifteenth Session, Paris, 1968, Resolutions*, resolution 3.343.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 249, p. 240.

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. II, annex 19.





---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

#### 如何获取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### 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 libraire 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 вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---