

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

APR 22 1988

UN/SA COLLECTION

2233rd MEETING: 24 JUNE 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2233)	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

UN LIBRARY

APR 2 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.

2233rd MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 24 June 1980, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Ole ÅLGÅRD (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/2233)

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 11.25 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: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Pakistan 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 conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Shahi (Pakistan) took places at the Council table and Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) and Mr. Laraki (Morocco) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated

20 June from the representative of Tunisia [S/14013], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

3. The proposal of the representative of Tunisia is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when invited to participate under rule 37.

4. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

5. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The United States has said on many occasions that we do not believe there is any legal basis for extending an invitation to the PLO to participate in the debates of the Council with the same rights of participation as those enjoyed by Member States. On the other hand, it has been our consistent position that the PLO could be invited to participate under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. Accordingly, when a vote is taken on this issue we will vote against the manner in which the invitation is extended.

6. The PRESIDENT: If no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of Tunisia.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, China, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Philippines, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dajani (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

7. The PRESIDENT: I have received another letter dated 20 June from the representative of Tunisia [S/14012], which reads as follows:

“I have the honour to request that the Security Council invite Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled ‘The situation in the Middle East’, in accordance with the provisions of rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.”

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to the request.

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the letter dated 28 May from the representative of Pakistan to the President of the Security Council [S/13966].

9. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, Mr. Agha Shahi, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers. I call on him.

10. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, it is a matter of special pleasure for me to address the Security Council under your presidency. We have been colleagues in the service of the United Nations, where I have had the opportunity of knowing you as an outstanding personality dedicated to the cause of peace, humanity and international good will.

11. I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for responding to the request of Pakistan, made on behalf of 39 member States of the Conference of Islamic Foreign Ministers, to convene an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the dangerous situation arising from Israel's latest moves to consolidate its illegal annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and to declare it as the permanent capital of Israel. These steps have stirred the deepest emotions and indignation throughout the Moslem world, and at the Eleventh Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers I was honoured, in my capacity as Chairman of the Conference, with the mandate of bringing to the attention of the Council the assertion of principles reiterated at that Conference and the expression of concern and anger that was contained in the resolution on Al-Quds Al-Sharif adopted unanimously at Islamabad last month.¹

12. The recent bill introduced in the Knesset declaring Al-Quds Al-Sharif as Israel's capital has added a new dimension to Israeli aggression and its occupation of the Holy City. The bill, which is said to

have received the full backing of the ruling coalition in the Israeli Parliament, has been referred to a committee for eventual adoption as a basic law. This move to alter juridically the status of Al-Quds Al-Sharif has been followed by the provocative decision to shift the office of the Prime Minister to East Jerusalem.

13. The Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers has viewed the introduction of this legislative measure as a dangerous development that demands the urgent attention of the Security Council. The Conference has declared the firm opposition of the Islamic States to any attempt by Israel to alter the status of Al-Quds Al-Sharif or to legalize its annexation. The Islamic Foreign Ministers affirmed, *inter alia*, the determination of all Moslem peoples and Governments to defend their eternal and sacred right to Al-Quds Al-Sharif and to the other Holy Places in Palestine. They have called upon the Council to convene immediately in order to examine the dangerous consequences of the Israeli measure, to declare its annulment and, in case of defiance by Israel, to impose against Israel the sanctions stipulated in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The resolution of the Islamic Conference also reaffirmed the commitment of all Islamic countries to severing relations with any country that promotes Israel's design to annex Al-Quds Al-Sharif by recognizing it as the Israeli capital.

14. This decision of the Islamic Conference is based on one of the fundamental objectives enshrined in its Charter. Since its inception, the Conference has consistently opposed the Israeli occupation of Al-Quds and the insidious design to annex it, along with vast adjacent areas, under the guise of unification and to destroy the historical personality of the Holy City. Our steadfast opposition to these Israeli moves and our abiding commitment to the liberation of Al-Quds have been reflected in a number of resolutions and declarations of the Islamic Conference of which the Council is well aware.

15. In 1969 at Rabat, the heads of State and Government of the Islamic world who assembled to consider the grave situation arising from the desecration of one of the holiest shrines of Islam, the Al-Aqsa Mosque, declared that Al-Quds Al-Sharif must be restored to the status it had prior to June 1967, a status which had been established and sanctified by a history of 1,300 years. This same commitment was reinforced at the Second Islamic Summit Conference, held at Lahore in February 1974, which declared that Israeli withdrawal from Al-Quds Al-Sharif was a paramount and unchangeable prerequisite for lasting peace in the Middle East.

16. The Tenth Conference of Islamic Foreign Ministers, held at Fez in May 1979, was devoted to Palestine and Al-Quds. It invited member States to call upon the countries having diplomatic missions in Israel to resist all pressures aimed at making them

transfer their embassies, consulates and offices to occupied Al-Quds. The Fez Conference warned all countries of the adverse consequences to their relations with the Islamic countries that would result should they do so.

17. The Islamic Conference resolutions I have cited should leave no one in doubt of the primary importance attached by the entire Islamic world to the inadmissibility of annexation by military conquest of Al-Quds Al-Sharif and to its liberation from Israeli occupation.

18. The United Nations itself has adopted a number of resolutions on this question. In this connection, I may recall that resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), adopted by the General Assembly in July 1967 at its fifth emergency special session, declared all measures taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem invalid and called upon Israel to rescind those measures and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of the Holy City. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 252 (1968), 267 (1969), 271 (1969), 298 (1971) and 446 (1979) have unequivocally affirmed the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by military conquest and declared totally invalid all legislative and administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem, including the expropriation of land and properties, the transfer of population and legislation aimed at the incorporation of the occupied section. In almost all of those resolutions, the Council has condemned or censured Israel for its refusal to comply with the Council's resolutions. In its most recent such resolution—namely resolution 465 (1980) of 1 March 1980—the Council determined

“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 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War² and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East”.

19. The universal spiritual heritage and significance of Jerusalem, and its pivotal importance to peace in the Middle East, were given eloquent expression by His Holiness Pope John Paul II in his address to the General Assembly last year.³ Recently the European heads of State and Government who met in Venice declared that “they will not accept any unilateral initiative designed to change the status of Jerusalem” [S/14009, para. 8.].

20. In total disregard of universal sentiment and opinion regarding the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, Israel has persisted in its insidious design to alter the status and destroy the historical, spiritual and demographic character of Al-Quds Al-Sharif. We are being asked to believe and to accept a number of cynical contentions that are being advanced to justify the Israeli claim to annexation of the Holy City and its Judaization through sequestration of Arab property, eviction of its Arab inhabitants, demolition of Arab homes and acts of sacrilege against Islamic shrines. Those crimes are a violation of the unique religious sanctity of the Holy City and a denial of the hallowed symbolism that it has radiated for more than 3,000 years. Jerusalem embodies the world's greatest spiritual tradition and the continuity of the divine message proclaimed by Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

21. Throughout the 13 centuries of Moslem rule over Palestine, Islamic sovereignty over Jerusalem was exercised as a sacred trust. It was in the year A. D. 638, when Caliph Omar entered Jerusalem, that the Jews were allowed to return to the city and to establish their synagogues after an exile of more than 500 years. The history of Muslim sovereignty over Jerusalem is eloquent testimony of Islam's true spirit as a religion of peace and toleration and its great tradition of respect for other religions and their places of worship. The unique spiritual heritage of Al-Quds, which spans a period of more than 3,000 years, was consistently nurtured and preserved under Islamic administration.

22. Today, that sacred heritage is being systematically obliterated by the obsessive Zionist scheme to Judaize Al-Quds and the other cities of Palestine such as Hebron and Nazareth. The Israeli announcement declaring the Holy City its permanent capital is part of the same design. The sacrilege at the Al-Aqsa Mosque, the desecration of Al-Khalil and plots to demolish the sacred places of Islam in Palestine are not simply isolated incidents but constitute composite facets of the Israeli plan permanently to occupy Al-Quds and to destroy its historical and unique spiritual character.

23. Those intolerable acts aimed at the mutilation of the historical personality of Jerusalem constitute a betrayal of a sacred trust, a profanity and a crime against civilization. It is the duty of all of us to put an end to this iniquitous situation. Al-Quds cannot be made the spoils of war. It must be restored to Arab sovereignty. As the Lahore Summit declaration affirmed,

“Al-Quds is a unique symbol of the confluence of Islam with the sacred divine religions. For more than 1,300 years, Muslims have held Jerusalem as a trust for all who venerate it. Muslims alone could be its loving and impartial custodians for the simple reason that Muslims alone believe in all the three

prophetic religions rooted in Jerusalem. 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 bargaining or concessions will be acceptable to the Islamic countries. Israeli withdrawal from Jerusalem is a paramount and unchangeable prerequisite for lasting peace in the Middle East."

24. The Security Council must act and bring all possible pressure to bear on the Israeli authorities to rescind forthwith the administrative and juridical measures taken by them to annex Al-Quds and to destroy its character. The arrogant and contemptuous statement made by the Israeli authorities two days ago, announcing the wholly illegal decision to shift the Israeli Prime Minister's office to East Jerusalem, provides a conclusive reason for the Council to act urgently and decisively in the matter.

25. The Council must clearly warn Israel that it can no longer flout the verdict of the international community or present the world with another *fait accompli*; that it must respect the decisions of the United Nations, to which it owes its very existence; and that its spurious historical claim to the annexation of Al-Quds is repugnant to international morality and inadmissible under international law. This claim totally negates basic human rights and the fundamental right of self-determination of peoples.

26. Justice and peace are inseparable. Peace cannot be built on a foundation of injustice. The denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people is the core of the Middle East conflict. The deepening concern over the crisis in the Middle East has been reflected in the successive meetings of the Security Council convened to deal with the series of aggressive actions by Israel undertaken to perpetuate its military occupation of Arab and Palestinian lands and to coerce the indomitable people of Palestine into accepting the colonization and usurpation of their homeland. This policy cannot bring peace. It can only lead to ever greater violence, bloodshed and conflict in the Middle East, and destroy the lingering hopes of a just and lasting peace.

27. The situation calls for determined action by the international community. The United Nations surely cannot permit itself to acquiesce to expansionism. The Security Council must reaffirm the overriding necessity of ending the prolonged occupation by Israel since 1967 of Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. It is our inescapable duty to compel Israel to terminate its aggression against the Palestinian people, whose agony is deeply felt, particularly throughout the world of Islam. In this regard, it is necessary to reiterate the fact that the countries which support Israel bear a special responsibility to contain rampant Israeli aggression and not to encourage Israeli intransigence under

the shelter of the veto, but instead to impress upon their ally a modicum of respect for the norms of international behaviour.

28. The Council must firmly and immediately act to ensure that, pending withdrawal, Israel, as the occupying Power, carries out its obligations in accordance with the United Nations resolutions and the fourth Geneva Convention.² The Council must take all necessary measures to ensure the preservation of the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. Should Israel persist in its design to annex the Holy City and to declare it its capital, the Council must proceed directly to the imposition of sanctions stipulated under Chapter VII of the Charter.

29. The Islamic nations cannot ask for less. The cynicism with which Israel has carried out its expansionist policy in Palestine and strengthened its grip over Al-Quds Al-Sharif in contemptuous defiance of the Council compels us to demand that the firmest measures be taken under the Charter. We make this call because of our respect for the rule of law in international relations, our commitment to the Charter principle of self-determination of peoples, our concern for a just and lasting peace and our deep reverence for Al-Quds Al-Sharif.

30. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for National Education of Morocco, Mr. Ezzedine Laraki, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the Jerusalem Committee of the Islamic Conference. I welcome Mr. Laraki and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

31. Mr. LARAKI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): At this delicate juncture where the fate of one of the most important Holy Places of Islam is at stake, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for allowing me to speak in order to express the feelings and, above all, the concerns of hundreds of millions of human beings who are deeply spiritually hurt and anxious about the future of the prestigious heritage handed down by many generations which have safeguarded it with vigilance for centuries.

32. The Holy City of Jerusalem holds a very special place in the hearts of all those who believe in one God and for the Muslims, in particular. Jerusalem was the first kiblah towards which the first Muslims in history turned to pray and it is there that the chief mysteries of the faith have been accomplished.

33. For 14 centuries Jerusalem was a unified Arab city, throughout the Islamic caliphate and up to the very recent British Mandate. Throughout that time, the Holy City was a point of encounter and of mutually enriching contacts for the various religious communities attached to it, without the obstacles or the constraints unfortunately to be found in the region today.

34. The undisputed historical truth is that the Holy Places of the three monotheistic religions were never so well protected or so easily accessible to all believers than during the long period of Islamic responsibility. It is precisely for that reason that mankind has received almost intact, after centuries of ravages of every kind, the whole historical and spiritual heritage handed down to it in the land of Palestine.

35. In Jerusalem, that city of peace, peace has been martyred, in the words of an inspired poet. The Israeli occupation quickly imposed in Jerusalem hatred, mistrust, a falling away from the most common acts of devotion and even gratuitous violence and the murder of innocents for which atonement cannot be made.

36. Slightly more than 13 years ago, specifically on 7 June 1967, a high-ranking Israeli officer peremptorily but rather prophetically declared:

“The Israeli Defence Forces have liberated Jerusalem. We have reunified the capital of Israel, a divided city. We have returned to this most sacred site which we will never leave.”

That statement, made at a time when Israel was annexing Jerusalem while claiming to be repulsing a so-called Arab offensive, is unquestionably incriminating and indeed bears out the fact that, far from seeking to safeguard what the international community at that time hesitated to recognize as theirs, the Israelis had in mind expansionist plans that were as illegitimate as they were unbridled and detrimental to the spiritual and material interests of the neighbouring Arab and Islamic—and above all, Palestinian—communities.

37. Once again this morning, as too often in the past, the Council has heard the catalogue of violations, expropriations, transfer of populations, destruction of religious or private property, and transformation of the Arab or Islamic character of the Holy City and its environs. Entire districts such as the historic district called Al-Maghariba or the Moroccan quarter, have been wiped off the map and given over to the bulldozer.

38. The deliberate burning in August 1969 of the Al-Aqsa Mosque, the main Islamic kiblah, represented a painful challenge to all Islam and provoked universal indignation the effects of which are today still far from dissipated. Following that criminal act, His Majesty Hassan II, King of Morocco and Emir of the Believers, interpreting the feelings of the *Oumma*, the Islamic nation, that same year invited to Rabat the first Conference of Islamic States. The Conference was established as a standing organization devoted to the defence of the sacred values of Islam, and in the first place of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the national rights of the Palestinian people, the principal victims of international zionism.

39. In the more than 10 years of its existence, the Organization of the Islamic Conference has con-

sistently adopted courageous and resolute positions to combat the multifaceted Israeli policy, which seeks on one hand the continual, illegal establishment of settlements in the occupied Palestinian Arab territories and on the other, with the same aim of absorption, the gradual Judaization of Jerusalem, which is destined to become the wrongful capital of Israel.

40. That Israeli policy, based on obstinacy and the flouting of international disapproval, led the Islamic Conference to decide henceforth to hold meetings of the Committee on Jerusalem at the level of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, with His Majesty Hassan II as its Chairman.

41. From its first meetings, the Committee on Jerusalem decided on international action which would be of a particular style and a new character, so as to take advantage, for the sake of peace, of special relationships long established and maintained, notably with His Holiness Pope John Paul II, a man of great prestige whose love of justice and mankind are beyond doubt, and with heads of States who, in particularly troubled international circumstances, have been willing and able to take on responsibilities for which mankind will be much indebted to them.

42. In answer to these efforts at pacification, which called for reason, moderation and humility in the face of the real problems which confront mankind, we met only with arrogance, blindness and the spirit of conquest.

43. Today, the Israeli occupation authorities are determined to launch a new phase in the escalation, a decisive phase since it might lead to the establishment of Jerusalem once and for all as the indivisible capital of the State of Israel.

44. What is still presented simply as a possibility fits very neatly with what is known from other sources of Israeli plans for the Holy City and the other occupied Palestinian territories; and Prime Minister Begin has quite recently himself explicitly corroborated all the apprehensions we have had.

45. The fact that the Islamic Conference has resorted to the Security Council today bears witness, in the first place, to the seriousness of the situation, as it is viewed by our organization, for the future of peace and concord in that region. It also shows that our countries continue to feel confident that this body will adopt measures as called for by the situation with a view to safeguarding the fundamentally spiritual and moral interests of a large part of the international community.

46. In communicating with His Holiness Pope John Paul II, His Majesty Hassan II, Emir of the Believers, was well aware that he was addressing the successor of Saint Peter in order to discuss a subject of interest to all mankind, the subject of which was Jerusalem, a Holy City many times over.

47. With my mandate from His Majesty Hassan II, I believe that I am faithful to the feelings and thoughts of almost a billion Muslim believers in saying in their name to all those present that Jerusalem must be saved, that devastation by the occupier must be halted, that the Holy Places, Muslim, Christian and Jewish, must be liberated from the sectarian grasp of violence and repression, the aim of which is illegally to expropriate them the better to isolate them, and to change their character at the very probable risk of destroying them once and for all.

48. The Council has repeatedly considered this issue and has taken a number of very brave and pertinent decisions. In May 1968 and July 1969, it declared itself in resolutions 252 (1968) and 267 (1969) against the legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel at that time which affected the status of Jerusalem. In its resolution 271 (1969) of 15 September 1969, the Council unanimously expressed its indignation at the criminal burning of the Al-Aqsa Mosque. Other resolutions followed, unswervingly condemning Israeli initiatives tending to change the nature of the status of the Holy City and other Palestinian townships and advocating the implementation of the fourth Geneva Convention.

49. The role entrusted to the Council by the Charter for maintaining international peace and security is an exalted one, but one that is also heavy with responsibility. We have the firm hope that the Council will spare no effort to see that the Holy City of Jerusalem, a city of peace, can regain and maintain that peace; that the Palestinian people can return to their homeland and establish a respected national State; and that the whole Middle East, delivered from fear, war and violence can resume its role, both in the same way and better than it did in the past, to consolidate international peaceful co-operation.

50. The Council, we are convinced, will live up to its responsibilities in the face of the challenge which has been facing the whole international community for several decades. If it proves necessary, the Council will be able to adopt appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter to put an end to that challenge to the dignity of the United Nations.

51. The task of the Council is all the clearer since we have noted from very responsible sources the adoption of positions which represent explicit disavowals of Israeli obstinacy and arrogance.

52. The position adopted recently by the European Community on the Middle East question and on Jerusalem in particular, despite its positive aspects, apparently has not given full satisfaction, as had been hoped. None the less, it is a very encouraging sign that the decisive steps desired by the Palestinian people and the Arab and Islamic peoples will be taken for the benefit of peace and peaceful co-operation in one of the most sensitive parts of the world.

53. The very constructive vote taken recently in the United States House of Representatives concerning the unfortunate move by the Knesset gives ground for hope that the international community as a whole will deal with those Israeli plans to impair the status of Jerusalem.

54. We strongly reject the whole Israeli policy of hegemony and annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and of any other occupied Arab territory. The Islamic nation, which represents about one third of mankind, protests these Israeli plans which are detrimental to the status, character and institutions of Jerusalem as guaranteed by the international community and will regard any change that may harm its material and spiritual interests in the Holy City as a provocation which will have unquestionable effects on international co-operation, peace and security.

55. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

56. Mr. DAJANI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, we are pleased to see you guiding the deliberations of the Council on an issue of the utmost importance to us and to mankind as a whole. We are confident that under your wise and able leadership the deliberations will be most fruitful.

57. The Council is meeting again to consider the question of Jerusalem and it will meet again, as long as Jerusalem remains under occupation. Indeed, as long as the occupation continues, the occupiers will commit crimes and the victims of the occupation will suffer and will resist. Therefore our point of departure in the discussion of any aspect of occupation is putting an end to that occupation.

58. The issue under consideration in the Council today is the bill before the Israeli Knesset proposing passage of a basic law relating to the annexation of Jerusalem as a new link in the long chain of crimes committed by Zionism against both our rights and the will of the international community. The heavy suffering resulting from Zionist crimes in Jerusalem affects both the Palestinian people and believers the world over.

59. For us, the Palestinian people, Jerusalem is the capital of our homeland Palestine and it has always been its symbol since our forefathers, the Arab Canaanite Jebusites, established it over 3,000 years ago in a distinctly strategic location consecrated to God. Our founding forefathers gave it the name "the City of Peace". It was in Jerusalem, the City of Peace, that our people worshipped the compassionate God and glorified His name. It was in Jerusalem that they established their Arab Canaanite civilization. It was from Jerusalem that the masses of our people conveyed the message of morality, peace and love, heralded by the divine religions believing in the one God. Therefore, for the Palestinian people, the liberation of Jerusalem is a question of destiny.

60. Moreover, Jerusalem is the kiblah of the faithful, the direction in which all believers in the divine religions turn in prayer. It is the destination of their pilgrimage to glorify the name of God. Therefore the liberation of Jerusalem constitutes a basic issue for all believers.

61. We in the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people, are struggling with our eyes set on those two facts. Our destiny is tied to the liberation of Jerusalem; its liberation will bring good to all believers. We are proud that our people have assumed throughout the ages their responsibility of providing care and protection to the pilgrims. We are proud of our cultural heritage, of which the Jewish, Christian and Muslim cultures are component parts inherited from ancestors who upheld Judaism, Christianity and Islam. We, the Palestinian people, are proud of the atmosphere of toleration that has characterized their relations with one another and their attitude towards the pilgrims during their stay in the Holy Land.

62. The agony of Jerusalem under Israeli occupation is the direct result of the Zionist conquest of our homeland, Palestine. The history of Palestine throughout the ages clearly draws a distinction between two groups: the pilgrims and the conquerors. The former came to pray; the latter came to usurp. The conquerors came to confiscate property and oppress us. They concealed their real aims behind religion. The Zionist movement wanted to repeat what the European crusaders had done nine centuries earlier. Our people—Muslims, Christians and Jews—equally resisted the Crusaders and the Mongols, some of whom were Muslims. In both cases our people emerged victorious.

63. Our people distinguished between persons like Moussabeh Maimoun—Moses Maimonides, the Arab scholar of the Jewish faith—and Benjamin of Tudela, who came to Palestine as a pilgrim, and those Zionist invaders like Menachem Begin, the terrorist who came from Poland and who led the massacre of Deir Yassin, and Meir Kahane, who came from New York full of hatred planning to blow up the Al-Aqsa Mosque and several churches while they were full of worshippers.

64. History distinguishes the constructive role of the pilgrims, which represents cultural interaction and enriches human civilization, from the disastrous effect of the invaders, which represents cultural deterioration.

65. Clearly, because we are proud that Jerusalem is the destination of believers from all over the world, we shall do our best to meet the requirements for the continued protection of the Holy Places. But in no circumstances shall Jerusalem be open to attack by alien invaders, nor shall its sanctity be a pretext for conquest and usurpation of our homeland and our culture. Over the ages Palestine has been the home-

land of its people and the holy destination of all believers.

66. It would be redundant to detail the crimes committed by the Israeli occupation in Jerusalem. The Council has on various occasions heard details about those crimes. Recently it heard detailed statements about the atrocities of the military Government, the settlements, oppression and confiscation of land. It is sufficient to note briefly that the Zionist invaders have to an extreme degree attempted to destroy our culture and used the most inhuman methods.

67. Jerusalem has suffered a great deal of destruction. Its holy character has been distorted by the establishment of concrete military structures. It has been desecrated by the introduction of life patterns far from spiritual values and contrary to all holy values.

68. Today we witness the beginning of new measures of annexation and read about the determination of the Israeli Government to transfer its seat to East Jerusalem upon the demand of Menachem Begin, which is an indication of his insistence on usurping Jerusalem and challenging the will of the international community as expressed by United Nations resolutions and by international agreements, especially the fourth Geneva Convention.

69. The Council is meeting on the initiative of the Islamic Conference, which met last month at Islamabad. Among other issues before it, the Conference discussed the question of Jerusalem and considered it the central issue before the member States in terms of its influence on all the other issues. The Conference also observed that the recent Israeli measures called for a stand by the international community within the framework of the United Nations.

70. The concern of the Islamic Conference over Jerusalem is based on two factors. First, the PLO is a full member of that Conference; secondly, the Conference is the voice of the Muslim world.

71. Because of its concern, the Conference called upon the international community to challenge all the Israeli criminal measures of annexation in Jerusalem. The Conference specifically called upon the United States to shoulder its responsibility for the agony of Jerusalem. It condemned

“all policies, activities, declarations and stands of . . . certain forces and circles in the United States of America that encourage the Israeli enemy to escalate its aggression”.¹

The Conference also called upon the Muslim countries to take a firm position *vis-à-vis* the United States Government and those forces by adopting concrete and practical measures aimed at putting an end to the continued Israeli aggression against the right of the Palestinian people and the integrity of Jerusalem.

72. The suffering of Jerusalem under Israeli occupation is a matter of deep concern to the international community as a whole. A few days ago His Holiness the Pope reiterated, in the presence of President Carter, that the resolution of the question of Jerusalem was essential for the attainment of a just peace in Palestine. Furthermore, the declaration issued on 13 June 1980 in Venice by the European Council, which represents tens of millions of Christians, states:

“The Nine recognize the special importance of the role played by the question of Jerusalem for all the parties concerned. The Nine stress that they will not accept any unilateral initiative designed to change the status of Jerusalem and that any agreement on the city’s status should guarantee freedom of access of everyone to the Holy Places.” [S/14009, para. 8.]

73. Moreover, despite Zionist pressures, a number of Jewish leaders and intellectuals have on various occasions expressed their concern over what the Zionists are doing in the name of Judaism. Recently, the American Friends of the Peace Now Movement published a statement signed by a number of American Jewish personalities saying that continued Israeli rule over more than 1 million Arabs in the occupied Palestinian territory was subversive.

74. The majority of the countries of the world have defined their stand on what is happening in the many relevant resolutions adopted by the international community.

75. Given that degree of suffering imposed by the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem and its people and the deep concern of the international community, how can Israel pursue its aggression and challenge the will of the international community?

76. The experience of the past 13 years has demonstrated that Israel cannot pursue its aggressive policy without the unlimited support of the United States. Therefore, what is happening in our homeland is primarily the responsibility of the United States. Through United States support, zionism is enabled to implement its expansionist plans of building settlements and confiscating Arab land. Thanks to United States support, zionism can show contempt for Palestinian human rights.

77. The United States has a declared position on the question of Jerusalem, contained in two official statements made before the United Nations by Arthur Goldberg in July 1967⁴ and Charles Yost in July 1969 [1483rd meeting]. Both statements clearly consider Israel as an occupying Power subject to the rules of international law which prevent the occupying Power from making changes in the legal or administrative status of the occupied territories. Mr. Goldberg expressed the insistence of the United States “that the measures taken cannot be considered as other than

interim and provisional”.⁵ Yet the actual United States policy, which culminated in the Camp David accords, is contradictory to the declared United States position.

78. Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of United States policy is that it has enabled the Zionists to continue their occupation of Palestine and Arab territories and it has given priority to the Israeli concept of security over the Palestinian rights of expression, assembly, self-determination and sovereignty, as well as over the principles of the Charter of the United Nations which establish the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. The United States has gone further in its collaboration with Israel: the United States refuses to recognize the rights of our people which are guaranteed by international agreements; it is even committed to an absurd policy which rejects even a dialogue. In this connection, the United States has made of itself a hostage to Israeli policy.

79. Yet it is a source of satisfaction that some forces have emerged among the American people rejecting that official United States behaviour and calling for a policy based on the moral principles of justice and right.

80. The Zionist concept of security is predicated on the acquisition of more land, the subjugation of the peoples of the region and the exploitation of their natural resources. On the other hand, our conception of security is based on peace and justice. Herein lies the difference between the logic of the Zionist aggressor and the logic of human liberation of the Palestinian revolution. The usurpation of territory and the practice of terrorism breed resistance by peoples defending their freedom and dignity. Security cannot be established at the expense of justice and the rights of others. History is full of lessons for those willing to learn.

81. In spite of our sufferings as individuals and as a people and in spite of the failure of the United Nations to implement its resolutions concerning our rights, our presence here today is a reaffirmation of our belief in the constructive role of the international Organization in the search for peace and justice.

82. We should also like to make it clear that it is our sacred right and moral responsibility to struggle against the Israeli Zionist occupation and aggression. We are proud of the heroic struggle of our brothers and sisters against aggression. We strongly reject any and all attempts to equate, or even to compare, our legitimate struggle for self-determination and national independence with the aggression of the Zionists. That would amount to equating the victim with the criminal. It is high time for those who talk about the cycle of violence and counter-violence to stop this distortion and condemn the aggressor.

83. I should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the achievement of a just and lasting

peace which fulfils our national and inalienable rights, namely, our right to self-determination and national independence and our right of return, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. This position has been adopted by the Palestine National Council, the supreme legislative body of the PLO. The Arab States are also committed to that peace. They have expressed their commitment in the resolutions of the Baghdad Arab Summit Conference, held in November 1978.

84. While the PLO and the Arab States reject the Camp David accords, which ignore our rights, we are striving within the framework of the United Nations for a comprehensive and just peace.

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

86. Mr. SUWONDO (Indonesia): First of all, I should like to express my appreciation to the members of the Council for affording me the opportunity to participate in the deliberations on this very important matter.

87. May I also offer my warm congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. We are convinced that your wisdom and diligence will provide expert guidance in our present deliberations.

88. As a member of the Jerusalem Committee established under the aegis of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and in view of the resolution concerning Jerusalem adopted recently by the Islamic Foreign Ministers at Islamabad,¹ my delegation finds it incumbent on it to participate in the present deliberations. Our concern is further exemplified by Indonesia's membership in the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. Therefore, my delegation cannot remain silent regarding the events that have been unfolding with respect to the status of Jerusalem.

89. We have followed the various statements made at recent meetings of the Council on the situation in the Middle East. We have listened to them with close attention, always in the hope and expectation that they would contribute to finding a peaceful and comprehensive solution to the problem. It is obvious, however, that the situation has deteriorated.

90. My delegation deplores the occurrence of a number of disturbing developments, in particular the decision by the Government of Israel to annex Jerusalem and declare it Israel's capital. The Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers meeting in Islamabad last month adopted a resolution which unequivocally set forth its position concerning the status of the Holy City. It categorically rejected all illegal decisions by Israel and the bill which stipulates that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. The Conference reaffirmed not

only the historical, cultural and religious importance of Jerusalem to the Islamic world, but also the right of the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable national rights.

91. My delegation cannot fail to note that Israel's actions and policy in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, are the prime cause for the aggravation of tension in the area. Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem is already giving rise to increased anger and concern among the inhabitants of the occupied territories and, indeed, among the entire international community. This decision will only exacerbate the already tense situation in the region. My delegation therefore wishes to call upon Israel immediately to abandon its decision.

92. Furthermore, measures taken by Israel which change the legal status and character of Jerusalem have long been declared invalid by the Security Council. Indeed, the Council, in unanimously adopting resolution 465 (1980) last March, strongly deplored Israeli practices and called upon Israel to dismantle the existing settlements and to cease the planning and establishment of new settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

93. It is significant that within the past few months the Council repeatedly has condemned Israel and insisted on the restoration of the right of the Palestinians to determine their own future. The Council's preoccupation with the Middle East issue reflects a genuine concern that the mounting violence on the West Bank is threatening the fragile peace in the region. Clearly the principal reason for the recent deterioration in the situation is the continuance of the occupation. Thus, in resolution 471 (1980) the Council stressed "the overriding necessity to end the prolonged occupation of Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem".

94. The Government of Indonesia has consistently participated in the many deliberations in the United Nations and other forums held with a view to finding a just and lasting peace in the Middle East through effective implementation of all relevant resolutions, as well as through recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. The termination of Israeli occupation is long overdue. It is imperative, therefore, that the Council exercise its responsibility and take the necessary and effective measures under the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and, in keeping with its own relevant resolutions, achieve a just and durable settlement.

95. Finally, regarding the status of Jerusalem, which Israel is now annexing in disregard of all Security Council resolutions, my delegation believes that it is important that the Security Council should act expeditiously in this matter, for failure to do so will only exacerbate the already dangerous situation and lead to further tension, which we may find to be beyond control.

96. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

97. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I intend to make a statement at a later stage in our deliberations, and I shall then fully set out Israel's position on the matter before us.

98. I have asked to be allowed to speak today in exercise of my right of reply to sound a note of warning. A dangerous dimension has been injected here into our discussions. We have heard in this meeting, right from its beginning, the shrill voice of hatred, incitement and fanaticism. As the representative of a people which throughout the ages has been the traditional victim and target of this despicable phenomenon, I feel in duty bound to caution against succumbing here to an evil that has brought so much misery not only in the past, but even in our own time. Members of the Council need not be reminded of the most recent manifestations of this evil and of its implications for all of us.

99. The nature of this debate and its objectives were clearly revealed by the tone and contents of the statement that led off this discussion. It was characterized by intolerance and incitement. One of the manifestations of this intolerance and incitement here today has been an attempt by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan—whose absence from the chamber I deeply regret—to obliterate even the name of Jerusalem by which that city has become known and venerated for the past three millennia. The name of the city is of course derived from the Hebrew Yerushalayim, meaning the City of Peace. The attempt made here today to obliterate this historic name is not the first of its kind. It was preceded by, among others, that of Rome, an imperialist Power of another age, which, having crushed Jewish independence and sovereignty in the land of Israel, then set out to obliterate the name of

the country and of Jerusalem, renaming the latter Aeolia Capitolina.

100. But Jerusalem and its historical name cannot be obliterated. Its historical unity cannot be jeopardized by transparent political exercises. Spurious attempts to rewrite and falsify here the history of the Jewish people, of 3,000 years of Jerusalem and the cultural and spiritual history of mankind are doomed to failure.

101. One would have hoped that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan might have directed his attention primarily to the grave threats to his country's sovereignty, integrity—nay, to its very survival; and we all know where those threats to his country come from. Or could it be that his appearance here today was calculated to conceal his real concerns and pre-occupations? In other words, is Jerusalem being abused here for the sake of concerns connected with Kabul? Is Jerusalem's sanctity being dragged into these discussions for the sake of all kinds of mundane interests totally extraneous and unrelated to it?

102. Let me appeal to the Council not to permit the voice of intolerance and prejudice to prevail here. Let us all substitute reason for prejudice and reconciliation for incitement.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/35/419-S/14129, annex I, resolution No. 4/11-P.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 17th meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1554th meeting.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 100.