

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

APR 22 1988

UN/SA COLLECTION

**2234<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 24 JUNE 1980

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2234) .....	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

1 p.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
APR 23 1968  
UNIVERSITY 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.

## 2234th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 24 June 1980, at 3.30 p.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/2234)

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 4 p.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 decisions taken at the 2233rd meeting, I invite the representatives of Israel and Pakistan to take a seat at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan and Morocco to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a seat at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Naik (Pakistan) took places at the Council table, 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 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 Lebanon, Mauritania and the Syrian Arab Republic, 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. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Kane (Mauritania) and Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to express my sincere congratulations to you, Ambassador Ålgård of friendly Norway, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council with your widely acknowledged outstanding wisdom, statesmanship and dedication. Similarly, it is my privilege to express my highest commendation to Ambassador Oumarou of friendly Niger on the exemplary manner in which he presided over the work of the Council during the month of May.

5. The chief victim of Israeli colonization, despoliation and emasculation has been the Holy City of Al-Quds Al-Sharif, Jerusalem.

6. In 1947-1948, Israeli terrorists forcibly occupied virtually the whole of Palestinian Arab West Jerusalem, inaccurately described as Israeli Jerusalem. They expelled the inhabitants, seized their homes, furniture, lands and belongings and rendered them refugees under every sky. If anyone should have the slightest doubt about my assertion, all he need do is read the title-deeds of ownership, which have been microfilmed and preserved by the British Government and passed on to the United Nations and its Palestine Conciliation Commission. The records of what belongs to whom and where it is are at present available in the archives of the United Nations for all to see and read. Seventy per cent Arab was Chief Justice Sir William Fitzgerald's verdict when he delineated the zoning of the Arab and Jewish quarters in Jerusalem for the purpose of autonomous administration by the two respective communities where the inhabitants would enjoy wide

powers of local government and administration, within a special international régime in a *corpus separatum*, for a 10-year period, unless an earlier re-examination scheme was found necessary. That was an integral part of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), part III, which mandated the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State and a Jewish State. The Jewish occupation of West Jerusalem, as shown in the blue Armistice Line of 1949, running north to south, included twice as much territory as was assigned the Jews by the Fitzgerald Commission on Jerusalem in 1945.

7. A glance at the provisions which spell out in minute detail the inalienable rights of the indigenous people of Jerusalem and its environs, and the deference accorded to them by the world community, serves to highlight the depth of the abyss in which Zionist machinations and acts of aggression have obliterated those sacred rights. It has been full-fledged conquest.

8. Not satisfied with the magnitude of the horrendous and traumatic highway robbery perpetrated by the Zionist gangs against new Jerusalem, its overwhelmingly Palestinian Arab environs and their inhabitants before the end of the British Mandate, the Zionist military machine persisted in its relentless military onslaught against the tiny remnants of Arab Jerusalem after the termination of the Mandate. But for the heroic resistance of the civilian population in East Jerusalem against all possible odds and the timely rescue intervention of a 600-man contingent of the Jordanian army on 18 May 1948, at the urgent plea of the beleaguered citizens, what had remained up to 1967 as Arab Jerusalem might have suffered a fate identical to what had been inflicted upon the greater part of Jerusalem, namely, colonization, sequestration of private property and exile and, within the context of that period, large-scale massacres of the civilian population, which would have dwarfed the Deir Yassin massacre, to induce the inhabitants to flee, as Menachem Begin boasted openly in his memoirs.

9. Because Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator, recognized the predominantly Palestinian Arab character of the whole of Jerusalem—old and new—he was made to pay with his life at the hands of Jewish terrorists in the streets of Jerusalem in 1948. That is the background—lest we forget.

10. When the Israelis allege that their conquest and annexation of Arab Jerusalem as it existed between 1948 and 5 June 1967 was a benign act of reunification, they deliberately overlook the fact that the demarcation, barbed wires, armistice lines and other consequences which flowed therefrom were a result of deliberate Israeli aggression and designs. The Jerusalem Arabs have never advocated or accepted the dismemberment of their city. On the contrary, they found themselves the principal and innocent victims of Israel's premeditated policy of brute force, usurpation, despoliation and conquest in Jerusalem as elsewhere in Palestine. Besides, it is outrageous to speak

of unification under Israeli tutelage. One can never impose unification on a city.

11. The 5 June 1967 occupation of the remnants of what until 1948 had been a sprawling, heterogeneous and prosperous city and environs predominantly Palestinian Arab in population as well as in lands and properties was only the final act in the relentless implementation of a carefully laid plan for the demise of a historical Jerusalem which, under all rules of law and equity, should have remained a sacred trust, a tolerant and ecumenical city and the inalienable possession and legacy of the indigenous inhabitants, who were predominantly Palestinian Arabs, without in the least dispossessing, excluding or discriminating against the citizens of the Jewish faith or anyone else. As a matter of fact, in 1947, when the Zionists started their onslaught, my last neighbour in Jerusalem was Jewish. Every citizen of Jerusalem and his offspring should naturally have remained proud and free citizens of their immortal city, regardless of race or creed. That is the civilized way.

12. The magnitude of the injustice inflicted upon the Palestinians can be gauged from the following figures. In 1917 the Jews owned 1.5 per cent of the land of Palestine; by the end of the Mandate that had increased to 5.7 per cent, including public domains granted to them by the Mandatory Power. As a consequence of the Israeli military onslaught against the Palestinian people, in 1947-1948 the Israeli military machine occupied 73 per cent of the total area of Palestine.

13. In the Jerusalem of 1948, the Israelis militarily seized and usurped almost the whole of new Jerusalem; we were left with what we used to describe, in jest, by an Arabic expression which means "the only remaining quarter" and also means that God is the only immortal thing. In 1967 the tiny remnant was seized, including the Old City, comprising the most sacred Islamic and Christian Holy Places and shrines.

14. Throughout history neither the Arab world nor the Islamic world has shown any intolerance towards the people of the Judaic faith. Indeed, no Muslim would be a true Muslim if he showed such intolerance; it would be an aberration. Also, it was the Muslims who throughout the centuries allowed the Jews back into Jerusalem whenever they were expelled from it. And even after Israel's occupation of most of Jerusalem and the expulsion of its citizens, the Arabs, after the General Armistice Agreement of 1949 between Jordan and Israel,<sup>1</sup> were willing to permit the Jews access to Al-Buraq Al-Sharif—the Wailing Wall—for prayer and gave a solemn declaration to that effect, provided the Israelis accorded the Christians and Muslims the reciprocal right of visiting their Holy Places under Israeli occupation. It was the Israelis who turned down the offer, requesting that the matter be deferred. This can be ascertained from the official records of the United Nations and the minutes of the

Special Committee set up for this purpose under the General Armistice Agreement.

15. On 15 November 1949, the Governments of Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and Egypt pledged themselves to the following declaration, in response to an appeal by the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

“The Governments of Egypt, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Lebanon and Syria undertake to guarantee freedom of access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem, or, pending that settlement, in the territory occupied by them under armistice agreements; and, pursuant to this undertaking, will guarantee rights of entry and of transit to ministers of religion, pilgrims and visitors, without distinction as to nationality or faith, subject only to considerations of national security, all the above in conformity with the *status quo* prior to 14 May 1948.”<sup>2</sup>

The Conciliation Commission made a similar request of Israel. The reply of the Israeli representative, Mr. Arthur Lourie, contained in a letter of 8 November 1949 to the Chairman of the Commission, was that

“[The Government of Israel] is of the opinion . . . that it would in the circumstances be in the interests of a constructive and final settlement if the matter of formulation were dealt with after more far-reaching consideration of these problems by the General Assembly.”<sup>3</sup>

16. It is manifestly clear, therefore, that, in spite of persistent Israeli allegations that during the period of unity between the West Bank and the East Bank of Jordan the Israelis were denied access to the Wailing Wall, it was Israel itself which refused to make a declaration on visits to the Holy Places in Palestine similar to that made by the Arab Governments. The reasons are self-evident: the Israelis were determined to prevent any Palestinian from returning to his home and homeland or visiting his Holy Places. Their minds were set on the occupation and annexation, at a subsequent appropriate time, of the rest of Palestine and the remnants of Arab Jerusalem—which they carried out in 1967.

17. All the crocodile tears about being denied freedom of access to their Holy Places between 1949 and 1967 are maliciously false and misleading, and their persistent charges to the contrary do little to give them any credibility. They are mistaken in believing that by repeating this charge they can eventually brainwash people into believing it. This is Goebbels's style *par excellence*. And let me remind the representative of the Israeli entity at this point that the Palestinian people are a victimized refugee population, and not the Nazi war machine and the SS, as Menachem Begin is obsessively addicted to repeating.

18. The Israeli occupation of Palestine and the whole City of Arab Jerusalem has in fact prevented tens of millions of Christian Arabs throughout the Middle East and hundreds of millions in the Islamic world from performing their prayers at their Holy Places for three decades in three fourths of Palestine, and for over 13 years in Arab Jerusalem and the rest of the territories occupied since 1967. Indeed, the Palestinian inhabitants of Jerusalem are regarded as guests and residents in their own ancestral city. They are treated as beings, not human beings, and the Israeli occupiers are impatiently awaiting the attrition by mortality of the old, the exodus of the young abroad for education and gainful employment—for hardly any exists for them in their own city—to achieve their eventual elimination. As for the Jerusalem exiles, it is hardly an exaggeration to state that their chances of going into outer space are far greater than their chances of attaining the basic and inalienable right of repatriation to their city. Incomprehensible as it may sound, I assure representatives that it is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Is this what the world is expected to live with or tolerate?

19. Over and above that, after 1967, Muslim and Christian Holy Places in Jerusalem were placed under the jurisdiction of an Israeli Ministry, namely the Ministry of Religious Affairs. The Higher Islamic Council, Al-Haya' Al-Ilmiyyah Al-Islamiya, has been refused recognition by the occupation authorities.

20. As I have already stressed, the foremost victim of Israeli colonization, metamorphosis and despoliation have been east, north and south Jerusalem, occupied during the 1967 war. Millennia-old structures have been felled; holy sites have been bulldozed; the unique magnificence, serenity and character of that ancient city have been compromised. How can anybody rebuild those ruined and bulldozed houses?

21. The encirclement of the 1967 occupied sector has become virtually complete with a massive ring of high-rise buildings to the north, south, west and east. The latest feat of Israeli encirclement from the east began to surface a mere couple of weeks ago with the completion of some of the high-rise buildings at the eastern entrance to Jerusalem from Eizeriyah Village overlooking Gethsemane.

22. A whole town is being built on that site confiscated from the villagers of Eizeriyah, a town as large as, if not larger than, the Ramat Eshkol Israeli colony built in the north on Arab lands in the Al-Sheikh Jarrah quarter, where Mr. Begin declared two days ago that he intended to move his Government. By reason of the manifold expansion of Jerusalem's municipal boundaries, Israeli colonization stretches today from the doorsteps of Ramallah in the north to Bethlehem in the south. By incorporating more and more of the environs and villages, the Israelis can boast to the world that the Jerusalem Arabs have increased to over 100,000. I should remind the Coun-

cil that the district and suburbs of Arab Jerusalem—and I am acquainted with it because we had censuses taken during the usual elections—always contained several hundred thousand.

23. The more than a millennium-old walled City of Jerusalem, with its monumental Al-Aqsa Mosque and the breath-taking magnificence of the Dome of the Rock, the great church of the Holy Sepulchre—the oldest church in the world—along with numerous other religious and cultural shrines and sites, were for centuries surrounded by characteristically neighbourly and friendly ethnic quarters governed by an immutable and, if I may add, an inimitable *status quo*. They included a Jewish quarter, although 80 per cent of all properties in the Shurafa—or Jewish Quarter, as it came to be known—was leased to the Jews by Arab owners, and leased willingly, because we recognized the adherents of the three monotheistic faiths.

24. Nevertheless, after the occupation of the Old City, Israel embarked upon a programme to enlarge the three-metre-wide area between Al-Buraq Al-Sharif, or Wailing Wall, and the adjacent Moroccan and Bab Al-Silsila quarters. Both quarters, and many others, of course, were Islamic *Waqf* religious endowments. They consisted of hundreds of ancient and picturesque Arab homes and buildings of great artistic, historical and religious value. Their age alone entitled them to deference. They were all bulldozed to the ground in spite of the outcry of the international community and condemnation by UNESCO and other United Nations bodies. A huge assembly square opposite the Wailing Wall—Al-Buraq Al-Sharif—now covers the area where those historic buildings once stood. It is at present being used for tourists and buses, and overlooking the whole panorama are newly built villas for the habitation of Israeli ministers, military governors and other usurpers.

25. I need hardly repeat that when an international commission, under the chairmanship of a former Swedish Foreign Minister, investigated the Wailing Wall dispute in 1930, it definitely established that the Western Wall and the pavements therein were the property and legacy of Islam and not the remains of the Old Jewish Temple, as the Israelis today claim. Indeed, extensive, diligent and deep excavations beneath that entire area, going down almost 50 metres below the Al-Aqsa Mosque itself, carried out over the past 13 years by Israeli archaeologists have unearthed no Israeli traces whatsoever.

26. Concurrently, bulldozers were busily preparing for the steel and cement structures which have disfigured the city from within and totally cut it off from the rest of the West Bank. Eighteen new Israeli settlement suburbs have rendered the Arab Jerusalem of 1967 almost unrecognizable. And not only that; for by expanding relentlessly outside the municipal boundaries, the Israelis have practically eaten up the heartland of the West Bank whilst still calling it

Jerusalem. For all I know, they might extend the boundaries to Nablus and still call it Jerusalem.

27. If any evidence were needed to prove that Israeli designs are categorically intended to alter the universal and indigenous character of the city, both territorially and demographically, with the speedy and eventual extinction of the universal character of the city, the evidence is right there in Jerusalem for all to see. As I stated earlier, the Israelis in 1948 occupied and confiscated most of the city of Jerusalem. Why should anyone be driven out of his home? I should like an answer to this. Why should I be driven from my home? It is a home that I built with my own toil and labour, savings and investments. Though such seizure was strictly illegal, unilateral and wanton, these territories afforded unlimited opportunity for additional building, over and above what had already been extensively built by the Palestinian Arab citizens of Jerusalem.

28. The premises of the Knesset and the Hebrew University were built after 1948 on Arab lands belonging to the beautiful village of Ein Karem. But apart from these and a few other instances, very little indeed has been done in the field of construction in those areas—I am talking about the new Jerusalem—over the past three decades; not even essential maintenance and repairs. Members of the Council may have read a little report in *The New York Times* the other day in which the residents of the Katamon quarter, a 100 per cent Arab quarter in west Jerusalem, were complaining about the delapidation of the quarters in which they were living. Of course, they happened to be Sephardic or Oriental Jews.

29. When the remaining part of Arab Jerusalem in the east, north and south was occupied in June 1967, a spurt of construction suddenly began on an unparalleled scale, not in the western section, but in the eastern; not over Jewish lands or Arab lands already confiscated since 1947-1948, but over additional lands, likewise confiscated, in the east, south, north and west of an expanded Jerusalem.

30. Both sectors are part of Jerusalem, and yet, because Israel's main objective is to obliterate, and not to coexist alongside, the people of Jerusalem with its unique character and its immortal past, this destructive course has been recklessly pursued under Israeli occupation. That this sickly obsession and racist psychosis will one day assuredly lead to unspeakable destruction does not seem to worry the Israelis in the least. But that is one more reason that the rest of the world should not allow a tiny group of chauvinistic fanatics to lead us all down the drain through their carnage. Responsible decision-makers—and not the Gush Emunim, Kahane and their thinly disguised protectors, such as Begin, Shamir and Burg—should be the peace-makers and the decision-makers in issues pertaining to justice and injustice, to law and lawlessness, to war and peace.

31. It is in full awareness of this potential horror that the heads of State and Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the European Council representing the European Community have joined in the near-unanimous belief of mankind in advocating the imperative need to achieve a comprehensive and just settlement which highlights the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including, of course, self-determination, the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the Palestinian people's representative, an end to territorial military occupation and the illegality of settlements, and security for all. And why do we always talk about Israeli security? What about our own security? We are an endangered species; when we talk about security, let us talk about it within the proper framework. The nine countries of the European Community have also recognized the special importance of the role played by the question of Jerusalem for all the parties concerned. According to the text of the Venice declaration, the Nine stressed

“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 to the Holy Places” [S/14009, para. 8].

32. My Government takes this opportunity to express the most profound appreciation and gratitude to His Holiness Pope Paul II for the categorical, ecumenical and universal humanism of His Holiness' statements on Jerusalem and the whole Palestinian question during His Holiness' meeting with President Carter two or three days ago.

33. To return to the declaration of the European Community, it is my Government's assessment that, even though we have no illusion that the declaration will end occupation and redeem the Palestinian people's inalienable rights overnight, and while we recognize that the declaration is not wholly adequate as it stands and is somewhat blurred in some of its provisions—those are the ways of international politics—it is a vital and deeply valued tributary to a confluence which is mightily emerging to achieve a just and comprehensive peace. To say the least, it alleviates the bewildering burden—a psychological as well as physical burden—to which our people have been subjected over the past two years by the attempt, albeit totally without success, to convince us that the perpetuation of occupation is not occupation, that the occupation and annexation of Jerusalem are neither occupation nor annexation, that municipal rule is not enslavement and eventual obliteration but, rather, self-determination and independence. That has been the tragedy of the Camp David accord as it relates to the question of Palestine.

34. The bones of the sages of international law, the many deceased architects of the Charter and the author of Webster's Dictionary must have been turning in their graves as they witnessed such blatant misuse of

concepts to conceal real aims. And, incidentally, this is not even a novelty of the Camp David participants, for Mr. Shimon Peres, as Minister of Defence, in January 1974 presented it to the mayors and leaders in the occupied territories, who unanimously and scornfully turned it down. They told him, “What are you offering us? Are you offering us positions as mayors of our cities? We are already mayors. Are you advising us to make sure that the water systems work? We are already doing that.” No, this is not an exaggeration.

35. Barring conquest, which the United Nations was created specifically to prevent and declare illegal, it is pertinent briefly to examine within a legal context how the Israelis occupied, colonized and annexed most of new Jerusalem in 1948 and the rest of Jerusalem in 1967.

36. On 2 August 1948, claiming a failure by the United Nations to provide a legal framework for Jerusalem—even though that legal framework was very much there in part III of resolution 181 (II), and assiduous efforts were being made to solve the problem on that basis by various United Nations emissaries, efforts which culminated in the Lausanne Protocol of 1949, which Israel initialled but on which it later reneged—the Israeli authorities declared western Jerusalem to be Israeli-occupied territory retroactive to 15 May and began moving some of their ministries to the Holy City.

37. On the same 2 August, the military Government was disbanded and western Jerusalem was annexed. Why such a bizarre exercise in legal abuse should have been resorted to is beyond rational analysis. The Knesset decision proclaiming Jerusalem the capital of Israel on 23 January 1950 consecrated that exercise.

38. On 3 April 1949 an Armistice Agreement was signed. In article II, paragraph 2, the Agreement asserts that

“no provision of this Agreement shall in any way prejudice the rights, claims and positions of either Party hereto in the ultimate peaceful settlement of the Palestine question”.<sup>1</sup>

39. The study entitled *The Status of Jerusalem* prepared for, and under the guidance of, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is to be highly commended for its judicious and factual description and presentation pertaining to Jerusalem. It is in this spirit of appreciation and comprehension that I find myself in duty bound to take exception to certain references to a so-called Jordanian occupation of the remnants of Arab Jerusalem. This must have been inadvertent, because I know the integrity of the members of that Committee. The Jordanian presence in Jerusalem, as I have repeatedly stated, was fundamentally and qualitatively different from Israeli occupation.

40. To begin with, the Jordanian army had been all over Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine. They were guarding the Palestine broadcasting station in which I worked between 1945 and 1948. They were in the whole of Palestine during the Second World War as part of the Allied war effort. The Jordanian army withdrew totally and promptly at the termination of the British Mandate to enable the United Nations to implement its resolutions on Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine.

41. Prior to that, and while the British still had the Mandate and were still responsible for law and order in the city, Jewish forces belonging to the Haganah and the Irgun and Stern terrorist groups had already been rampaging and annexing most Arab quarters in the New City and its environs. The unspeakable massacre of at least 250 men, women and children and the dumping of their mutilated and bayoneted bodies in the village wells of Deir Yassin, a suburb of West Jerusalem, was but one of the many notorious crimes committed against the citizens of Jerusalem and its environs. Everybody said that the people of Jerusalem fled their city. This is the response: Who flees his city voluntarily, unless he is totally unprotected and subjected to the kind of massacre to which the people of Deir Yassin were subjected? Meanwhile, the Israeli aggressors planted about 1,000 men of their forces in the Jewish quarter within the walled and historic city against the express and categorical wishes of the Jewish inhabitants of that quarter. They did not wish to have their quarter turned into a battlefield, and they resisted and they refused. But those 1,000 soldiers, who were captured and subsequently, of course, returned through the Red Cross, insisted on going there and turning that Jewish quarter into a battlefield. And here there is talk about us desecrating Israeli Jewish Holy Places. It was in the course of that street fighting that not only synagogues but churches and mosques, including the Al-Aqsa Mosque, were damaged. That is a fact of history, and there are many people alive today who bore witness and can testify to it. We have never desecrated any Jewish places in all our history because, as I said, we would not be good Muslims if we did.

42. Immediately upon termination of the Mandate, the Jewish forces from within and outside mercilessly pounded the walled city for three days and nights between the fifteenth and the eighteenth of that fateful month. The Palmach itself, the striking force of the Israeli army, was involved. But they were repulsed by the determined citizenry, largely unarmed and with no regular forces or any regular or dependable supplies to enable them to continue a coherent defence. They literally expended their last bullets and they repulsed the last attacks by using the few sticks of dynamite that were left at their disposal. It was then, and only then, that they sent very urgent pleas for help to their Jordanian brethren. An advance force of the Jordanian army returned to Jerusalem—they did not occupy Jerusalem, they returned to Jerusalem—at dawn on

18 May on a salvation mission, a mercy mission. During the street fighting imposed upon us not only synagogues, as I said, but churches and mosques were damaged, including the Al-Aqsa Mosque itself, which took years to repair.

43. The world conscience would hardly have tolerated the massive massacre and expulsion of close to 90,000 Palestinian Arab citizens of Jerusalem, many of whom had by then been crowded into the Old City of Jerusalem, in the monasteries and with relatives in any space that they could find. Anyone who lived at that time knows this fact all too well and there are many such people today.

44. The Jordanian army set up a military administration while waiting and striving for a United Nations political settlement. When all those efforts were aborted and torpedoed by the Israelis and when there remained a truncated eastern Palestine, cut off from the sea, from the west, the north and south, it was the Palestinian inhabitants themselves who requested unification with their brethren in East Jordan, pending a final solution of the Palestine problem.

45. But I should like to add the following. The act of unity between the West Bank and the East Bank of 24 April 1950 speaks for itself. It states:

“ . . . to assure the safeguarding of all Arab rights in Palestine, and defending those rights by all legitimate means and, with full faith and without prejudicing the final settlement of its just cause, within national aspirations, Arab co-operation and international justice”.

46. This position has never changed and, now that the international community is striving to solve the Palestine problem, it is absolutely for the Palestinians to exercise their right of self-determination within conditions of total freedom, in any way they wish. That is a basic entitlement of every people on this little planet on which we live.

47. I must confess that the term “Jordanian occupation” sounds sour in the light of what I have just stated. A people cannot be in occupation of themselves. The Governors of Jerusalem all through that period were indigenous inhabitants: Jamal Tuqan; Aref Al-Aref, the famous historian; Daud Abu Ghazaleh, a Supreme Court Justice; Hassan Al-Khatib, one of the senior administrators of the British Mandate; Anwar Nuseibeh; Anwar Al-Khatib and others were all sons of Jerusalem and Palestine. The same was the case with the Mayors and, indeed, at the central Government level in Amman. At least half the Cabinet, half the Parliament and 60 to 70 per cent of the army were from the West Bank, and the trilateral regency always had somebody from the West Bank included whenever His Majesty King Hussein was outside the country.



48. At present, under Israeli occupation, colonization and annexation, an Israeli corporal can summon the elected Mayor of Bethlehem or of any city or town to have an audience or to receive a summons or an act of expulsion from the exalted military governorship, an Israeli major, colonel or brigadier, or possibly a captain. Not an inch of territory was ever taken by the unified State from the people. That belongs to the inhabitants, a common right which the Israelis cannot and never will understand, because their basic aim is conquest and the supplanting of the indigenous inhabitants. That is the basic difference.

49. How did the Israeli occupation unilaterally annex Arab Jerusalem occupied since 1967? It was very simple, after they gained all the necessary legal experience in 1948. The occupation authorities did the following: on 27 June 1967, the Knesset added a little paragraph to the so-called Law and Administration Ordinance of 1948 stating:

“The State’s laws, jurisdiction and administration shall apply to any area of the land of Israel which the Government shall designate by order”.

We are now talking about orders. The following day, such an order was passed which included Jerusalem. Let us recall that the entire world had regarded Jerusalem and all the occupied territories as occupied territories, and yet the Israelis lightly referred to them as an area of the land of Israel, by ordinance, of course. On 29 June 1967, an Israeli military order dissolved the Municipal Council of Arab Jerusalem. A little while later, Mr. Ruhi Al-Khatib, Mayor of Jerusalem, was exiled.

50. I cannot understand why the international jurists spend all their precious time analysing legal rights and wrongs when it is so much easier to emulate the Israelis and issue decrees, orders and ordinances in a couple of lines which decide the fate of a whole people and strike at the heart of international law and universal values and legacies.

51. If Israel stands outside the shade of international law, the international community, to be sure, is not the obedient servant of this prodigal and lawless offshoot, which, without unlimited United States support, would have been forced to heed the universal will.

52. The annexation of Jerusalem and the measures which have been taken to change the status and character of the Holy City are blatantly contrary to international law, the Hague Convention of 1907, the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other relevant conventions. They are audaciously in violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations which categorically prohibit the acquisition of territory by military conquest. They arrogantly defy General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) and Security Council resolutions 252 (1968), 267 (1969),

271 (1969), 298 (1971) and 465 (1980). Consequently, the issue, as I see it and as it stands today, is between the Council, the highest executive organ of the United Nations and an aggressive Israeli entity.

53. The Eleventh Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, meeting at Islamabad from 17 to 22 May 1980, reviewed with the gravest alarm the all but complete devouring of Al-Quds Al-Sharif, Jerusalem. The Israeli aggressors, having snuffed out the life and legacy of Jerusalem, are seemingly determined to destroy even its 1,400-year-old holiest places, the Al-Aqsa Mosque sanctuary and the Dome of the Rock.

54. On 21 August 1969, a supposedly deranged man, allegedly Australian, partially succeeded in an arson attempt against the Al-Aqsa Mosque. A month and a half ago, in the words of former Defence Minister Ezer Weizman, a horrible crime was about to be committed when two Israeli soldiers and their accomplices were apprehended with a stockpile of 264 pounds of explosives, scores of bombs, fuses and wiring. It was subsequently disclosed that the plan of the not-so-deranged but fanatical soldiers had been to blow up the venerated Al-Aqsa Mosque and the unmatched Dome of the Rock, so close to the hearts of almost 900 million Muslims—their first kiblah in Islam and their third holiest sanctuary. It is the spot from which the prophet Mohammed made his nocturnal journey to the heavens to witness God’s infinite creation. The plan was to have been executed on a Friday, when normally—except at Ramadan, when there are many more people present—at least 100,000 civilian worshippers assemble for prayer within the two mosques and outside them, throughout the open spaces of the holy sanctuary. Thousands, of course, would have been killed, wounded and maimed. Civilization and culture would have lost one of its most ancient and priceless treasures. In its combination of Arab, Byzantine and Palestinian elements, the sanctuary represents a confluence of the artistic abilities of so many civilizations which contributed to the construction of the ancient structures. The Israelis have also conceded that the aim of that terrorist group was also to blow up many Christian institutions within Jerusalem and throughout Palestine. With the mushrooming of underground Israeli military movements, there is no way of knowing when a third attempt might be made.

55. Let me assert that for Christians and Muslims Jerusalem, with its Holy Places, is as vital as their very heartbeat; it is linked to their spiritual experiences and beliefs, their memories, traditions and existence by over 2,000 years of profound spiritual history. If the Israelis think that Jerusalem is uniquely the spiritual centre of Judaism and of no other faith, they are disastrously and myopically wrong. The Israelis can talk in the most passionate terms about their own feelings—that is their prerogative. But they have neither the right nor the ability to gauge the infinite and undying intensity of the innermost feelings of reverence which the other two great religions hold

towards Jerusalem in its spiritual and historical significance. Without the Palestinian Arab Jerusalemites, Muslim and Christian alike, there would be no Islam or Christianity in Jerusalem. The existence of the Palestinian Arabs—increasingly threatened, as I mentioned earlier—is inextricably intertwined with the concrete embodiment of the two great religions in Jerusalem. The Palestinian Arabs are the sentinels who daily fill the churches and mosques; without them those hallowed places would become empty museums for tourists and occasional pilgrims.

56. Since Israel has already started through the Knesset the legislative process of formalizing in basic law their *de facto* annexation, the Foreign Ministers of the 40 Islamic States have decided, amongst other measures, to request the Security Council to convene in order to examine the dangers of the Israeli decision, to declare the annulment of that decision if carried through and to impose the sanctions as stipulated in Chapter VII of the Charter against any recalcitrant Member whose actions pose a grave threat to peace and security in the world. The United Nations has adopted numerous decisions, but to no avail. The purpose which prompted the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers was to urge the Council to shoulder its full responsibilities under the Charter, by taking meaningful and constraining action before it is too late. My delegation is fully confident that the Council will not shirk its solemn responsibilities.

57. A word in passing: the representative of the Israeli entity objected to the use by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan of the name Al-Quds Al-Sharif, which means in Arabic the Holy City, for Jerusalem. The Israeli representative wants the Hebrew name used, but he should have known better, because the Hebrew tribes adopted their name for the city from the forefathers of the Palestinians, the Jebusite Canaanites, who founded the city some 5,000 years ago and named it Uru Salema or the City of Peace. The latest archaeological excavations in Ebla in northern Syria by an Italian archaeological team have unearthed Jebusite inscriptions in which Jerusalem is called Uru Salema.

58. The Zionist intransigence has set the world on a collision course. Let us all act in concert to avoid a global catastrophe. The foremost prerequisite is the prompt Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied territories, foremost among which is Holy Jerusalem. That could be the springboard to the formulation of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, which is the aspiration of all mankind.

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

60. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): It is indeed reassuring to see you, Mr. President, presiding over the deliberations of the Security Council. The delegation of Egypt

has already extended to you its warmest and most sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. It is a good omen that an able and recognized diplomat from Norway, with its long and distinguished commitment to peace, is presiding over the Council's deliberations while the issue of the City of Peace is under consideration.

61. The status of the Holy City of Jerusalem has a distinct and most profound significance. Protection of and access to the Holy Places, in view of the diverse deep-seated religious and spiritual attachments, require that unilateral measures altering its status continue to be rejected categorically by the international community. Notwithstanding the stream of resolutions by the Council, the General Assembly and other competent organs, the situation in Jerusalem and the occupied territories is rapidly deteriorating. Every day the Israeli authorities systematically carry out well-planned and even well-publicized designs to build new settlements, expand existing ones, expropriate lands, demolish houses and expel inhabitants, including elected officials.

62. Today's deliberations attest to the perilous and grave consequences of Israeli policy in Jerusalem and in the occupied territories as a whole; a policy based on utter disregard for the Charter, for the rule of international law, for justice and for legitimacy; a policy which persists in obstructing the realization of the inalienable rights of a whole people and in frustrating earnest and sincere efforts aimed at the establishment of a just peace in our region.

63. The Council has already heard the comprehensive and lucid presentations by the representatives who preceded me. They advanced irrefutable facts and figures to document convincingly Israel's designs on Arab Jerusalem.

64. This is not the first time, nor I suspect will it be the last time, that the Council has convened to consider the status of the Holy City. On several previous occasions, the Council considered the status of Jerusalem and numerous resolutions were adopted unanimously but, regrettably, never implemented. Notwithstanding the gravity of Israel's sustained proclivity to defy the will of the community of nations, my delegation firmly believes that it would be erroneous for Israel to assume that those resolutions have no value or are destined to be shelved and to languish in the archives of the United Nations without exerting any real effect. From a legal point of view, the relevant decisions have served a useful purpose. Their adoption has confirmed the applicability of the relevant principles of international law. Their provisions have, moreover, decisively and repeatedly affirmed in clear terms that the attempts to annex Arab Jerusalem are illegal and invalid. The determination by the competent United Nations organs defines and articulates the legal status of Jerusalem beyond any doubt, rendering illegal all past, present and future

efforts or attempt to annex Arab Jerusalem. It should therefore be obvious to Israel that the mantle of legitimacy will never be conferred on its annexationist designs over Jerusalem.

65. The thrust of the statements made in the course of this debate, as well as in previous debates, has amply clarified the overwhelmingly adverse impact and the wide-ranging implications that ensue from all attempts and measures designed to alter the status of Jerusalem, regardless of the definition, description or label attached to the source of such attempts. Whether administrative or legislative, whether emanating from the incumbent Government, from the former Government, from the governing coalition, from the opposition or from splinter parties or even individuals, all attempts and measures taken by Israel to change the status of the Holy City are judged by the competent United Nations organs as totally invalid. Israel has, moreover, been resolutely and repeatedly called upon to rescind all measures already taken and to desist from embarking on any action which purports to alter in any way the status of the Holy City. The combined effect of those resolutions constitutes an authoritative pronouncement of a body of law which confirms a fundamental dictum of the contemporary international legal order, namely, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the necessity for respect for the provisions of the relevant binding international legal instruments. To allow any form of tampering with that cardinal rule would amount to placing in jeopardy the entire edifice of our modern civilization.

66. The present debate was requested as a response to the tabling of a bill in the Israeli Parliament to declare Jerusalem the capital of Israel. The ultimate objective of that bill was to consolidate and supplement the illegal measures declared in the aftermath of the 1967 war. It will be recalled that following the enunciation of those measures the General Assembly adopted two resolutions, 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V). The Assembly declared those measures invalid and requested the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of its decision. The pattern of Israel's gradual annexation of Jerusalem should be carefully studied. It would seem even ironic to recall the approach used by Israel then. Mr. Abba Eban, then Foreign Minister of Israel, stated in the General Assembly in 1967, when he attempted to rationalize the measures his Government had adopted:

"We have made it clear that measures of an administrative nature do not prejudice our readiness and our intention to work towards the goal of safeguarding those universal spiritual interests."

Mr. Eban was obviously trying to secure a fall-back position and create the impression that it was still possible to achieve an acceptable solution in spite of the unilateral Israeli measures of 1967.

67. What was then stressed by Mr. Eban was the administrative nature of the Israeli measures and the

fact that their adoption was without prejudice to the final outcome. This seemingly flexible posture did not, however, last long. Shortly thereafter, a Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Thalman of Switzerland, conferred with the Israeli authorities. On 12 September 1967, the Secretary-General submitted a report [S/8146] in which his personal representative disclosed Israel's true intentions. The report stated that Israel's leaders had made clear to the personal representative of the Secretary-General that Israel was taking every step to place under its sovereignty those parts of the city not controlled before June 1967. The Israeli authorities stated that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable. Slowly but consistently, the Israeli authorities pursued further their expansionist designs and strove to enlarge the area of the city, with a view to annexing additional chunks of the occupied West Bank. As a result of that deliberate policy, it is estimated now that approximately 30 per cent of the West Bank has been absorbed within the city limits. To pass a basic State law in 1980, and then allegedly to declare the enlarged city, comprising approximately one third of the West Bank, the capital of Israel, is the height of international illegality.

68. The position of Egypt is a matter of record. It has been clearly and amply defined by President Sadat during his recent visit to the United States. On 10 April, he stated that Al-Quds—Jerusalem—"has a unique centrality in Islamic, Christian and Jewish thought". President Sadat went on to say:

"We would like to set there a model for tolerance and togetherness among all believers. This cannot be achieved under the present circumstances. The annexation of territory by force and the expropriation of other peoples' land cannot stimulate the sort of coexistence we are promoting.

"The unification of the city cannot be used as a cover for expansion and denial of rights."

69. Thus Egypt's position is that Jerusalem, venerated by all Egyptians as a Holy City, is an integral part of the West Bank, that Arab Jerusalem should always remain under Arab sovereignty and that the Palestinians living in Arab Jerusalem are definitely entitled to exercise their sacred right to self-determination. The Holy Places should be open to all faiths without any discrimination as to race, nationality or religion and all measures to change the demographic composition of Arab Jerusalem should be rescinded. The authority of Israel, as an occupying Power, is strictly confined to limited action, in conformity with the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and other related international agreements. That, in essence, is Egypt's position.

70. When it was reported that a final blow was about to be struck, in the guise of a basic law, Egypt

registered its vigorous and categorical objection. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Cairo on 15 May issued a statement confirming Egypt's strong opposition to any unilateral attempt to alter the juridical or political status of Jerusalem and any action designed to create a *fait accompli*. The statement affirmed:

“Such action creates a serious and grave situation which contravenes the principles of international law and legitimacy, the framework of Camp David and the spirit of peace”. [S/13945, annex.]

71. The Egyptian Government has made it abundantly clear that this policy adversely affects the peace process and has gravely undermined the current strenuous efforts for a just peace. Under such conditions, the Government of Egypt suspended the peace talks.

72. On Jerusalem, the international community has from the very outset committed itself to acting in accordance with the unique importance and significance of the Holy City. It is universally recognized that the Council's deliberations encompass highly sensitive political, legal, spiritual and secular considerations that transcend all man-made geographical and political boundaries. It is, therefore, a source of satisfaction for my delegation to recognize that opposition to all measures to alter the status of the city has emerged and commanded clear and solid unanimity. My delegation wishes most sincerely to express the hope that on other aspects of the Palestinian problem, in particular the most fundamental of these aspects, the realization of the inalienable Palestinian rights, unanimity will soon materialize.

73. In this connection, we note with appreciation the constructive position taken a few days ago by the European Community. It should be recalled that for over 10 years Egypt has been in close and constant contact with the European Community and has always urged the European countries to come out with a clear policy statement in support of the efforts to establish a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East. The Venice declaration [S/14009] was welcomed by Egypt. President Sadat described it as positive, constructive and balanced. Mr. Boutros Ghali, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, expressed Egypt's support for the constructive European policy and welcomed the objectives and principles contained in the Venice declaration. Moreover, he declared Egypt's complete readiness to co-operate with any delegation dispatched to the Middle East and gave assurances that Egypt would spare no effort to ensure the success of all constructive measures aimed at the achievement of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

74. Last year the Council unanimously adopted resolution 446 (1979), which established a commission with the clear mandate of examining the situation relating to the settlements in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. In the Commission's

report reference was made to the urgency of Israel's compliance with and implementation of the Security Council resolutions pertaining to Jerusalem. As the Committee's report [S/13450 and Add.1 of 12 July 1979] clearly reveals, Egypt extended its full co-operation. The Commission visited Cairo in 1979 and had a series of extensive meetings with high Government officials, including the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, as well as many non-officials. In the light of the latest attempts to alter the status of Jerusalem, my delegation takes note of the most recent letter from Ambassador Mathias of Portugal, Chairman of the Commission, requesting information having a bearing on the Commission's mandate. We whole-heartedly welcome the valuable efforts of this Commission and we should like to pay a tribute to its Chairman and its members for their diligent and objective endeavours.

75. In conclusion, I should like to reiterate once more that Egypt's policy is and will always remain based on the attainment of a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East, a peace that will provide Arabs and Israelis alike, on an equal and reciprocal basis, genuine opportunities to enjoy peace, security and prosperity. It is therefore imperative that occupation be terminated; it is also imperative to recognize the futility of embarking on provocative measures and the dire necessity of abandoning short-sighted policies. Vision and courage are the prerequisites to ensure peace and justice. It is high time that the world, represented in the Council, took all appropriate steps to ensure the speedy achievement of this lofty objective. The Council's actions will affect—and affect profoundly—not only the fate of a whole people but also the deep religious feelings and the spiritual heritage of hundreds of millions of Muslims and Christians all over the world.

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

77. Mr. KANE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The outbreak of violence, bringing in its wake mourning and sorrow, that has once again shaken occupied Arab Palestine has led the Council to place at the centre of its most pressing concerns a conflict which, unfortunately, remains completely unresolved and with no solution in sight.

78. The concern shown by the Council, and rightly so in the light of what is occurring in the Middle East, is a surprise to no one, as the international balance and peace and security in our world are today more seriously imperilled than at any other period since the creation of the United Nations.

79. Why are we more threatened today than ever before by a conflict which can be fraught only with tragic consequences for mankind? It is because the injustice done to the Palestinian people—which

zionism and its protectors have endeavoured to minimize for more than a generation—has led to a confrontation which has now reached its peak.

80. Indeed, for more than 30 years the politico-military system which has chosen to reside in Palestine has attempted, with the aid of some Powers, to eliminate the Palestinian people. Our Organization, when it assumed the burdensome responsibility of permitting the creation of the Zionist State, despite itself was abetting the dispossession, expropriation, deportation and the attempt systematically to liquidate the Palestinian people.

81. This tragedy, which has long haunted our consciences without giving us sufficient strength to restore the most sacred rights of the Palestinian people, finally shook up the former international order and caused a true mobilization of oppressed peoples against those who endeavoured and still endeavour to make the Organization give a political and moral endorsement to the crimes committed against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation.

82. If the Organization has since been shaken by a crisis which has undermined it and today threatens its very foundations, it is because the decisions adopted by the majority of Member States are constantly being called in question by means of procedures which from every standpoint run counter to justice, law and the most elementary common sense. Indeed, the arbitrary equation introduced into the Charter, an equation that some seek to justify by all possible means, an equation whereby a super-Power—a single super-Power—is legally equal or even superior to more than 150 Member States, is not only an aberration but indeed also an insult to one's intelligence. The right of veto—and I am talking about its excessive and abusive utilization—unfortunately continues to paralyse the Organization and to cause throughout the world violent reactions, which are the legitimate expression of those who are unable to rely on international justice to defend their most sacred right to freedom and life.

83. Permit me to dwell for a few moments on this question, because it is obvious that international peace and security, stability and freedom in the world are now, more than ever, bound up with this principle which has become the most essential of the Charter.

84. We for our part thought—and this is a profound and sincere conviction—that those who arrogated to themselves so many political privileges when drafting the Charter were also quite obviously aware of the immense moral responsibility incumbent upon them. We also thought that, because of this responsibility, they would endeavour to be the jealous guardians of justice and law and would avoid this most attractive, yet perilous, pitfall of being both judge and jury to the problems the solution of which is the major responsibility of the Organization. We believe this because we

are a small country, but also and even more so because we see in the Charter a real instrument in the service of freedom, justice and peace. The equality of small or large States, forcefully proclaimed in the Charter which each of our countries freely and solemnly pledged to respect, was for us the corner-stone of the structure built after a murderous war whose all too disastrous moral consequences continue to be a matter of concern to the international community.

85. If this was and remains the conviction of the majority of nations comprising the United Nations, none the less it does not seem to inspire certain great Powers which are concerned to expand their living space and are trying to establish zones of political and economic influence throughout the world by contravening commitments into which they have entered.

86. In this feverish activity of colonial reconquest, Israel and South Africa quite naturally are being used as bases to liquidate Palestinian resistance and South African liberation movements. So, as seems perfectly clear, it is not a permissive attitude on the part of the Organization that has led the Zionist entity to trample underfoot relevant General Assembly resolutions and decisions. The verdict of the General Assembly concerning the expansionist and genocidal policy practised by Israel is sufficiently clear and peremptory. Both the style and substance of that policy have been unambiguously and irreversibly condemned.

87. In truth, what leads Israel to defy the Organization and to pursue its policy of liquidating the Palestinian nation is doubtless the guilty complicity of imperialism which continues to support the Zionists militarily, financially and diplomatically. That is why Israel, strengthened by the unconditional support of imperialism, is continuing deliberately to violate the most fundamental human rights in the Middle East.

88. This breach of the spirit and the letter of the Charter, which has led to the expropriation and dispossession of the Palestinians unfortunately, recently reached its peak when the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and the Sharia Judge of Hebron were expelled, without any justification whatever. And yet those eminent Palestinian personalities had been freely and democratically elected by the Palestinian people even though Palestine is occupied by the Zionists. In this connection, the Council has adopted resolutions which have remained a dead letter because of the well-known stubbornness of the Zionists.

89. But the arrogant policy of Israel does not stop there. Al-Quds Al-Sharif, a Holy City for many reasons, which had always been an integral part of Arab Palestine, has just been transformed into the capital of the Zionist entity. The Holy Places of this city have been profaned. There is no religious community in the world which has not condemned these acts which are destructive from both the moral and

the human point of view. The Foreign Ministers of the Islamic Conference, at their meeting held at Islamabad last May, condemned this decision of the Israeli Government and considered it to be null and void. They requested a meeting of the Council to consider the dangers that might result from that decision of the Zionist entity.

90. The Council once again is seized of a matter that has been before it for more than 30 years. It goes without saying that the decision that emerges from the discussion here may have a lasting effect on peace, stability and justice not only in Arab Palestine but throughout the world, for the situation in Palestine has spawned and continues to create other situations which slowly are leading our universe towards a war whose consequences would be incalculable for mankind as a whole.

91. The 1980s should witness a just and lasting solution of the question of Palestine. That solution will be the work of the United Nations and of the Security Council, and this is what we hope, since otherwise the world will once again have to confront a conflagration that can only reduce and weaken the conscience and reason of man. But if by misfortune a solution within the framework of the United Nations cannot be found, then the Arab nation, in so far as it is concerned, will shoulder its responsibilities, all of them, because the legitimate struggle waged by the Palestinian people is being waged not only to affirm its right to exist; that struggle is also being waged to defend the most authentic values of the Arab nation—its age-old civilization, its dignity, its personality and its sense of responsibility.

92. In this connection, it should be indicated that it would be useless for an Arab State to attempt to establish within its confines conditions of independence and prosperity, however necessary they may be, as long as the Palestinian people, an integral and inseparable part of the Arab nation, suffers under Zionist domination and exploitation and is condemned to wander and to beg. Any independence and prosperity in such circumstances can only be fictitious and indeed constitute an act of betrayal. Those who have embarked upon that path will inevitably have to answer to history and to their people.

93. In the struggle against zionism, an enemy of mankind, the Arab nation does not stand alone, cannot stand alone and will never stand alone, since today, like yesterday, it is a matter of the just against the unjust, truth against falsehood, morality against the denial of the most sacred right of man, that is, the free choice of one's destiny.

94. In the Middle East, in Latin America, in Asia and in Africa, the struggle is the same, and it is not mere chance that the Zionist entity is collaborating closely with the South African racists in all areas in an attempt to stem the surge of peoples to independence in those

regions. Likewise—and this should be emphasized—it is no mere chance if the same Powers always adopt the same attitude towards the same problems here in the Security Council. The choice is clear and the responsibility well defined.

95. What is required today more than ever of the Arab and African nations, where unfortunately the most flagrant violations of human rights still subsist, violations perpetrated by racism and zionism, is that resolute and unswerving respect be paid to the moral values underlying the Charter. I mean to say that as long as in our countries a man may be pursued without justification, condemned without reason and executed without trial, we will have assumed the responsibility—the heavy responsibility, I would go so far as to say—of bringing grist to the mill of zionism, racism and their foreign supporters. The life of a man, wherever he may be and whatever may be his race or colour—and this is a fundamental truth—is far too precious for it to be extinguished without clear moral justification.

96. In view of this situation, it is even more imperative that the Arab nation should stand united against the Zionist and imperialist acts of aggression. In fact, the Zionists of Tel Aviv have only too often exploited our division to impose their domination over our region. Consolidation of our independence by the creation of an atmosphere that can promote unity in our respective countries and a steadfast and expanding solidarity among the States of the Arab nation are the imperative duties incumbent upon each and every one of our countries.

97. Above and beyond the unity of the Arab nation which is so necessary, the strengthening of the natural ties of solidarity between the Arab nation and the African nation is today even more indispensable, for who can understand the situation of the Palestinian people better than the Namibian people? Who can truly appreciate the situation in Lebanon better than the South African people? Who can feel both the suffering and the hopes of the Arab nation better than the African nation?

98. Between the situation that we inherited immediately after the Second World War and the current situation there has surely been an evolution in our world. The circle of the United Nations has expanded. The universality sought by the Organization and which constituted the fundamental objective of the Charter has increasingly become a fact. Wrested by struggle and sometimes at the cost of indescribable suffering, the independence, both political and economic, of the small countries nevertheless continues to be a source of preoccupation. Imperialism, while adopting a policy of retreat necessitated a few years ago by the international situation, today seems to be trying to get the situation in hand. South Africa and Israel are being used quite obviously by means of weapons, money and publicity to ensure control of the



raw materials of Africa and of the Middle East for the benefit of the imperialist multinational corporations. During this time, the Palestinian, Namibian and South African peoples are forced to vegetate in concentration camps on the very land of their ancestors. Unbearable pictures of tearful children, with swollen bellies and feverish countenances, which are published daily in newspapers and shown on television, reveal the full dimension and cruelty of the tragedy imposed on Africa and the Arab world. These people are forced to beg, for these people poverty, disease and suffering are their daily fare, and yet, when they defend by force of arms their right to exist, it is they who are called terrorists.

99. This approach by imperialism and Zionism is certainly not new. Was not the "yellow peril" long exploited to prevent the People's Republic of China from taking its place in the concert of nations? Was not the idea of so-called premature independence utilized by colonial Powers to prevent African, Asian and Latin American countries from acceding to independence and national sovereignty?

100. The strategy of zionism and racism consists of frightening the world by purveying the belief that the independence of Palestine, Namibia and South Africa will lead to an apocalypse. That is not a new strategy; it surprises no one. Just like the admission of China to the United Nations, just like the recent liberation of Zimbabwe, independence for Palestine, Namibia and South Africa will come about because truth is obstinate and no State in the world—this has been tested in parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America—no State at all, wherever it may be, whatever its wealth and its military power—can now stay or will be able to stay the course of history.

101. The liberation of Jerusalem, an integral part of Palestine, cannot be accomplished separately from the liberation of Palestine as a whole. The Zionists and their allies wish to use the Jerusalem issue to create a situation where one cannot see the wood for the trees. But that is not and cannot be the question. To be sure, Jerusalem has its peculiar characteristics, as we all agree, and its own religious status. But that cannot abrogate the fact that legally and historically the Holy City belongs to the Arab nation of Palestine. The decision of the Knesset to change the character and status of the city on the basis of a so-called biblical interpretation moves only those who now and always have exploited religion for base materialistic ends. It is today obvious that the presence of Zionists in a part of the Holy City and the measures they are adopting are far from religious in nature.

102. In fact, no one can remember religion ever having been so profaned and utilized for such inhuman and unjust purposes. Israel's attitude is in no way whatsoever different from that of the faithless and lawless settlers that hid their colonial expeditions with the cloak of religion the better to despoil the

Asian, African and Latin American peoples. As the saying goes: "Settlers came with their cross when we had our lands and later they left us their cross and took away our lands".

103. That is the policy that has been utilized by the racist Government of Pretoria in an attempt to justify the oppression and exploitation of the South African and Namibian peoples. However, it appears that neither Israel nor the racist régime in Pretoria has understood that history is irreversible and that, whether it be in 1 year, 5 years or 10 years, they too will be thrown into the waste-basket of history along with their kind.

104. I did not deliberately set out to change a well-established tradition, but I have decided to conclude with remarks that would usually occur at the beginning of a statement. The President of the Security Council is both a friend and, if I may say so, a tireless defender of the Palestinian cause and the independence of the African continent. That is why I have reserved these last words for you, Mr. President, as a friend. On behalf of my country, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, I should like to convey to you our sincere congratulations not only on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month but also on the steadfast courageous position your country has assumed in defence of fundamental principles of the Charter.

105. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I now call upon him.

106. Mr. BLUM (Israel): To start with, I wish to register my appreciation and indebtedness to Mr. Nuseibeh for having so eloquently explained to the Council why Jordan must indeed be regarded as the Palestinian Arab State. The representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan has spoken here today about Jerusalem in his characteristically petulant and parsimonious manner. He has given free rein to his imagination and has not recoiled from the most crude fabrications. He has also taken his customary liberties with facts and figures.

107. It is an affront to history that Jordan should complain to this body about Jerusalem, for Jordan stands condemned as the first country in modern history to have bombarded the Holy City. It will be recalled that it was Jordan—or Transjordan, as it was called in those days—which, intent on destroying the fledgling State of Israel and on unlawfully grabbing territory for itself, attacked Jerusalem in 1948 in clear defiance of the principles of the Charter. It placed Jerusalem under siege and opened fire on its inhabitants and on its historical and religious sites.

108. Jordanian forces attacked and destroyed the densely populated Jewish quarter of the Old City with mortar shells and seized the eastern part of the city,

including the historic walled section, which contains religious shrines holy to Jews, Christians and Muslims. Between 1948 and 1967 Jerusalem was a city cut in two by barbed wire and minefields. In flagrant violation of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement of 1949, Jordan barred access by Jews to their Holy Places and cultural institutions. Further, the Jordanian Government began systematically to eliminate every trace of Jerusalem's Jewish past. Fifty-eight synagogues, some of great antiquity, like the 700-year-old Hurva Synagogue, were wantonly destroyed and desecrated. Those that were not razed to the ground were converted into toilets, stables and hen houses filled with dung heaps, garbage and carcasses. In the process, hundreds of holy Torah scrolls and books reverently preserved for generations were plundered and burned to ashes. On the Mount of Olives, a hallowed spot for Jews for centuries, 38,000 of the 50,000 tombstones in the ancient Jewish burial ground were torn up, profaned, broken into pieces and used as flagstones, steps and building materials for public latrines and Jordanian army barracks. Large areas of the cemetery were levelled and converted into parking areas and gas stations. Through the devastated remains of the graves, the Jordanian Government cut an asphalt road to provide a short cut to a new hotel, built irreverently on the top of the Mount of Olives.

109. Nor were the discriminatory policies of Jordan directed only against Jews, who, as is well known, were not permitted to live in the Jordanian-occupied section of Jerusalem, although they constituted in Jerusalem then, as they have uninterruptedly for the past 150 years, the vast majority of the city's population. During the Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967, stagnation set in and there was considerable emigration from it, since Jordan discouraged economic development in Jerusalem with a view to ensuring the primacy of Amman. Particularly hard-hit were the Christian residents under Jordanian occupation, and their numbers decreased significantly during that period, from 19,000 in 1948 to 11,000 in 1967.

110. When in 1952 Jordan declared Islam to be the official religion of the realm, that declaration was made applicable also to the Jordanian-occupied part of Jerusalem. As a result, Christian holidays were no longer recognized as official holidays of the Christian citizens. Christian civil servants were required to take their weekly holiday on Friday. They were permitted to absent themselves from their jobs on Sundays only until 11 a.m. Christian schools were required to remain closed on Fridays.

111. In 1953 a Jordanian law imposed severe restrictions on the purchase of land by religious institutions affiliated with "foreign religious organizations". In 1965 Jordan completely prohibited the acquisition of ownership or possession of land within the walled city of Jerusalem without prior special authorization by the Government. This resulted in preventing the

construction of any Christian church or place of worship within the Old City. In October 1966 the Jordanian Government took further measures with a view to discriminating against Christian ecclesiastical institutions and clergy, such as the abolition of exemption from custom duties previously granted to those institutions and clergy. A Jordanian law passed in 1955 was from then on strictly enforced also against Christian educational institutions. It required them to abandon foreign languages of instruction and to substitute Arabic for them. The teaching of the Koran was also introduced on that occasion.

112. When Jerusalem was reunited in 1967, the number of its non-Jewish residents was about 70,000—roughly one quarter of the population. The non-Jewish population has since risen to more than 100,000.

113. In this regard, it is also relevant to recall that for 19 years, between 1948 and 1967, Jordan also barred the Muslim citizens of Israel from visiting and praying in mosques of the Old City of Jerusalem. They gained access to them only in 1967, when the city was reunited.

114. This, then, is the lamentable record of the Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967. The Jordanian Government destroyed the ancient Jewish quarter in the Old City, drove out all of its inhabitants and subsequently barred Jews from entering, even as tourists. It severely oppressed and discriminated against the Christian residents of the city, as well as against Christian religious institutions. It equally discriminated against the Christian and Muslim citizens of Israel. By contrast, Jerusalem today is a city open to all its residents—Jews, Muslims and Christians—as well as to members of all faiths from all nations. It is open even to those who claim to be Israel's enemies. To date, millions of tourists from all over the world, including hostile Arab States, have visited Jerusalem and have been afforded freedom of access and worship at their respective Holy Places. And yet, the representative of Jordan comes before the Council to regale it with the fabrications of his vivid imagination.

115. There is a maxim common to all legal systems which has found its succinct expression in English law. It says in a most concise form: "He who comes seeking equity must come with clean hands". The representative of Jordan may do well to remember this maxim.

116. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Jordan has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

117. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I regard it as almost immoral to give any response to the representative of an entity which is in occupation of my country.



But yet I feel compelled to do so because of the volume of his fabrications and distortions, which everybody knows are completely at variance with the truth and with the facts which I presented to the Council a short while ago.

118. To begin with, when I said that the Palestinians during the period of unity between the East Bank and the West Bank of the Jordan lived a life of dignity, equality and freedom with their brethren in the East Bank, I made it categorically and specifically clear that that was an interim arrangement which was enacted by Parliament in 1950, pending a final solution of the Palestinian problem. Would it have been better for any party, least of all the Palestinians, to be kept, as they are now kept by those usurpers, aggressors and occupiers for two decades, under the whim and whip of a military Governor? They needed to live a decent life pending a final solution of the Palestine problem.

119. What I said does not in any way mean that Jordan is the Palestinian State of Jordan. What it means is that there were two brethren who came to each other's succour in their hour of need and made the best of the situation, pending the redemption of the Palestinian people and their repatriation, as an elementary right to their homes and homeland. "Thou shalt not steal" is one of the Commandments; and yet all those Israelis about whom the representative of Israel was talking are living in our homes, in Arab homes throughout Palestine. Palestine is Palestine and Jordan is Jordan as they were before the partition and dismemberment of Palestine.

120. The second point that the representative of Israel made—and he made so many that I reserve the right to give a more organized answer to his fabrications—was an allegation that the Jordanian army fired at Holy Places and at Jewish quarters during its stay in Palestine under the British Mandate. I think everybody knows—and the representative of the United Kingdom can corroborate this point—that the Jordanian army never fired a shot during the entire period of the Mandate and that they promptly and completely evacuated all Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, West Jerusalem, the Alamein Bank, the Katamon quarter, Mia-Shairem and all the strategic locations in Jerusalem, without firing a shot. They were a disciplined armed force, which crossed the river to enable the United Nations—the United Nations Mediator and all other United Nations operatives—to implement the resolution on a solution of the Palestinian problem. Only on 18 May 1948, three days after the termination of the Mandate, did that Jordanian army enter Jerusalem to save 90,000 hapless, unarmed civilians who had never in their lives had any military training. Under the British Mandate, anyone who was caught with a bullet was liable to be hanged. And yet our people fought off the best strike force in the Israeli army for three days, until they were left with not a bullet. It was then that the Jordanian

army, 600-men strong, came in at the urgent pleading of our people. My own brother had his leg amputated on that mission, in asking for help and succour for his brethren across the River Jordan.

121. The representative of Israel, along with all the representatives of Israel over the past several years that I have been here, have always gradually inflated the number of synagogues in the small Jewish quarter in Jerusalem. If anyone from the Old City of Jerusalem is asked, he will answer that there were four synagogues—two important ones, Al-Kanis Al-Kabir or the Greater Synagogue and Al-Kanis Al-Soghir or the Lesser Synagogue. Unless Mr. Blum regards every Jewish household as a synagogue, it is unclear how he could possibly come up with that figure of 58 synagogues. Once in the past the figure 48 was mentioned. And yet everybody knows that there were four synagogues in the Old City and, as I stated, if we had wanted to desecrate any of those Holy Places, we could have done so over the period of 1,400 years. However, not a single stone was touched over those 14 centuries. It was the Israelis who infiltrated some of their worst elements from the Stern and Irgun gangs, in an attempt to bombard the Holy City of Jerusalem from the outside, from the Jaffa Gate, as well as from the Jewish quarter. Heaven knows what would have happened to the 90,000 unarmed citizens whose few rifles had become sticks once the few bullets in their possession had been exhausted. They used to pay a whole shilling for a bullet on the open market, because nobody was supplying us as the Israelis were supplied with money and arms.

122. The representative of Israel has talked about the desecration of Israeli Holy Places. He, of course, mentioned the famous Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives. Allow me to read from the statement of the Jordanian Mission annexed to the letter dated 20 January 1972 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General [S/10517]:

“... the alleged desecration of a Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives is again a subject which Israel should not raise, for the invidious comparison which reference to it would necessarily evoke. To start with, this Jewish cemetery is only 100 years old and it is a piece of land which belongs to the Muslim *Waqf* (charitable foundations)” —which knew how to revere Judaism and to abhor zionism— “and leased for a Jewish cemetery for 100 years, which lease expired [more than a decade] ago. [Whatever little] damage to this cemetery was done when the Israeli gangs and forces barricaded themselves in it to bombard the Old City”—the representative of Israel said that the Jordanian army was the first to have bombarded the Old City; they never fired a shot—“in their attempt to occupy it at the end of 1947 and the beginning of 1948. As soon as the Jordan civil administration was established in the City, the municipality undertook the task of its maintenance and protection by assigning special watchmen and caretakers to it.”

This was done even though Israel had cut us off from all the sources of electricity and water. They literally wanted us to die of thirst; we had to improvise and we did so very well indeed.

“What do we find on the other side of the scoreboard? Without exaggeration, we come across one of the most massive and sinful programmes of desecration that the world has ever known.”—It is compiled in books and I shall look them up in my office—“One of the most hallowed Muslim cemeteries, the Ma'manallah (Mamillah) Cemetery in the western section of Jerusalem, is at least 1,000 years old. Like the Kremlin or Arlington or Westminster Abbey, it contains the remains of great men by every standard and in all fields of achievement—saints, warriors—philosophers—leaders of men and of history. What is presently its fate? A public park for human beings and animals to trample on, as any visitor to Jerusalem can see for himself.”

I am sure that the staff of the United States Consulate in West Jerusalem can verify this for themselves because the site is in very close proximity to that Consulate.

“The shrine of a great religious leader in Jaffa, several hundred years old: if anyone happens to visit Jaffa and feels like having a drink in exotic surroundings, he can go there, walk down a few steps and see for himself. The mosques of Safad and Tiberius have been converted into art galleries. Mr. Evan M. Wilson, previously quoted, has this to say on page 125 of his book *Jerusalem, Key to Peace*:<sup>5</sup>

“ ‘After the war [of 1967] Christian authorities who had been unable for many years to visit certain Christian properties on Mount Zion . . . because they were . . . closed off by the Israeli military, found that some of these institutions had suffered severely. The tombs of the Armenian Patriarchs in the courtyard of the Armenian Church of St. Saviour had been broken into and the bones scattered about. A famous mosaic floor had been removed from the church during or just after the war, and the church itself was in a deplorable state of disrepair. Several Christian cemeteries in the vicinity were in bad condition, with thick vegetation and opened graves. . . There is reason to believe, moreover, that this vandalism . . . is continuing.’ ”

Why should there be reason to believe? It is still continuing. It happened a month ago and it was published in the papers here.

“ ‘It was found in the spring of 1968, after the war, that the crosses on 83 tombs in the Catholic cemetery on Mount Zion had been shattered. It was in this area also that the tower of the Dormition

Abbey was used for many years as an Israeli machine-gun nest.’

“Several mosques, churches, shrines and other sacred spots throughout Palestine have been desecrated or destroyed beyond recognition at Israeli hands. Instances of desecration of Christian properties in Israel are given in a letter of 19 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General [S/8552].”

123. I do not think that I should abuse the Council's time, so I shall go on to something else. The representative of Israel has talked about discrimination and the disappearance of the Christian Palestinian Arab community. If he wants to know where the Christian Palestinian Arabs are, I will tell him. They are mainly in Amman. They have joined their Muslim Palestinian Arab brethren mainly in Amman, but also some emigrated to the United States and they are, like the Muslims, dispersed under every sky. It is unfortunate that the representative of Israel thinks in terms of these petty differences. We have never had that approach. We are one people. The Palestinian people is one people. Before Zionism it included the Muslim Palestinians, the Christian Palestinians and the Jewish Palestinians. After Zionism there were the Christian Palestinians and the Muslim Palestinians. There is no distinction whatsoever. That concept applied strictly—no, not strictly; it was natural. We cannot behave otherwise.

124. As for the holidays that the representative of Israel has referred to, I should like to inform him that for Christian schools Fridays and Sundays were official holidays, whereas for Muslim schools it was only Fridays. The same applied to exemptions from taxes on importing vehicles or ambulances for Christian institutions. I was a member of the Government and I remember that cases used to come before us and invariably all the requests presented by the Christian churches for charitable purposes were unequivocally endorsed. It was not quite the same with the Muslim institutions and yet that was the case with the Christian ones, because several of them were not indigenous but came from other friendly countries. I think that His Holiness the late Pope Paul VI would have testified to how Christianity was faring in Jerusalem when he honoured us with his visit to Jerusalem in 1965-1966, because to us Christianity is so venerated that we regard Jesus Christ as emanating from the spirit of God and we behave accordingly.

125. I shall reply in due course to some of the other points that were mentioned by the representative of Israel.

126. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

127. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I wish to draw the Council's attention to the fact that the representative of Jordan

has again repudiated his monarch here today, for it was King Hussein who, in 1972, categorically stated "Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan". I would express the hope that Ambassador Nuseibeh will not be accused of *lèse-majesté* by his Government.

128. We have been told by Ambassador Nuseibeh that "only" four synagogues were destroyed by the Jordanians in 1948. That would seem to imply that the destruction of four synagogues is regarded as permissible by him. However, Ambassador Nuseibeh has unwittingly supplied us here today with yet another example of his notoriously low credibility rating. Let me therefore give the Council the full list of those 58 synagogues: (1) Bikur Holim; (2) Or Ha-Haim; (3) Ha-Ari Ha-Kadosh; (4) Sukkat Shalom; (5) Hesed El; (6/7) Habad (two synagogues); (8) Shoneh Halachot; (9) Beit Hillel; (10) Menahem Zion; (11) Ahavat Ha-Torah Veba-Shalom; (12) Ha-Ramban; (13) Rabbi Baruch; (14) Rabbi Yehuda Ha-Hasid (the "Hurva" Synagogue); (15) Warsaw; (16/17) Adot Ha-Ma'arav (two synagogues); (18) Beit-El Synagogue of the Kabbalists; (19) Rabbi Yohanan Ben Zakkai; (20) Ha-Emtza'i; (21) Istanbul; (22) Eliahu Ha-Navi; (23) Beit Aharon; (24) Sha'arei Shamayim; (25) Yehudei Sepharad; (26) Yemenite; (27) Ohel Avraham; (28) Beit Meir; (29) Or Olam; (30) Karaite; (31) Tiferet Yisrael; (32) Ohel Moshe; (33) Kurdish; (34) Porat Yosef; (35) Hayei Olam; (36) Ha-Kotel Ha-Ma'aravi; (37) Sukkat David; (38) Rabbi Meir Ba'al Ha-Nes; (39) Georgian Jews; (40) Ohel Ya'acov; (41) Zion; (42) Dubno; (43) Sdeh-Hemed; (44) Ahavat Zion; (45) Biderman; (46) G'milut Hasadim; (47) Moshav-Z'kainim Ha-Yashan; (48) Michael Rutman; (49) Torat Ha-Cohanim; (50) Aleppo Jews; (51) K'tav Torah; (52) Or Zorai'ah; (53) Persian Jews; (54) Chassidei Vizhnitz; (55) Chassidei Bratzlav; (56) Chassidei Tzortkov; (57) Kollel Horodno; (58) Rabbi Pinhasel.

129. I would very much hope that, now that I have given the full list of these synagogues, the myth of two or four synagogues canvassed by the representative of Jordan in the Council over the years will have been laid to rest. It is regrettable but understandable that the representative of Jordan should have seen fit to leave the chamber when I started reading out that list.

130. That, then, is how we have to evaluate the reliability or otherwise of Ambassador Nuseibeh.

131. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who is going to make a statement in reply.

132. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I just want to report here about the so-called freedom of education being given to the people under military occupation.

133. On 13 February this year, the publication *Zu Haderekh* reported that almost every month a new list of banned books is drawn up by what is known as

the office of the Israel Defence Forces Education Officer and sent to all schools of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Books are banned because their content is Marxist, because they contain the word "Palestine" or because they express opposition to Zionism and imperialism. However, on 9 June, West Bank schools received a list of banned books which included the interdiction to read, among others, Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*. That is an item I saw in *Zu Haderekh*, which really explains just how free our children are in their schools.

134. I do not want to stray from the subject before us. We are dealing with a very, very serious issue concerning the fate of Jerusalem, which reflects the fate of all the occupied Palestinian territories. But I think that we simply cannot leave here tonight without recalling the Zionist concept of Jerusalem.

135. How does Herzl refer to Jerusalem? In his diaries Herzl mentioned: "If Jerusalem is ever ours—and if I were still able to do anything about it—I would begin by cleaning it up. I would clear out anything that is not sacred, set up workers' houses" and so on. Now, as far as Herzl is concerned, what is "sacred"? I can assure the Council that, in his concept of Christianity, when he refers to the "Lovable dreamer of Nazareth" as having done nothing but help to increase hatred, anything that resulted from the teachings of the "Lovable dreamer of Nazareth"—our Redeemer Jesus Christ—is, to him, not at all sacred; it is something that should really be obliterated. Those are the words of Herzl.

136. As the Council was told this morning [2233rd meeting], there is in a committee of the Knesset a draft of a basic law concerning the future of Jerusalem. It so happens that the Deputy Legal Adviser to the Government is the same man who used to be the legal adviser to Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem. His name is Bar-Sela'. Now, how does he view the fate of historic Jerusalem, the people of Jerusalem? In his draft made four years ago, the legal adviser Bar-Sela' speaks of: "Old Jerusalem and all the public areas located outside the walls of the city which have been designated as a national park . . ."—so the Old City would become a national park. He adds:

"Many important historical and architectural sites which are located in the Old City of Jerusalem do not receive appropriate care and are neglected, and thus a preservation committee co-chaired by a minister and the Mayor of Jerusalem would act to preserve quarters and sites of a scenic, architectural, historical and national character."

137. We all know that, in that national park, it is not only the scenery and architecture we are interested in; it is the people; it is the spiritual dimension; it is the religious dimension. Well, that is not taken into consideration. But what is being taken into considera-

tion? And here comes the capital investment idea of how to get money. According to the plan, Israel's budget would contain a grant for Jerusalem and this would allow Jerusalem to enjoy what is known as a "residents' grant", which would be determined according to the number of Jerusalem's residents and which would be increased following the rise in numbers of Jerusalem's residents with Israeli citizenship. The draft law makes it clear there that every additional Jewish citizen would improve the financial situation of the municipality, but adds that the Arabs are not Israeli citizens. So the Arabs in Jerusalem are not "a capital investment"; Jewish citizens would be "a capital investment". That leads us safely to believe that the eventual fate of the non-Jewish citizens is known. Who wants to have a burden in a city when he can make some money by bringing in more Jewish citizens?

138. I just thought that, at this juncture, I would bring that to the attention of the Council because what

we are really dealing with is not just one aspect of the situation but the future of an entire people, the Palestinian people, and also the future of peace in the area.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. I, document A/1113, part C, art. 4.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, part B, para. 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, *Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1554th meeting, para. 74.

<sup>5</sup> Washington (D.C.), the Middle East Institute, 1970.