



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 5:</i>	
<i>Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued) . . .</i>	1

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Assembly that I have not been formally informed of the result of the consultations for which the General Assembly decided to adjourn on Wednesday, 5 July.
2. I should like to think, therefore, that these consultations are still going on; and, while I fully understand—as I am sure all Members do—that such serious consultations take time, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to request all representatives engaged in these consultations to inform the Assembly, directly or through the Chair, about the result of their continuing efforts, and to do this as soon as possible, keeping in mind that this is an emergency session on a very important matter of war and peace. No unnecessary delay should be allowed, while at the same time every desirable opportunity should be given for serious and hopeful efforts in the interest of peace.
3. I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who has asked to speak.
4. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation has read with deep dismay the Secretary-General's report [A/6753].
5. The Assembly will recall that resolution 2253 (ES-V) categorically called upon Israel to rescind and to desist forthwith from any measures which would alter the status of Jerusalem. Israel's response to this resolution is contained in Mr. Abba Eban's letter of 10 July to the Secretary-General [see A/6753]. We have studied the letter carefully. It leads to only one conclusion, namely, that Israel has refused to comply with a resolution of the General Assembly which was adopted by an overwhelming vote and without any dissent. This conclusion is self-evident. It would not normally need any elaboration. Considering, however, the skilful propaganda deployed by Israel and the decorative language pressed into its service, it might be pertinent to examine the contents of Mr. Eban's letter in some detail.

6. The first paragraph of the letter makes it clear that Israel's position on Jerusalem had already been explained by Mr. Eban on 21 and 29 June in this Assembly at the 1529th and 1541st meetings. Now, the very adoption of resolution 2253 (ES-V) meant that Mr. Eban's arguments and assertions had been conclusively rejected by the Assembly. If Israel were faithful to the Charter, if it had any respect for the stand unanimously taken by the entire membership of the United Nations, present and voting, Israel would be at least inhibited from advancing the same arguments again as a pretext for the non-implementation of the resolution. Such is the flush of military success, gained by a certain combination of circumstances, that Israel presumes to say to the Assembly: "We will go ahead with whatever we mean to do; you ninety-nine Members of the Assembly can say what you like."

7. This is the theme writ large in Mr. Eban's letter. The specific points that he has marshalled are all subservient to it.

8. Before adopting its resolution, the General Assembly had disposed of the point that Israel had merely undertaken some municipal or administrative measures. Mr. Eban repeats, however, that the term "annexation" is out of place. Let me, in reply, repeat that this is not a matter of semantics or artistry of words. Whatever be the euphemisms employed, the fact remains that Israel is attempting to absorb and integrate the Holy City within its territory. The point at issue is not how an action is described in the domestic legislation of Israel; the point at issue is the very adoption of such legislation and how it affects the vital rights of the international community.

9. Actually, Mr. Eban's letter of 10 July, far from allaying our worst apprehensions about Israel's intent, serves only to deepen them. The Assembly will note that there is not a word, not a phrase, not a qualifying clause in the letter which would suggest that any so-called municipal measures undertaken by Israel are provisional and subject to a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict or to a final disposition of the territories involved. On the contrary, Mr. Eban explicitly admits that these changes "have affected Jerusalem's life and destiny as a result of the measures recently adopted". Further, Israel invites us all to welcome a new prospect of "unity, peace and spiritual elevation" from its seizure of Jerusalem.

10. Apart from the cruel irony of such words being used by none other than the representative of Israel, what is it but extreme arrogance, albeit of the most sophisticated kind, that an invader, having overrun territory which does not belong to him, should ask the world to rejoice in this usurpation? I would ask the Assembly to give thought to this question.

11. The second point in Mr. Eban's letter relates to freedom of access to the Holy Places. Mr. Eban has made many assertions about this freedom. Before we examine his contentions let me point out that, even if we were to accept them at their face value, they can provide no justification for Israel's disregard of the Assembly's resolution. The Assembly did not address an inquiry to Israel as to whether or not it had assured freedom of access to the Holy Places. The Assembly called upon Israel to desist from any measures which would alter the status of Jerusalem. Any assertion by Israel that it has ensured freedom of access, even if true, is not therefore a relevant response to the Assembly's resolution.

12. But Israel's assertions are contrary to the truth. Mr. Eban makes the grandiose announcement that "the Government of Israel has now embarked on a constructive and detailed dialogue with representatives of universal religious interests." I can speak with authority about the religious interest which commands the allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the people of Pakistan. The Holy Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem is Islam's first Qibla and the third holiest shrine. No representative of the universal Islamic interest has entered into a dialogue with Israel. Surely we cannot be driven to a dialogue with Israel because Israel has dared to defy the United Nations. It is quite clear that, at this moment, the Holy Places of Islam in Jerusalem are not—I repeat: not—open to those nearly 700 million Moslems of the world who are not living in the territory under Israel's occupation.

13. To anyone with some knowledge of history it is apparent that our attitude, which is shared by the entire Islamic world, is not born of any prejudice against the Jewish people. If the leaders of Israel read their own history, they will testify that no religious culture showed a greater tolerance for the Jewish people than Islam. No symbiosis, indeed, was more fruitful and creative than that which prevailed between the followers of the Islamic and the Judaic faiths.

14. We would ask: how faithfully does Israel represent the values and traditions of Judaism? Is it not an outgrowth of the Zionist movement, whose leaders made no secret of their ambition to construct anew the Temple of Solomon on the site, and instead of the Holy Al Aqsa Mosque? Statements by Zionist leaders like Alfred Mond, Joseph Klausner, Ishaq Cook and Ben-Gurion are still fresh in our memory. So are the attempts made by the Zionists in 1929 and 1948 to capture the Holy Al Aqsa Mosque by force.

15. Could anyone consider that these designs would promote a dialogue between the Islamic world and Israel? Are we to blame if we are torn by the deepest anxiety about the future of our Holy Places if they were to remain in the hands of Israel?

16. This anxiety and sense of outrage is not confined to Moslems alone. According to a report in The New York Times of today, Bishop Samuel of the Coptic Christian church expressed indignation after reading Mr. Eban's letter on Jerusalem. He said: "It's like taking one's home away and then saying it will be all right for you to come and look at it."

17. Mr. Eban has made a few charges against Jordan concerning its custody of Jerusalem. Representatives of Arab countries have answered these charges at previous sessions of the Assembly when the question of the status of Jerusalem has been under consideration. Since, however, Jordan is the successor State of the Islamic régime which exercised sovereignty over Jerusalem for nearly thirteen hundred years, it is not out of place for me to mention a few facts here.

18. First of all, Mr. Eban's accusations against Jordan are contradicted by his own statements made in previous sessions of the Assembly. During the seventy-fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, on 8 December 1950, Mr. Eban had this to say, and I quote from the official summary record of that meeting:

"The two populations of Jerusalem, however divided in other respects, were united in wishing to preserve their own ways of life. He [Mr. Eban], agreed with the remarks made on behalf of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan to the effect that the protection of Holy Places and of religious interests was compatible with the peaceful maintenance of existing conditions and agreements in Jerusalem. His Government has been gratified by the number of pilgrims visiting Jerusalem during the Holy Year."^{1/}

19. At the seventy-ninth meeting of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, on 12 December 1950, Mr. Eban said, and I quote again from the official summary record:

"... the Government of Israel had recently been visited by ecclesiastical leaders and many pilgrims. Three archbishops who had visited Israel had expressed their satisfaction at the facilities given to the Holy Year pilgrims who visited the Holy Places. The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan had received similar expressions of gratitude. Those eminent pilgrims saw nothing explosive in the security situation in Jerusalem."^{2/}

20. These statements of Mr. Eban are an express acknowledgement that Jordan had accorded protection and respect to the Holy Places.

21. This is recent history. Prior to it, for centuries, Jerusalem under Islam presented to the world a shining example of serenity and religious tolerance. What was responsible for disrupting this tradition and erecting a wall of suspicion and discord? It was nothing but the emergence of Israel, which brought in its train the explosions and the aftermath of war. This could not but pose the severest security problems for Jordan. Naturally, that State could not throw itself open to infiltration from Israel. The very fact that it permitted neither the Jews nor the Moslems living in Israel to visit Jerusalem demonstrates that it did not practise discrimination against the Jews. It was merely taking minimal security precautions.

22. I may mention here that Jordan's solicitous regard and protection of the Holy Shrines of Chris-

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, 75th meeting, paras. 3 and 4.

^{2/} Ibid., 79th meeting, para. 82.

tianity have been widely and gratefully recognized by the authorities of different Christian churches. In a letter written to The Times of London and published on 13 June, the Canon of St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem—Canon Every—wrote:

"... the Christian shrines have been protected by the Islamic sovereigns of Jerusalem and the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem have had their traditional rights, including self-government in matters of personal status and in the administration of charitable and religious foundations.

"In the past, when the Christian Churches were often antagonistic to one another, the Islamic custody of the City prevented any one of them from monopolizing the shrines. Forms of Christianity which were proscribed as heretical in Christian countries were free to live their own life in the Islamic world. In recent years the courage, wisdom and courtesy of successive Governors of Jerusalem, under King Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, and his father and grandfather, have contributed in no small measure to the great improvement which has come about in the mutual relations of the Christian Churches in the City. This is symbolized by the restoration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

"As King Hussein in his speech to the Press before the historic pilgrimage of His Holiness the Pope, the adherents of Christianity and Islam live side by side in Jordan, 'as good citizens of a united people. We do not preach tolerance; we live it and take it for granted; this has been our history and is our inalienable tradition. We are proud of our record of faithful custody of the Holy Places and we are determined to live and abide by that tradition for ever'.

"The custodian is not the sovereign, much as he is revered. It is the sacred law which gives protection, in certain definite ways, to other monotheistic faiths in any Islamic State. This has been and may continue to be of real value."

23. This impressive record of protection and reverence for the sacred shrines of Judaism and Christianity is the outcome of the incontrovertible fact that Islam embraces the most vital elements of the Judeo-Christian tradition. We cannot be the followers of the Prophet Mohammed without an ingrained reverence for the Prophet Moses and the Holy Figure of Jesus, whom we refer to as ruh Allah, the Spirit of God. This claim cannot be made by Judaism, to which the traditions of Christianity and Islam are entirely foreign.

24. The letter of Canon Every disposes of Mr. Eban's assertion that during the previous nineteen years there was no legislation to protect the Holy Places in Jerusalem. In Islam, the protection of Holy Places is not just a matter of legislation; it is a matter of sacred law. Therefore, it is a principle of life itself, and its efficacy in protecting the Holy Places has been demonstrated for thirteen centuries.

25. Mr. Eban, in his letter, goes on to assert: "Since 27 June, sacred buildings desecrated since 1948 have been restored, and houses of worship destroyed

during the Jordanian occupation are being rebuilt" [see A/6753]. A doleful commentary on the character of this statement is furnished by news reports published in the world Press. I shall refer to only one or two of them.

26. The New York Times of 19 June 1967, in a news report from Jerusalem, states:

"Hundreds of Arabs are being evicted from the former Jewish quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem.

"Israeli authorities marked the appropriate buildings yesterday and told the Arabs living in them that they had until 3 P.M. today to leave."

These evictions, according to newspaper reports, were being carried out under the pretext that the Arabs were occupying buildings that had been synagogues and Jewish religious schools before 1948. A news item in The Washington Post of 20 June 1967 exposed the motives behind these Israeli acts. The report stated:

"At least two of the buildings officially designated as synagogues showed not the least sign of having been such, according to a Jewish observer. And it may be significant that an article in The Jerusalem Post today urged 'substantial' Jewish population to locate in the Old City to insure its becoming unified with Israel."

27. The New York Times of 19 June also mentioned the wide plaza in front of the Wailing Wall "created by the bulldozing of living quarters for 125 families".

28. Both of these Press reports stated that the evictees and those who had been rendered homeless by the demolition of their houses were being provided free transportation to the Jordan River at Jericho, from where they could cross the Allenby Bridge into the East Bank area.

29. There is another Press report in The New York Times of 27 June which, though it gives no idea of the magnitude of the situation and the numbers involved, describes the calamity that befell one man at Israel's hands:

"The next room contained the family of Zachariah Rishik, a driver for the Intercontinental Hotel who had recently been evicted from his home in the Jewish quarter.

"It was not a synagogue we were living in', Mr. Rishik said after the census information had been taken. 'The synagogue was next door but ours was an Arab house and we lived in it for 30 years. I was born in it.'"

30. Finally, there is a revelation of the mind and heart of Israel contained in a report in Time magazine of 30 June. It quotes the Israeli historian, Israel Eldad, about the project of rebuilding the Temple of Solomon:

"We are at the stage where David was when he liberated Jerusalem. From that time until the construction of the Temple by Solomon, only one generation passed. So will it be with us'. And what about that Moslem shrine? Answers Eldad: 'It is of course an open question. Who knows? Perhaps there will be an earthquake'."

What hope can we entertain about the protection of the Holy Places if such is the sanctity attached to one of the most sacred and beloved shrines of Islam?

31. This leads me to the third point in Mr. Eban's letter regarding what he calls "civic co-operation". Can the establishment of good-neighbourly relations flow from the eviction of hundreds of families from their homes? Is the demolition of scores of houses and the forcing of their occupants to flee across the River Jordan a municipal service? Israel claims that it is supplying bounty to the Arabs who have been the victims of its invasion. The daily exodus of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the West Bank across the River Jordan exposes the effrontery of this claim. An Associated Press report, date-lined Jericho, 10 July, states: "Refugees continued to move eastward over the bridge. Those crossing said they were leaving because their houses were searched for arms and because the food supply was chaotic."

32. Let me now revert to the subject of the universal interest in the Holy City of Jerusalem. In declaring invalid any measures taken by Israel to alter the status of the city, the General Assembly has served notice on Israel that it should not arrogate to itself the position of being the guardian of this interest. It is not the character of any measures, but their source that is the point at issue here. The very control of Israel over the city of Jerusalem would make it inaccessible, even if safeguards were provided for freedom of pilgrimage.

33. This important point was carefully weighed by the General Assembly when it was considering the termination of the Palestine Mandate. At that time it was pointed out that the history of Jerusalem during the Ottoman régime, as under the Mandate, showed that religious peace had been maintained in the city because the Government was anxious and had the power to prevent controversies involving some religious interests from developing into bitter strife and disorder, and, further, that the Government was not intimately involved in local politics and could, when necessary, arbitrate conflicts. Nothing distinguishes Israel more than a total lack of these qualifications.

34. In view of all these reasons, what is the position confronting the Assembly today? Mr. Eban's letter to the Secretary-General is indeed an extraordinary document. It purports to be a response to a General Assembly resolution; yet it scarcely condescends to refer to that resolution or to report how Israel intends to implement it. Instead, it loftily asks us all to offer thanks to Israel for bringing the fruits of civilization to Jerusalem—the same fruits that colonial Powers always showered on the backward peoples of Asia and Africa. It is for the Assembly to uphold its prestige, indeed to vindicate its honour, in the face of this total denial of its authority by one of its Members.

35. It is not my purpose here to discuss the wider issues involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. However, it has been one of the main themes of Israeli propaganda that Israel has a legitimate grievance in that it has been denied recognition by some fellow Members of the United Nations. I shall here leave unanswered the question of whether or not Israel is entitled to

such recognition under the Charter. But surely, under the Charter the General Assembly of the United Nations is entitled to recognition from Israel. The Secretary-General's report indicated clearly that Israel is in no mood to grant the Assembly such recognition. This non-recognition of the Assembly is all the more remarkable when it comes from a party which, unlike any other Member State, owes its very creation to a resolution of the General Assembly [181 (II)].

36. I trust that representatives here will look at this question primarily in this light. I need hardly persuade the Assembly of the supreme importance attached to the Holy City of Jerusalem by the Christian, Islamic and Jewish peoples of the world. It was this sense of importance, overriding conflicts of ideology, differences of alignment, or collisions of state interest, that actuated the Assembly to adopt its resolution [2253 (ES-V)]. Now the question is: What should the Assembly do to reassert its authority and overcome Israel's defiance? The Pakistani delegation ventures to suggest that anything less than the provisions of the draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce now, will mean that the Assembly is abdicating its power and position on a matter crucial to world peace, and that ninety-nine Member States have decided to retreat before Israel. I shall now read the draft resolution [A/L.528]:

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967,

"Having received the report submitted by the Secretary-General,

"Taking note with the deepest regret and concern of the non-compliance by Israel with resolution 2253 (ES-V),

"1. Deplores the failure of Israel to implement resolution 2253 (ES-V);

"2. Reiterates its call to Israel in that resolution to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council and the General Assembly on the situation and the implementation of the present resolution;

"4. Requests the Security Council to take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of the present resolution."

37. The Pakistani delegation has the fullest confidence that the Assembly will adopt this draft resolution, which is nothing more than the logical sequel to the earlier resolution, with the same unanimity as before.

38. I have only a few words to add in conclusion. Thousands dead, more than a million uprooted from their homes, families divided, men and women torn by anguish and doomed to live in dread, the cradle of civilization overhung with dark clouds of fear—this is the bitter harvest we have had to reap from the seeds that were sown in 1948.

39. As this tragic drama moves towards its inevitable denouement and Israel's militarist adventures

bring their inevitable reaction, humanity hungers for one oasis of tranquillity in the region. That site of serenity could only be Jerusalem. This is the place where the power of the spirit proclaimed itself far above the pride and passions of man. This is the place where the soul of man has found its sustenance through centuries. What will it be but a total failure of vision to consign this place to Israel's possession? Can we ignore the reality that Israel's ideology and state policy are based on the right of a racial and religious chosen people to exclusive existence at the expense of others, whom it would dispossess from their property and homeland? Let there be no mistake that such failure of vision will engender passions that will, in the long run, be disastrous to any hope of peace and reconciliation, not only in the Middle East but in wider regions of the world.

40. The commitments of the Charter are in the name of the peoples of the world, who have resolved to combine their efforts to accomplish its aims. The situation in the Holy City of Jerusalem today is of the deepest concern not only to States and Governments of Members of the United Nations but even more to the peoples of the world. Jerusalem is pre-eminently a question which involves the sentiments of men and women of three world faiths and in four continents.

41. We cannot look at this as a matter of state relations or of shifting policy calculations. More than any other question ever discussed in the Assembly, it involves the most profound aspirations of mankind. No Government represented here, I am confident, will fail to respect the will of its peoples and to make good their commitments under the Charter.

42. The world contains about 1,000 million Christians, more than 700 million Moslems and about 15 million Jews. Jerusalem is holy to all of them. Out of these, only two and a half million live in Israel, which, let us not forget, contains but a minority of world Jewry. Is it right that the Sacred City of Jerusalem, the City of Peace, should fall to Israel as spoils of war?

43. There is no more humane question, which stirs man to his inmost spiritual depth, to be pondered by the United Nations. I am sure the answer will be provided by the Assembly's vote. On Jerusalem, we ask for a vote of conscience, not of policy.

44. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution that has just been introduced by the representative of Pakistan [A/L.528] is now formally before the General Assembly.

45. Mr. TUQAN (Jordan): The failure of the General Assembly to adopt a resolution condemning the armed Israeli aggression and to call on Israel to withdraw immediately all its forces from the Arab lands which they now occupy prompted many peace-loving nations that uphold the ideals and principles of the United Nations to continue their sincere efforts to arrive at such a resolution upon the resumption of the meetings of this emergency special session of the General Assembly. It is abundantly clear that these noble intentions on the part of peace-loving nations are a manifestation of their dedication to the principles of peace and to the denunciation of aggression.

46. It was natural for the delegation of Jordan to show a positive attitude in regard to these efforts, to which you, Mr. President, kindly referred at the 1549th meeting on 5 July.

47. My country has been the victim of a wide-scale aggression perpetrated by the armed forces of Israel. Despite the tragedy which has befallen our homeland, our people faced it with courage, patience and fortitude. If we have to lose in the United Nations in our struggle against aggression, the first to suffer will be not our own interests, but the same principles on which this great institution is based.

48. It will be illusory for Israel to believe that through its present military occupation it has scored a real success. This is a temporary gain, apt to be lost in the long run.

49. The failure of the General Assembly to adopt a resolution for withdrawal has led to sad and grave consequences, first among them being the encouragement to Israel to go further in its plans of aggression in defiance of the United Nations and world public opinion. Today, we are faced with a new Israeli challenge to the whole world on a cardinal issue. Only one week ago, ninety-nine nations declared in the most unequivocal terms the invalidity of the Israeli measures regarding the City of Jerusalem and, without any opposition, called upon Israel to rescind all measures taken to change the status of Jerusalem [resolution 2253 (ES-V)].

50. During this last week, Israel continued actively and publicly to defy the pronouncement of this whole Assembly. Not only did it not heed the order to rescind its measure of annexation, it even expedited the process of absorbing the Holy City into its political structure. The Israeli leaders let no opportunity pass without making public statements emphasizing their persistence in their policy and their utter indifference to—or rather contempt for—the collective decision of the international community.

51. This attitude is clearly conveyed to the General Assembly in the report of the Secretary-General [A/6753] which is before the Assembly. The letter of the Israeli representative contained in that report is a deviation from the basic point at issue and a collection of unfounded allegations. It ignores the issue completely and plunges into an exercise of irrelevance on the municipal and social benefits accruing from the armed annexation of the Holy City by Israeli forces.

52. This is not an attitude new to the Assembly. On an earlier occasion, and in the midst of the international uproar against the early signs of Israel's policy of annexation, the Israeli representative came to this rostrum to say that the Jordanian citizens of the Holy City can now enjoy sightseeing in the New City. He said this at the time when Israeli bulldozers were wiping out whole quarters in the Jordanian sector and driving out Jordanian citizens to become refugees in the East Bank.

53. But let us examine some of the points contained in the Israeli letter. Since the early stages of annexation of the Holy City by Israeli authorities, the Israeli representative and other Israeli spokesmen, assisted

by a chorus in the American Press, have been talking of "unification" of Jerusalem. The letter of reply to the Secretary-General speaks of Jerusalem now enjoying "unity" and "peace". What "unity"? What "peace"?

54. These semantic acrobatics cannot hide the facts. The naked act of annexation through military occupation can in no way be verbally camouflaged as "unity". It is like saying that a colonial Power has just achieved its national unity by occupying militarily and annexing territorially and politically another nation or country. When the forces of Nazism occupied Czechoslovakia and Poland, Hitler announced "now our unity has been accomplished".

55. It is a most futile attempt at disguising the annexation, through military occupation, of the Jordanian part of Jerusalem to call it "unification". To pursue this preposterous line of argument, the Israeli representative speaks of Jerusalem now enjoying peace. What kind of peace? The peace of occupation? The peace of domination? The peace of non-existence?

56. The Israeli reply has another point to make. It claims that the so-called legislative arrangements with regard to Jerusalem were meant to ensure the protection of the Holy Places. It also alleges that that was not ensured by the Government of Jordan.

57. It is shameful to invoke with such irrelevance and deliberate distortion the sanctity of the Holy Places to try to justify an act of aggression intrinsically opposed to the very sanctity of the Holy Places. Israel cannot argue, explicitly or implicitly, that it has militarily occupied Jerusalem and annexed it to protect the Holy Places.

58. But let me say a few words about Jordan and the Holy Places. The Holy Places of Judaism and Christianity and doctrinally and theologically holy to Islam—as has just been every ably explained by the representative of Pakistan, Jordan has been, with the acclaim of all impartial witnesses, true to this tradition and faith. The Wailing Wall stands in Jerusalem today as a monument to the tolerance and reverence of 1,400 years of Islamic guardianship, with Jordan manifesting this attitude since 1948, when the Jordanian Government took over the responsibility of guardianship. Although the same attitude has never been displayed by Israel towards Islamic and Christian shrines and Holy Sites, never has desecration of any Holy Site taken place in Jordan. Legislation by the Knesset is not a guarantee, as the record of Israel has proved. But more important still, legislation by the Knesset is not a legalization of aggression and military occupation.

59. The last point the Israeli reply makes is the claim that new social, medical and educational services have been extended to the occupied part of Jerusalem. This is certainly the most audacious argument of them all. It is another form of the notorious civilizing mission of colonialism, and it is an offence to the principles of the Assembly and to the minds of representatives in it.

60. But—aside from the argument—was Jerusalem indeed lacking or lagging in social, medical and educational services? To everyone who has been in

Jordan and Jordanian Jerusalem, it is a known fact that the Holy City enjoyed the highest standards of economic prosperity, social progress, and educational and medical services and a steady growth in every field. It was a clean and friendly city, tolerant and progressive, before the scourge of aggression, destruction and military occupation befell it. The Jordanian Government, the municipal authorities and the various and innumerable communities and institutions contributed sincerely and generously to the well-being and atmosphere of tolerance and friendliness of the Holy City.

61. But all this should not divert the attention of the Assembly from the basic issue.

62. Improved municipal services—says Israel to the General Assembly awaiting the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the ninety-nine-Member resolution of 4 July rejecting the Israeli measures and ordering their revocation. In the resolution, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report to it and to the Security Council on the situation regarding Jerusalem and on the implementation of the said resolution. Authentic reports and reliable information which are reaching my Government reflect to us a chain of aggressive measures which the Israeli authorities are presently taking in Jerusalem to change the spiritual, physical and demographic character of Jerusalem, besides changing its present status.

63. Confiscation of property, looting of stores and houses, seizure of banks, and destruction of buildings are but examples of what is taking place at the hands of the Israelis in Jerusalem. The Arab inhabitants of the area who fled from their homes in tens of thousands in the face of the last Israeli terrorism are prevented from going back to Jerusalem as well as to other parts of the West Bank, contrary to the public pledges of the Israeli authorities for their return.

64. That is why my delegation is anxious to receive a report from the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on the situation, as requested in the resolution of 4 July. We feel that this report is essential.

65. The attitude of Israel in openly challenging the General Assembly resolution on Jerusalem is not a new attitude to this Assembly. This body has been reiterating its resolutions on the wider issue of Palestine for nineteen years with no Israeli response or even any sign of awareness of these resolutions. How many times has Israel been censured and condemned by the various organs of the United Nations without any results.

66. How would we expect Israel to act on this question when it has such a record with the United Nations and when, after its flagrant and all-out aggression against the Arabs, the Assembly failed to take a decision ordering the withdrawal of the forces of aggression from Arab territory? Do we expect Israel, after all this, to exercise restraint and to obey the overwhelming wish of the international community on the question of Palestine?

67. The answer has just come from Israel. We in Jordan and in the Arab world in general expect

this Assembly to act quickly and decisively. Its prestige, its authority, its moral power and its *raison d'être* are all at stake. Either the United Nations has the authority, the power, the *raison d'être*, or it does not. This is a moment of test.

68. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Today the attention of the General Assembly at its emergency special session—and not of the Assembly alone—is quite rightly focused on the situation created in Jerusalem as a result of Israel's illegal and arbitrary measures. The General Assembly, as is well known, adopted on 4 July by an overwhelming majority and, significantly, without opposition, a resolution [2253 (ES-V)] in which it expressed its deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem. The Assembly stated quite clearly that these measures were invalid, called upon Israel to rescind them and asked Tel Aviv to desist from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem.

69. This resolution of the Assembly had a special significance since the heads of many of the Governments of States Members of the United Nations, the leaders of various religions and world public opinion condemned, and expressed deep concern at, the annexationist plans and actions of Israel with regard to Jerusalem. The claim to the whole city of Jerusalem was put forward by Tel Aviv immediately after its armed aggression against the Arab States. From the very outset it was abundantly clear that this was an attempt by Tel Aviv to perpetuate the seizure of that part of the city of Jerusalem occupied by Israel forces. If there were any need for formal confirmation of the fact that Israel is obstinately striving to take over part of the territory of an Arab country, Jordan, in Jerusalem, it is to be found in the Israel Government's answer [A/6753] to the General Assembly resolution. This answer, which is included in the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly and to the Security Council, can be viewed only as insolent and arrogant defiance of the United Nations, and every one of its Members and of the fundamental principles of the Charter. Instead of heeding the unanimous demand of the Members of the United Nations, the Tel Aviv Government, takes it upon itself to lecture the General Assembly and the Security Council and seeks to justify international banditry and the policy of occupation of foreign territories by naked force. More than that, in rejecting and refusing to carry out the resolution of the General Assembly, Tel Aviv goes so far as to claim that the Israel invaders have brought "harmony" and "civilization" to the Arab population of Jerusalem. It has the audacity to allege that the bayonets of the interventionists have brought benefits to the Arabs of Jerusalem and that a "free and permanent association" is now being built in that city. This is not only monstrous hypocrisy, demagoguery, blasphemy, and a violation of the elementary principles of international legality, justice and morality, but an open mockery of the General Assembly and its decisions.

70. The Israel Government saw fit merely to repeat in its answer the completely untenable and fallacious arguments that were rejected by the emergency special session of the General Assembly, which ruled in its

resolution of 4 July 1967 that the measures taken by Israel in Jerusalem were invalid. In other words, Tel Aviv is ignoring the General Assembly resolution and has blandly indicated that its troops do not intend to leave Jerusalem. This shows that the aggressor is still in a state of intoxication and, relying on the assistance of its powerful protectors, has lost all sense of reality and is following a very dangerous and slippery path.

71. The Members of the General Assembly probably remember Israel's statements that it would not heed any resolutions, including those taken at this session of the General Assembly, which did not meet its requirements. Now the Assembly can see that these statements were not mere threats, but a reflection of the official policy of Israel, which is issuing ultimatums to the Arab countries and to the General Assembly.

72. It is significant that what the Tel Aviv Government preferred to gloss over in its answer on the question of Jerusalem was quite openly stated by Mr. Eshkol, the Prime Minister of Israel, in a recent interview with *Der Spiegel*. Without further ado the Prime Minister declared that "Israel without Jerusalem is Israel without a head". "We are entitled," he added, "to ask of the world that it entrust to us all the Holy Places in the city."

73. But even this is not all. The Israel Premier declared that "the Gaza Strip must remain under Israel". He said that Israel was not prepared to make a statement that it abandoned territorial claims since this was a "difficult question". Mr. Eshkol also reserved Israel's freedom of action on the question of territorial claims over some parts of Syria.

74. There is not the slightest doubt that all this has far-reaching consequences and is fraught with great danger for many countries and peoples. Tel Aviv now declares that Israel without Jerusalem is Israel without a head. Tomorrow it will affirm that Israel without Damascus and Amman is a country without arms, and then, following the same monstrous logic, it will say that Israel without Cairo is a State without legs or some other parts of the body.

75. Or else the Israel benefactors may demand the right of trusteeship over the whole of the Middle East, obviously following in the bloody footsteps of their powerful patrons, who, as we all know, arrogate to themselves the role of trustees of whole regions, which incidentally, are quite remote from their continent.

76. These matters cannot but make the peoples, especially those of small countries, engage in serious reflection, for it must not be forgotten that in the world there are many potential aggressors, large and medium-sized who are avid for foreign territory.

77. If the aggression of Israel is not repulsed at once, as it must be, if the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and legitimate rights and interests of the Arab States which have been violated as a result of the armed attack by Israel are not immediately and fully restored, this will merely encourage other predators, and endanger peace and international security. Such action is all the more important and urgent because the

Tel Aviv leaders seem to have lost their heads completely. They claim rights under the United Nations Charter but do not wish to be bound by the obligations imposed by that same Charter. How else can one interpret the Israel Prime Minister's refusal to declare that he will abandon territorial claims on Arab countries, a refusal which is tantamount to open mockery of the principles of the Charter?

78. Neither can we forget that those who directly or indirectly support or encourage Israel in its unrestrained and over-ambitious demands not only harm the cause of peace in the Middle East but also undermine the efforts of the United Nations to find a just solution to the problems of that region. They will be fully responsible for the future course of events, for a possible new and wider military conflict, for fresh conflagrations and bloodshed. We must not forget that a point is easily reached where the peoples whose rights are trampled underfoot by aggressors and invaders will lose patience and weapons will flash again.

79. The statements made by Tel Aviv leaders with regard to Jerusalem are remarkable for their insolence and cynicism and involuntarily bring to mind those times when the Nazi Fuehrers of inglorious memory proclaimed their demented plans for a "new order", demanded that the map of Europe and of the entire world should be redrawn and, like the Tel Aviv leaders today, spoke of "civilization" and "benefits" for the population of countries and cities groaning under their hobnailed boots. This soothing myth of the "blessings" and "benefits" brought by the interventionists will never delude anyone. But it reminds me of the Japanese proverb about adding legs to a snake.

80. The bitter truth is that a Government claiming to represent a people which has lost so many of its members and undergone such suffering at the hands of the Nazi executioners is itself applying the methods and echoing the arguments of the Nazi butchers, who made a cult of force and glorified the "benefits" of occupation.

81. No people will agree to tolerate the misdeeds of foreign invaders, as everyone should remember, including the ruling circles of Tel Aviv. The sops they offer and their cynical sophistry will never delude either world public opinion or the General Assembly, and will not help them to enslave the peoples of Arab countries, part of whose territory is temporarily occupied by Israel's armed hordes.

82. The question of Jerusalem is not a circumscribed or particular question; it cannot be viewed apart from problems of prime importance and significance which concern the rights and interests not only of the peoples of the Middle East. My delegation has already drawn attention to the fact that if territorial conquests should be recognized by individual States, they would only lead to other and perhaps wider conflicts, and peace and security in the Middle East would remain an illusion. Such a situation cannot be tolerated.

83. The present arbitrary rule of the Israel usurpers in Jerusalem reveals the true face of the aggressor and unmasks the organizers of Israel's military adventure and their expansionist plans which were worked out in detail long before their perfidious attack

on the Arab countries. If they think in Tel Aviv that the freedom-loving peoples of the world and the United Nations will condone the seizure and occupation of foreign territories, allow the Israel intervention forces to enjoy the fruits of their aggression, and enable them to dictate their terms from a position of strength, they are making a fatal mistake: Israel will have to pay in full for its crimes, including those it has committed in Jerusalem. The Tel Aviv Government is playing irresponsibly with the fate of its own people, for it is arousing hatred among the peoples of the world. We have often heard it said that Israel is "fighting" for its existence as a State. But if this is so, why is it that Tel Aviv not only prepares but, as can be seen from the example of Jerusalem, puts into effect plans for annexation and territorial expansion? Is it not clear that if there is one thing calculated to undermine the very foundation of Israel's existence, it is the policy of playing with fire espoused by the ruling circles of Tel Aviv? Is it not obvious that attempts to consolidate the results of aggression can, in the last analysis, only bring harm to Israel and its people?

84. Events of recent days in Jerusalem forcefully confront the General Assembly with a most important and vital problem—that of the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops from the territories they have occupied in the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. Fresh military provocations by Israel, which is acting in violation of Security Council resolutions on the cessation of hostilities; the events in Jerusalem; the defiant attempts of the aggressor to remain on foreign soil, to take over territories which never have belonged and do not now belong to it—all these are alarm signals, a warning that the situation is extremely dangerous and that, as long as the Israel forces remain in the seized territories of the Arab States, there can be no peace in the Middle East and the flames of war can erupt again at any moment. The fact that virtually all the Members of the General Assembly, except the aggressor and its allies, have opposed the seizure of territory by aggression and have thus condemned Israel leads us to believe that the Assembly, can, as it must, be equal to the situation. It must take the most vigorous measures to ensure the withdrawal of the Israel forces, the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression, and the creation of the necessary conditions for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

85. It will be remembered that the Soviet Union has warned that if Israel continues to disregard the Security Council's resolutions and proceeds with its policy of expansion, sanctions would have to be imposed on it as an aggressor in conformity with the United Nations Charter. If such a decision is taken by the Security Council, the USSR is prepared to take part in the implementation of such sanctions.

86. The USSR firmly supports the Arab States in their just struggle for freedom and territorial integrity and lends them every assistance. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as stressed in the communiqué on the meeting of leaders of the fraternal parties and Governments of socialist countries, held in Budapest on 11 and 12 July 1967, resolutely support and will continue to support the friendly Arab States

in their just struggle for the elimination of the aftermath of Israel aggression and, above all, for the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from the territory of Arab countries which they seized by force.

87. We consider that the United Nations must do its duty under the Charter, decisively put an end to Israel's aggression, ensure respect for the lawful rights of the Arab States, and restore peace in the Middle East. The General Assembly must condemn Israel's illegal actions in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv's refusal to heed its resolutions. The General Assembly must sternly warn the reckless aggressor and put it in its place.

88. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I would inform the Assembly that we have two more speakers on the list for this afternoon. I shall give the floor to both of those speakers. However, before doing so, I should like to mention that, although I have been informed informally of the intention of a number of delegations to take part in the debate on the draft resolution [A/L.528] before us, none of them has yet inscribed its name on the list. I should like to make it quite clear that unless a name is inscribed on the list I have no way of knowing that a representative intends to speak. I would therefore seek the co-operation of those representatives wishing to speak and would ask them to inscribe their names as soon as possible, to enable me to decide when to convene our next meeting.

89. Mr EBAN (Israel): We have just lived through one of the most disgraceful hours in international history, an hour full of religious bigotry, incitement and political hate. It will not be easy to bring this debate back to the harmony and the serenity which the United Nations Charter should inspire; for both the beginning and the end of this discussion so far illustrate precisely those habits of mind and thought which, if maintained and pursued, will bring the international discourse into disrepute.

90. The debate was opened by the representative of Pakistan. His country has always supported a policy of non-recognition of Israel; it has always been identified with the belligerent policies of Arab States; it has blindly supported every policy and every resolution and every proposal that the representatives of Israel's hostile neighbours have submitted. And today its representative came to this rostrum to plead for a return of Jerusalem to the separation and the hostility out of which it has emerged.

91. I am sorry he found it possible to make the astonishing assertion that Judaism is foreign in some way to Christianity and Islam. If Judaism is foreign to Christianity and to Islam, it is as foreign as a mother is foreign to her children.

92. We also heard from him a contemptuous reference to the prophetic doctrine of the "chosen people", a theological tenet based on the concept not of arrogance, but of special burden. And thus, for the first time in the history of international institutions, remarks prejudicial to a religious faith were made from this rostrum. There was no objectivity in that exposition. I confess to the General Assembly in all candour that, in view of the policy of Pakistan towards Israel and towards its neighbours, the fact that a recom-

mendation affecting Israel's interests is drafted and initiated by Pakistan has an enormous effect on the moral weight that my Government and people give to such a recommendation.

93. It is not surprising, I think, that speeches coming from such sources should have entirely misrepresented the significance of the Israel Government's statement on Jerusalem and the Holy Places. I submit that the statement that my Government has addressed to the Secretary-General [see A/6753] is a landmark in international conciliation. For the first time in historic memory there is a tangible prospect that in the Holy Places which give Jerusalem its universal significance; the assertion of exclusive and unilateral control shall be replaced by agreed arrangements which will ensure the universal character of the Holy Places. This is the first time that such a prospect comes within view. Never in human memory has there been any disposition by any Government in the region to exclude the Holy Places from its exclusive and unilateral control. This, therefore, is a statement of great significance, not only in the history of our region, but in the history of mankind, and this doctrine is specifically stated in the Israeli Government's letter. It is not stated as an abstract principle; it is not made as a point of polemical argument. It must be read against the background of a constructive and detailed dialogue now being conducted with those who are most intimately and sincerely concerned, not with barren political controversies, but with the higher universal and spiritual interests of mankind.

94. It is a fact that for the first time in twenty years any Christian, any Moslem, or any Jew in any country of the world can have access to the Holy Places of his faith. This was not the situation in the past twenty years when the oldest of Jerusalem's holy sites was barred to Jewish access as well as to access by Moslems and Christians in Israel.

95. But in addition to measures taken within its own responsibility to ensure the protection and the immunity of the Holy Places and free access to them, my Government has embarked on discussions to express the universal responsibility in connexion with the Holy Places. These discussions have involved, or will involve, all the world religious interests which give Jerusalem its special place in the context of our times. Some aspects of that dialogue have already been published. For example there is a joint statement on talks already held by the Israel Prime Minister and the Under-Secretary of State for Extraordinary Affairs of Vatican City which refers not only to the cordiality and mutual understanding which governed that contact, but also "to the discussion of various possible formulations looking forward to a satisfactory solution of this important question connected with the Holy Places". It is also stated in that communiqué that "the talks will continue". But other conversations in a similar sense are being conducted with representatives of other great world religions. It is our policy that not only the Christian and the Jewish Holy Places, but also the Mosque Al Aqsa, shall come within the application of the formula which I have here defined, namely, that the Holy Places of all the faiths shall be placed under the responsibility of the religious interests which hold them sacred.

96. Anybody endowed with historic imagination should understand the importance of this first effective attempt to solve a problem which, despite many resolutions and statements, has been held down in immobility for two decades. There is, therefore, an element of innovation in the prospect which now comes into view. I have said that the dialogue now in process involves, or will involve, all the religions which have their Holy Places in Jerusalem. If this effort is successful, a new dimension may be given to international life, and the motive which led the United Nations to show a special interest in Jerusalem may, for the first time, find effective satisfaction.

97. Now, while all this proceeds, together with a new impulse of fraternity and neighbourliness and common discourse amongst Jerusalem's citizens, the representative of Pakistan comes on the scene with a formula [see A/L.528] which might disrupt, or at least hinder, any prospect that Jerusalem may thrive in unity, peace and spiritual elevation; this is an *ex parte* draft resolution inspired by the Arab political interest. It was submitted originally on 4 July, with no analysis or criticism of its text, amidst the preoccupation of the General Assembly with other issues. It spoke of rescinding measures, without any attempt to understand or to define what those measures were. These measures add up to one thing and one thing alone, namely, that Jerusalem's citizens should live together in peace instead of living apart and in hostility. That is what these measures mean: that the Jews and Arabs in Jerusalem should live together in peace instead of living apart and in hostility; that they should live in daily union and discourse with each other instead of facing each other across barbed wire and minefields.

98. Therefore, it seems to me that the United Nations should ponder long and hard before it gives any impression of preferring the old separation and hostility to the new unity and peace. It would be wrong to hamper the continuing dialogue with universal religious interests, a dialogue which may well bring about an agreed basis for the expression of universal concern.

99. The representative who opened this debate expressed "dismay". The trouble is that on this issue, as on so many others, dismay is selectively expressed. I heard no such expression of dismay from the representatives of Pakistan when in 1947 Jordanian guns rained death and slaughter on Jerusalem's streets. I heard no expression of dismay when the city was besieged to the very threshold of starvation and of thirst in 1948. I heard no expression of dismay when Jordan, having obtained Jerusalem by military conquest in defiance of a specific resolution of the Security Council asking Jordanian forces not to enter Jerusalem at all, entered Jerusalem and later, in 1950, annexed it unilaterally after the signature of the Jordan-Israel General Armistice Agreement.

100. I heard no such dismay expressed when Jordan refused to acknowledge any special international interest in the Holy Places, when Jordan was criticized by the President of the Trusteeship Council for refusing to make any proposals involving an international interest in the Holy Places. I heard not one

expression of dismay across the entire human scene when Jordan destroyed ancient synagogues in the Old City in an orgy of hate. No United Nations organ expressed any dismay when Jordan, for twenty years, refused any access to the oldest and most revered of all Holy Places: the Western Wall. Nor was there any expression of dismay when tombstones on the Mount of Olives were uprooted to build walls in secular buildings—a sight which I saw with my own eyes but a few days ago. For I have seen with my own eyes—and perhaps this distinguishes me from my other colleagues here—evidences of such destruction and sacrilege which should strike horror into every humane heart.

101. Similarly, not enough dismay was expressed when, on 5 June, notwithstanding Israel's earnest efforts to keep Jerusalem out of the range of hostilities, Jordanian forces bombarded Jerusalem, with dozens of men and women and children killed and hundreds wounded; or on 6 June, when the Church of the Dormition was bombarded.

102. In short, the past two decades have been dark decades in Jerusalem's history. For twenty years there have been hostility, separation, sacrilege, desecration and, in relation to the Holy Places, a discrimination against the Jewish faith.

103. There is in the life of Jerusalem today, in the union of its citizens, in their free access to each other, something which should inspire all who cherish Jerusalem's peace and who understand its particular significance in the spiritual history of mankind. We find those long separated now together. We find the minefields removed and the barriers down. Surely, representatives whose Governments may differ from us or from each other on political aspects of this problem should be capable of rejoicing at the ecumenical harmony which now inspires the daily contact and discourse amongst Jerusalem's citizens. And it would be logical for the General Assembly to express satisfaction at the news that a serious effort is in progress to bring the Holy Places under the responsibility of those universal religious interests which hold them sacred.

104. Indeed, some early beginnings of international satisfaction have already come to expression. The representative of Pakistan referred to one prelate. Let me then remind the General Assembly of the statement of Bishop Abba Theophils of the Patriarchate of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, who said:

"The Patriarchate of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church would like to express its appreciation to the Israeli Government for the proper care with which it handled the sanctuaries in the Holy Land in general and the Ethiopian Convent in particular. ... We also extend our thanks to the Israeli authorities for having granted unhindered and free movement to our clergy in Jerusalem during the war and after. We hope that such good care of the Holy Places will continue to enable our people in Jerusalem to perform their religious duties without any difficulty. Please convey this message to your Government. Truly yours in the Lord. Abba Theophils."

105. Moreover, a group of the most distinguished theologians in this hemisphere have published ideas

and concepts which deserve scrutiny and attention. They write, in a statement appearing in The New York Times this morning, the following words:

"During the past twenty years the city of David has experienced an artificial division. This has resulted in a denial of access to their Holy Places for all Jews and for Israeli Arabs of the Moslem faith. It has also severely limited accessibility to Christian shrines for Israeli Christians. This injustice, we must confess, did not elicit significant protests on the part of the religious leaders of the world.

"We see no justification in proposals which seek once again to destroy the unity which has been restored to Jerusalem. This unity is the natural condition of the Holy City, and now once again assures the world's religious peoples the freedom of worship at the shrines which remain the spiritual centres of their faith.

"We are gratified that the sanctity and protection of the Holy Places of all denominations have been assured by the Government of Israel, whose record over the last twenty years in providing free access to Christian shrines within her jurisdiction inspires confidence that the interests of all religions will be faithfully honoured. This confidence is further strengthened by Israel's offer to place the Holy Places under independent denominational supervision."

106. To those statements there should be added the question whether a statement on cordiality and mutual understanding could be exchanged on Jerusalem's soil, such as that which I have quoted, if there were really the horrendous situation which has been here portrayed. It is only from the contemplation of Jerusalem's life itself that a man can learn and feel and taste this great transition from separation to union, from hostility to daily contact, and from closed access to open access.

107. One can feel it, for example, on Mount Scopus, where the great university and the centre of learning were strangled into paralysis by an illegal blockade on the road. It was on the way to that medical centre that seventy eminent doctors and nurses were killed by Jordanian aggression in the earlier phase of the anti-Israel war.

108. But now Mount Scopus is open, as it should always have been under existing agreements, to learning and to the arts. Now the Wailing Wall is open. For twenty years, the Armistice Agreement which then existed between Jordan and Israel required and demanded, in article VIII, that this free access should exist. That access was refused. Therefore, both in respect of Mount Scopus and in respect of the Wailing Wall, what is called a return to the previous position would be a return to illegality.

109. It is in that light that the present situation in Jerusalem should be regarded. And, whatever anyone thinks about the city's past and the city's future, there should be a deep sense of eternal spiritual

satisfaction at two aspects at least of the situation: at the end to social, municipal and cultural division, and at the first prospect in history that universal religious concerns will find effective expression in the Holy Places instead of the assertion of exclusive and unilateral control.

110. The speech that we heard from the representative of the Soviet Union added nothing to the debate but a considerable volume of bitterness. Perhaps there is a certain irony in hearing this concern for religious freedom expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union, a Government whose contemptuous attitude to all religions is embodied in an official ideology. I have decided not to answer all of Mr. Fedorenko's remarks about Israel. The intemperance of his utterances is a well-known feature of international life, and every time he speaks this virulent hatred I feel that the international discourse becomes degraded and debased. The fidelity of the Soviet Union to General Assembly resolutions would also be an enthralling subject, for that Government is in violation of so many Assembly resolutions that merely to list them would take us well through the summer months.

111. The whole drama of this session lies in the efforts of a great Power to intimidate a small nation, one of the greatest of all Powers attempting to intimidate one of the smallest of all nations. It is very easy for Mr. Fedorenko to sneer at Israel's traditional concept of the body and the head—Israel as the body and Jerusalem as the head. This is a concept which lies beyond and above, before and after, all political and secular considerations. It is so easy to sneer at the eternal link between Israel and Jerusalem, a link more ancient, more potent and more passionate than any other link between any people and any place. For after all, it was by Israel in Jerusalem that ideas were proclaimed whose echoes have resounded across all time with eternal force, and it was Israel in Jerusalem which gave birth to those concepts of individual conscience, social justice and international peace which have fashioned the life of all peace-loving mankind.

112. And therefore Israel will continue to pray, yearn and work for Jerusalem's unity and for Jerusalem's peace; and above and beyond all political and secular considerations we shall pursue a serene and patient dialogue in an effort to ensure that the Holy Places are no longer dominated by exclusive and unilateral control, as in the past, but are integrated into the life of a Jerusalem which shall thrive in unity, peace and spiritual elevation.

113. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Members of the Assembly that there are now inscribed on the list the names of several delegations that wish to speak tomorrow morning, and also some for tomorrow afternoon. This meeting is therefore adjourned and the Assembly will meet again at 10.30 tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.