

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SIXTH YEAR

1581st MEETING: 17 SEPTEMBER 1971

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1581)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 13 September 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10313);	
(b) Reports of the Secretary-General (S/8052, S/8146, S/9149 and Add.1, S/9537 and S/10124 and Add.1 and 2)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 17 September 1971, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Toru NAKAGAWA (Japan).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1581)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. B. Toukan (Jordan) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Security Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representatives of Egypt, Lebanon, Mali, Morocco and Saudi Arabia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, on the understanding that they will be invited to take places at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon), Mr. S. Traore (Mali), Mr. M. M. Zentar (Morocco) and Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The first name on the list of speakers for this meeting is that of the representative of Morocco. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like to extend to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of this Council my thanks for your having been so kind as to permit me to speak on behalf of the Kingdom of Morocco and to express here the profound concern of my country in the face of the tragic situation in Jerusalem, not only because of foreign military occupation, which seems to be continuing endlessly, but above all because of the blind policy of Israel, which is aiming at the final annexation of the whole of the Holy City at the expense of the legitimate rights of the Arab people—rights which, moreover, have been recognized by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations—and also in complete disregard of the feelings and beliefs of hundreds of millions of Moslems and Christians throughout the world.

5. Hardly a week or a month passes without the world hearing of the dynamiting of whole quarters, of the forced exodus of the small Arab population of Jerusalem to a wretched and precarious exile in distant and overcrowded camps, which are breeding-grounds for violence and resentment. Day after day Israel sets in motion without shame or even discretion its relentless machine which devours, through new legislation and through bulldozers, the Arab town of Jerusalem, and indeed neighbouring towns and villages, and all that in the name of a new order, sometimes in the name of the welfare or even the well-being of the people who are being driven out in that way.

6. But no one is fooled for a moment. No one anywhere is so criminally simple-minded as to believe for a moment in the hypocritical motives which are advanced to justify the systematic despoliation and the economic, cultural, spiritual and finally human elimination of the Arabs—Moslem or Christian—from a town or a country in which they have lived for 15 centuries and, in some cases, even longer.

7. My friend the Ambassador of Jordan and my friend the Ambassador of Egypt have made brilliant statements of rare clarity tracing the course of developments, both recent and

present, of this brazen operation which is being carried out in broad daylight under the blazing sun of the Middle East by an occupier determined to make old dreams come true at whatever cost today to the rightful inhabitants of the region, and perhaps tomorrow to the international community as a whole.

8. The international community must beware. Dazzling successes, lightning wars, even six-day wars, have never brought about any lasting change to the map of the world, especially when they have been based only on an appetite for illegitimate territorial conquest, like certain persons who once sought living space at the expense of their neighbours.

9. There are many Members of our Organization which have suffered in one way or another from such operations. There are also many who realize that such operations have always come to the same end, the same sorry end—but at what price, at the price of what turmoil and suffering which humanity could well have been spared.

10. If the Arab people as a whole, Moslem and Christian, is unable to endure indefinitely the cruel law which Israel wishes to impose upon them—Israel which rejects all the solutions which have been proposed one after the other, even those which have been judged to be equitable and realistic—if the Arab people can no longer endure such treatment indefinitely, because they are now seething and will one day throw off their yoke, we must not disregard the actions of a wider community, a community of more than 600 million Moslems who also feel frustrated, humiliated and battered by the occupation of its holy places, by a threat which is no longer potential but actual to one of the holiest places of Islam.

11. The whole world remembers the impressive reaction of the Moslem world to the announcement of the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque. On the initiative of His Majesty Hassan II, Morocco had the honour of hosting the first Islamic Conference ever held at this level and with the participation of so many Heads of State, who were also outraged by the criminal act perpetrated against the Holy Mosque.

12. In the joint statement issued by that meeting—a statement noteworthy for its restraint, its lofty point of view and the unreserved devotion which was expressed therein to the principles and ideals of the United Nations—the Moslem Heads of State and Government who met at Rabat stated:

“The grievous event of 21 August 1969, which caused extensive damage by arson to the sacred Al Aqsa Mosque, has plunged over 600 million followers of Islam throughout the world into the deepest anguish.

“This sacrilege against one of humanity’s most venerated shrines and the acts of destruction and profanation of the Holy Places which have taken place under the military occupation by Israel of the Holy City of Jerusalem, sacred to the followers of Islam, Christianity and Judaism, have exacerbated tensions in the Middle East and aroused indignation among peoples throughout the world.

“The Heads of State and Government and representatives declare that the continued threat upon the sacred shrines of Islam in Jerusalem is the result of the occupation of this City by the Israeli forces. The preservation of their sacred character and unimpeded access to them require that the Holy City should be restored to its status, previous to June 1967, which was established and sanctified by the history of 1,300 years.

“They therefore declare that their Governments and peoples are firmly determined to reject any solution of the problem of Palestine which would deny Jerusalem the status it had before June 1967.

“They urge all Governments, particularly those of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, to take into account the deep attachment of the followers of Islam to Jerusalem and the solemn resolve of their Governments to strive for its liberation.

“The continued military occupation of Arab territories by Israel since June 1967, the refusal by Israel to pay the slightest heed to the calls by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations to rescind the measures purporting to annex the Holy City of Jerusalem to Israel, have caused their peoples and their Governments the most profound concern.”¹

13. I have made a long quotation from that noteworthy and historic statement because—with regard to a criminal act which is one of many other aggressive acts of which Israel each day is guilty if only because of its continued illegal occupation of other people’s territories—it expresses better than I might have done, and with all the authority belonging to the collective voice of nearly 25 Heads of State or their representatives, the feelings and the beliefs of the whole of Islam, its cry of distress to the international community, and to the great Powers in particular, to put an end to this permanent aggression.

14. But behind what is expressed in words in that statement are profound feelings of distress, indignation, concern at the prolonged military occupation; a determination to reject any solution to the Palestinian problem that would not restore to Jerusalem its former status; and, finally, a pressing and final appeal to the international conscience of which the members of the Security Council are now the guardians.

15. It is worth recalling that the essential purpose of our Organization is to maintain international peace and security, to take all effective measures to prevent threats to peace. The Security Council in particular has the primary duty of taking such action when it is a question of preventing the development in a given region of conditions or situations which are liable, sooner or later, to degenerate into armed conflict.

16. In the particular case of Jerusalem, it cannot be denied that both the General Assembly and the Security Council

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969*, document S/9460.

did adopt appropriate stands when they became well aware in 1967, 1968 and 1969 of the dangers threatening the Holy City and peace in the region and in the world following the unilateral measures taken by Israel in an attempt to sanction, by inadmissible *faits accomplis*, its final grasp on its recent conquests.

17. For the Arab peoples the matter seemed to have been settled, both because of the near-unanimity in support of the pertinent resolutions and because of the measures the Council envisaged if the decisions it had taken were not complied with.

18. But two years will soon have elapsed without anything having been done to halt this relentless process. Israel, with rare stubbornness, has flatly rejected without the slightest explanation all your resolutions. There is a name for that attitude: defiance, and it calls for a certain reaction on the part of the Council, a reaction which is to be found in the Charter. It consists of sanctions.

19. To all resolutions, to all condemnations, Israel replies—when it has time—that the situation is irreversible, non-negotiable, and at the same time in the area itself the master plan for greater Jerusalem is going on, the transfer of Arab populations is accelerated and local leaders declare for everyone to hear that they must make haste.

20. What speaker really needs arguments proof, evidence to persuade his audience of facts that are today so flagrant? Who is not yet convinced that this operation is taking place in the most outrageous colonial and imperialist style, a style which would physically eliminate the indigenous inhabitants in order to transform the country into a colony settled on the basis of race, colour or religion?

21. Who still doubts that what is happening in Jerusalem is now being extended—and will be extended even further in the future—to the West Bank of the Jordan, to the Golan Heights, to Gaza, to Sharm el Sheikh, and even further? Who can doubt, for example, the real nature and objectives of these settlements of soldier-farmers who are being installed in great numbers right up to the cease-fire line?

22. But the Geneva Convention of 1949—to which Israel is a party—forbids the transfer of people in militarily-occupied territories, and that Convention was not proposed or adopted by any particular group of pro-Arab countries, that is, countries that would therefore be hostile to Israel and would only deserve its scorn.

23. If today we are asking this Council to intervene vigorously, it is particularly to prevent the international community from being deceived any longer and being deprived of any possible reaction in the face of unjust and repugnant *faits accomplis* which then become irreversible through the simple will of the perpetrators. Furthermore, such a situation, if tolerated any longer, would not only discredit the Organization but obviously would lead to a chain reaction of violence, with the classic denouement, whatever illusions may be naively nourished at present by the invaders, who are standing athwart the current of history in this way. But in fact would this not be one more way of gaining time in order to compromise once and for

all the slim chances that might still exist, as we should like to believe, for a peaceful, just and humane solution which would restore the territory to the neighbouring countries and restore to the great forgotten people in this drama their legitimate rights?

24. In resolution 267 (1969), which the Council adopted on 3 July 1969, it is stipulated in paragraph 6 that the Council:

“Requests Israel to inform the Security Council without any further delay”—this was two years ago—“of its intentions with regard to the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution.”

And in paragraph 7 the Council:

“Determines that, in the event of a negative response or no response from Israel, the Security Council shall reconvene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter.”

25. In invoking those two paragraphs, my delegation would express the earnest hope that at least, and for the moment, the Security Council will request the Secretary-General, after consultation with the President of this Council, to have recourse to the adequate means at his disposal, including the dispatch of a representative or a mission, in order as quickly as possible to throw some light on the way in which Israel is complying or failing to comply with the resolutions adopted on Jerusalem. When that report is presented my delegation reserves the right to draw the necessary conclusions and to support the Council in any appropriate action it then decides to take.

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

27. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, I wish to express to you and to the members of the Security Council my appreciation for the opportunity you are according me to present the views of my Government on the important question of Jerusalem which is before the Council. In response to your appeal, I shall refrain from touching upon the other aspects of the Palestinian drama, with regard to the other Arab territories where the Israeli occupation weighs very heavily.

28. My colleagues, the representatives of Jordan and Egypt, ably presented the case to the Council yesterday in their remarkable and well documented statements. My delegation fully supports the contents of those statements and the arguments contained therein.

29. The Government and people of Lebanon attach special importance to this question, for they are deeply concerned about the fate of the Holy City. They are perturbed by an Israeli policy which is designed to Judaize the City, to strip it of its Arab character and to efface its Christian and Moslem physiognomy. Lebanon finds itself in a unique position to reflect the grave concern of both Christianity and Islam for Jerusalem. Our Christian and Moslem

population is equally chagrined by the persistent measures undertaken by the Israeli occupying authorities in the tormented Old City of Jerusalem. These measures constitute a challenge to the authority of this Council and its resolutions, to the principles of the United Nations and international law and morality and to spiritual values and civilization itself.

30. Since the occupation of the Holy City of Jerusalem by the Israeli forces following the Israeli aggression of 5 June 1967, Lebanon, in its actions and pronouncements in international forums or in its contacts with friendly governments and concerned religious bodies, has not ceased to bring to the attention of the international community the dangers generated by the Israeli measures carried out in the Holy City. Moreover, it has not failed to point out Israel's contempt for the will of the international community as embodied in United Nations resolutions. It has been, and still remains, our intent to awaken the international conscience and consciousness to the tragic events tormenting the Christians and Moslems of the area. I wish to call special attention to those Christians of the Middle East with historic, religious and ethnic attachment to the Holy City—to those Christians of the Eastern Churches, of whom I myself am one, who are genuinely concerned with the situation and who sense more than ever before the dangers threatening their Holiest City. I would remind members of the Council that 10 million Christians live in the Middle East—that is, more than three times the population of Israel—and that they find themselves, because of the Israeli occupation of that city, totally separated and estranged from their holy places. To them Jerusalem has become a remote and unattainable place. Their sorrow because of this prevailing situation is boundless. The Old City of Jerusalem constitutes in its spirituality a special fabric which has been interwoven into their hearts by centuries of direct and uninterrupted contacts.

31. On 4 June 1971—that is, the eve of the fourth anniversary of Israel's aggression against the Arab States—Mr. Khalyl Abou Hamad, Foreign Minister of Lebanon, said:

“Lebanon considers the question of Jerusalem a primary and urgent matter for which we have to mobilize all means and deploy all efforts to prevent the Judaization of the City. This matter supersedes the framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict; it interests all countries whose people believe in God, in the revealed religions and in spiritual values.”

32. We are indebted to our colleague Ambassador George Tomeh of the Syrian Arab Republic for bringing to the attention of the Security Council the unanimous views of Eastern Christianity which were expressed on 10 May 1971 in “An appeal to Christian conscience”, circulated as document S/10215 of 1 June. The leaders of the Eastern Churches are indeed those personages who must be heeded, for it is they, their parishioners and their neighbours who are suffering from Israeli military occupation and illegal measures. May I be permitted to repeat once more a few lines of that appeal which summarize most succinctly the beliefs and the hopes of Christianity—and yet also its fears? The Patriarchs and Pastors who assembled at the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus wrote:

“The events which are currently taking place in the city of Jerusalem are so grave that their dimensions and implications go beyond the local aspects. . . Spiritually and morally, however, they are of the level of human civilization. . . .”

“What we are witnessing today represents a complete and radical distortion of the human and spiritual significance of civilization. For the goal of Zionism—implicitly or explicitly stated—is to destroy this human and spiritual heritage in merging it in a fanatical racist State. It claims that a haven is being founded for the Jews, but the whole world knows that this is being done at the expense of the Arabs. . . .”

“. . . we address this appeal to human conscience—Christian and non-Christian alike, but Christian first—to place it face-to-face with its historical responsibilities. The Christian, Moslem and Jewish communities, believers and unbelievers, are all equally concerned with the unfortunate consequences of Zionism. In short, it is the man as a man who is put in doubt.”

33. I could continue indefinitely reciting the scores of appeals and statements made by Eastern Christian leaders, for their concern and agitation have become a constant theme in their speeches, sermons and prayers. I wish, however, to refer to only one more such appeal as a further illustration. His Beatitude Elias IV, Patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church of Antioch, expressed his disturbance over the fate of Jerusalem at a Divine Liturgy held in Beirut on 6 June 1971. He declared:

“Should the Christians and the Moslems lose the Holy City, they would lose the very meaning of their existence, the significance of their mission on earth, and that of their faiths. The loss of the Holy City would mean the loss . . . of what we hold as most sacred.”

34. The Christians of the West look towards the East—towards Jerusalem—for their inspiration and spiritual guidance. Jerusalem not only contains their holy shrines but is also the eternal fountainhead of their beliefs and convictions. It is the natural right then of their Eastern brethren to seek their understanding and their support amidst such trying times. It is indeed gratifying to note the growing response of Western Christians to the appeals of the Christians of the East and their shared anxieties about the future of the Holy City.

35. In his statement yesterday, Ambassador Toukan of Jordan quoted extensively from an article published in the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* of 22-23 March 1971. I wish to repeat only a few of its words for emphasis. The article reads, in part: “Reference to expropriating measures is sufficient to give an idea of the radical manner with which a physiognomy is impressed on the City that greatly differs from its historical and religious character and its universal vocation.” The article states further: “We are bound to feel deep apprehension at changes of such gravity.” It also refers to the Israeli master plan for the Old City of Jerusalem, which has been described by the Israeli Minister of Construction himself as “a plan with Hebrew aims”; and concludes that the Israeli projects “are not

peace projects and cannot leave indifferent those who really work for definitive peace in the Middle East”.

36. On 15 December 1969, His Holiness Pope Paul VI expressed, in an allocution delivered to the College of Cardinals and the Roman Curia, his deep concern over the exodus of Christians from Jerusalem and the Holy Land. He said that the “number of the faithful of Jesus has diminished, and is still diminishing every day, from the land which was sanctified by His preaching and His sacrifice. This situation makes us wonder whether these majestic and beautiful religious edifices, which evoke the events of the life of Christ on the very spot where they have happened, will not be deprived one day of the living presence of their own ecclesial communities.”

37. The measures taken by Israel and designed to change the character of the Old City of Jerusalem and the composition of its population have been fully expounded upon by my Arab colleagues in this debate. Those measures are in flagrant violation of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, of the The Hague Convention of 1907, and of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The Israeli representative cannot complain about those Conventions, which embody the principles of international law and morality that are to be applied in cases of war and occupation, and which postulate the principles and obligations that should govern the conduct of a Power in its administration of an occupied territory. It is well known that those Conventions were not adopted by majorities friendly to the Arab States and unfriendly to Israel. Even the shallow complaint voiced by Mr. Tekoah yesterday, here in the Security Council, about the voting system in the United Nations being favourable to the Arab States does not hold ground. In the case which presently concerns us, the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, and unanimously adopted resolution 267 (1969) of 3 July 1969.

38. In fact, some nations that have diplomatic relations with Israel and which are friendly to the Israeli Government have criticized its policies on Jerusalem. Even the United States, which has long been the main supporter of Israel, has expressed its criticism upon several occasions. On 1 July 1969, during the debate in the Council on the question of Jerusalem, when referring to the measures adopted by Israel in occupied Jerusalem, Ambassador Charles Yost, the then United States representative, stated the following:

“The expropriation or confiscation of land, the construction of housing on such land, the demolition or confiscation of buildings, including those having . . . religious significance, and the application of Israeli law to occupied portions of the city are detrimental to our common interests in the city. The United States considers that the part of Jerusalem that came under the control of Israel in the June 1967 war, like the other areas occupied by Israel, is occupied territory and hence subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying Power.” [1483rd meeting, para. 97.]

39. Two years later, following the announcement by the Israeli Minister of Construction of his Government’s plan to

construct large housing projects on the hills surrounding Jerusalem, the spokesman for the United States State Department, Mr. Robert McCloskey, declared that unilateral actions taken by Israel tending to change the status of the City of Jerusalem were unacceptable. Another spokesman, Mr. Charles Bray, stated on 9 June 1971 that the Israeli building projects in the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem “violated the 1949 Geneva Convention”. The cynical Israeli response to the first statement is that visitors to Jerusalem are now being taken on a tour of what have become known as the “McCloskey heights”.

40. As reiterated yesterday by Mr. Tekoah, the Israeli authorities claim that such projects were intended to maintain—to keep—Jerusalem as a Jewish city. The fact is that the intention is, instead, to create a Jewish city—to transform it into a Jewish city—in short, to Judaize it. And to Judaize it is to “de-Arabize” it, “de-Christianize” and “de-Islamize” it. It calls for voiding the City of its authentic population—the Arab population—the population which has lived in the shadows of the Holy Places for 2,000 years. It is the height of historical absurdity to state, as we heard stated yesterday, that Jerusalem has never ceased to be a Jewish city except for only 19 years of Jordanian rule. Such a claim is an insult to history, to civilization, to human intelligence itself, and must certainly not be impressed upon the members of the Security Council as a fact.

41. By its actions Israel is hurriedly creating a situation which will enable it to lay claim to the Old City of Jerusalem, to create an accomplished fact, to overtake all diplomatic efforts tending to find a just solution to the Middle East conflict.

42. Following the announcement of the peace initiative of Mr. Rogers, the Israeli occupying authorities feverishly acted to present the world with a new “*de facto*” situation. Such action is not conducive to peace, but rather is detrimental to the hopes and efforts of all those who are working towards a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis. And the fate of Jerusalem, because of the City’s place in history, and because of its religious and ethnic importance, constitutes one of the most tragic dilemmas hindering the fulfilment of that peace. By strangulating the City, by pressuring its population to leave, Israel is hatching a problem which will become insuperable.

43. Israel has long defied the United Nations and its resolutions. Only yesterday we heard Mr. Tekoah launch another of his habitual assaults on the dignity and authority of the Council. Yet, it is our belief that the Council has a primary duty to enhance its authority and to effect its decisions. The question before us is clear: there has been an occupation of the Old City of Jerusalem by Israeli forces; there has been a decision by Israel to annex the City, and measures have been taken to effect that annexation. And there have been rejections, time and again, by the United Nations of Israeli claims to the City. Although the Security Council has called upon Israel to rescind all measures taken to consolidate the annexation and has requested that the Israeli Government itself refrain from taking further measures, Israel confirms and reconfirms its refusal to abide by the Council’s decisions. As I stated previously, the Council

finds itself faced with a situation where it must assert itself and enhance its authority. It must do so in order to strengthen the trust placed in the United Nations by the peoples of the world, and especially of those small countries which have been the victims of aggression and occupation.

44. In conclusion, the termination of the so-called annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem and the termination of its occupation must be effected for the sake of humanity and of peace in the Middle East and the world. Only the liberation of Old Jerusalem from Israeli occupation can restore its role and significance as a city where Judaism, Christianity and Islam can flourish and endure in trust, peace and co-operation.

45. The PRESIDENT: I have just received a letter dated 17 September from the representative of Tunisia [S/10325] in which he requests to be invited to participate in the current discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, and with the consent of the Council, I would suggest that, in view of the limited seating at the Council table, he be invited to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite the representative of Tunisia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Moussa (Tunisia) took the place reserved for him in the Council chamber.

46. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Jordan, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on the representative of Jordan.

47. Mr. TOUKAN (Jordan): Mr. President, thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to exercise my right of reply. The statement I made yesterday [1579th meeting] on the continuing Israeli measures in occupied Jerusalem contains a clear description of the situation and a specific demand that the Security Council enforce its declared will to protect the occupied city. My reply today is evoked by the shocking distortion of the facts and history by the Israeli representative yesterday [1580th meeting]. The slanderous tone and the crude demagoguery of the Israeli statement will not, however, cause my delegation to descend to that same level in its statement. I shall address myself only to facts and in the spirit appropriate to this august body.

48. The Security Council is dealing with a specific issue and has been making a specific demand of Israel. It is dealing with Israel's measures in occupied Jerusalem, designed to annex Jerusalem, and it has been demanding that Israel desist immediately from such actions and rescind its measures. The task of the Council now is to enforce its resolutions. It cannot be diverted from its task by the Israeli representative's wild and arbitrary assertions about Israel's "ownership" of Jerusalem on grounds of emotion and sentimental associations. A city inhabited by an overwhelming majority of Arabs for centuries, constituting an integral part of a larger Arab homeland, in every social,

cultural, ethnic, linguistic and historical sense, is not going to switch its destiny to Israel simply because the Israeli representative or the Zionist authorities state that Jerusalem is "the heart of Israel". The Holy City is occupied against its will through Israeli armed forces and is being mutilated demographically, culturally and physically in order to be integrated in an alien body. That is the obvious fact. The swallowing by Israel of the occupied Holy City must be stopped. That is the issue.

49. The representative of Israel has tried throughout this debate to picture in a very dramatic manner the benefits that are alleged to have accrued to the Arabs of Jerusalem as a result of the annexation of the Arab sector of the City to Israel. While the facts in Jerusalem prove the contrary, occupation will always remain an act of aggression, and annexation by a unilateral measure against the will of the indigenous inhabitants will always be an act of usurpation and expansion. The fact that a thief invests the stolen treasure profitably—if such is the case now—does not absolve him of his crime.

50. But let us examine the "benevolence" of Israel in occupied Jerusalem and the affection with which Israel has embraced the "liberated" city.

51. When after the occupation the Israeli campaign of terror and the subsequent free bus rides in Israeli buses to the Jordan Valley failed to induce a large-scale exodus, the Israeli authorities resorted to new tactics in the Holy City. These ranged from economic strangulation and political oppression to the destruction of houses and imprisonment and torture.

52. To start with, the Israeli authorities did not accept the Jordanian currency and forced the inhabitants to exchange the Jordanian dinar to Israeli liras at a rate of 26 per cent less than its real value. Israeli taxes and custom duties were imposed on the Arab population of Jerusalem in an attempt to force them to flee the city. Those who stayed were forced to finance the Israeli war machine, which was engaged in the daily killing of their brethren. This money was also used to help finance the campaign to bring more Jewish immigrants to occupy their homes and lands. The cultural heritage and Arab educational system were either replaced by or subjugated to the Israeli heritage and educational system. Arab boys have to learn Hebrew and declare that they are Israeli citizens. They now learn more about Zionism than Arab culture and history. When the Municipal Council of Arab Jerusalem refused to be subordinated to the wishes of Mr. Kollek, it was dissolved and its Mayor deported to the east bank of Jordan and its property confiscated. Deportation became a new Israeli policy to get rid of the Arab leaders who opposed occupation and a method to intimidate the rest of the population.

53. All these arbitrary measures carried out by the Israeli authorities against the Arabs of Jerusalem are in utter violation of the provisions of The Hague Conventions of 1907, the Geneva Conventions of 1949, the International Covenants on human rights of 1966 [see *General Assembly, resolution 2200 (XXI)*], and have been the subject of many complaints by my Government. Many of these violations were brought to the attention of the different organs of the

United Nations and to the twenty-first Conference of the Red Cross. The Israeli violations were established through the official reports by delegates from the International Conference of the Red Cross with accompanying pictorial proofs and the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.² I shall not take the time of the Security Council by repeating them.

54. These acts were committed by a State which boasted centuries-old Judaic and humanist culture. Dr. Chaim Weizmann once stated: "I am certain that the world will judge the Jewish State by what it will do to the Arabs".

55. These are the "ecumenical habits of thought and action" which were the subject of Mr. Eban's letter to the Secretary-General on 13 June 1967. This is the "bliss" that Mr. Tekoah wanted to bring to Jerusalem.

56. Since the Israeli aggression of June 1967, 53 different resolutions and decisions by the United Nations and its organs, and other international humanitarian organizations, have been adopted to condemn the above-mentioned Israeli violations against our brethren. Yet, Israel, true to its accord, never hesitated to flout each and every one of them. Such is the benevolence of the Israeli annexationist policies in Jerusalem.

57. The Israeli representative, this time and on many occasions before, tried to question the right of Jordan to East Jerusalem and claimed that Jordan's presence there was an act of invasion and occupation. I wonder if Mr. Tekoah really thinks that history could be distorted so easily by just repeating the same distortions endlessly. Let me explain first how West Jerusalem—not East Jerusalem—was seized by the Zionist forces in the earlier campaign of expansion in 1947 to 1948, and how the eastern part of Jerusalem was saved this fate until 1967 when it was occupied by Israel.

58. I spent my early school years in Jerusalem. In 1947, until two months before the end of the Mandate, I was Consul-General for Transjordan in this Holy City. All that I am going to say was shared by my colleagues, the Consuls of a number of foreign countries, in particular, the United States of America, France, Belgium and Yugoslavia. I used to meet them daily to exchange views and information on what was taking place in those dark days in the history of this city, which was an integral part of the larger Arab homeland. I have more intimate personal knowledge of the situation than any newcomer from Shanghai.

59. As soon as the Partition Plan was decided upon in the United Nations in November 1947, which provided among other things a special status for Jerusalem, the Zionist forces, with determined defiance of this resolution, started their violent military activities to occupy more areas than the territory allotted to the Jewish State. In the city of Jerusalem, the Zionist forces were comprised then of the Haganah and the Stern and Irgun terrorists—labelled as such by the Mandatory authorities. According to the records of the United Nations, after the assassination of Count

Bernadotte these terrorists began slowly and methodically to invade and occupy the Arab quarters.

60. Several predominantly Arab residential areas, such as Natamon, Upper and Lower Baqaa, Musrarah, Talbiyah, Lifta, Jaffa Street, the Russian compound, Queen Mary Street, Mamillah, Shammah, the so-called Greek and German colonies, King David Street, Allenby Street, and several others, all in West Jerusalem, were forcibly conquered and their inhabitants forced by terror to evacuate. The British forces desired to avoid the loss of British lives in keeping Zionists and Arabs apart when they knew that a few months later they were to leave.

61. As the defenceless Arabs of Jerusalem were fighting a losing battle with the advancing Zionist forces, the Jordan Government, directly and through me, received one appeal after another from the Arab inhabitants for help and protection. The Jordan army, however, could not respond to these appeals before the end of the Mandate.

62. A month before the end of the Mandate, after heavy attacks by the Zionist forces on what remained of Arab Jerusalem, the British High Commissioner, General Sir Alan Cunningham, succeeded in arranging a truce. The day before the last British were due to leave on 14 May the Consuls General of the United States, France and Belgium formed themselves into a Truce Committee, with the object of securing the prolongation of the truce in the Holy City after the end of the Mandate. The Jordan Government made every effort to prevent fighting in the city in order to avoid the destruction of any Holy Places.

63. An hour after the departure of the British High Commissioner and with him the last British troops, from Jerusalem on the morning of 14 May the Zionist forces immediately slipped into the buildings and barracks in the heart of the city, which had been occupied by British personnel and the British army. Early on 15 May the Jewish gangs started their advance in order to occupy the rest of the city, inside which there were Arab irregulars with a limited quantity of light arms defending it. Levin, the Jewish writer who was in Jerusalem at the time, wrote in his book *Jerusalem Embattled* that officers of the Haganah drove through the streets in specially prepared vans fitted with loud speakers, and urging everyone to fly from Jerusalem before they were all killed and calling out in Arabic: "Take pity on your wives and children and get out of this blood bath. Surrender to us with your arms . . . Or get out by the Jericho road, that is still open to you."³

64. In those dark hours of the history of the Holy City the Truce Committee, composed of the American, Belgian and French Consuls, laboured in vain to stop the Zionist attack on what remained of the Arab quarters of Jerusalem. The Jewish Agency had refused responsibility for renewed Zionist attacks which, it alleged, were being carried out by dissident Jewish terrorist groups.

65. The Arab defenders of the Old City started to collapse. The Zionist forces broke into the Old City and

² Document A/8089 (final offset).

³ Harry Levin, *Jerusalem Embattled* (London, Gollancz, 1950), p. 160.

made contact with the Jewish Quarter in which the Jews had already erected concrete roadblocks, concrete pill-boxes, and machine-gun emplacements and trenches. Confronted by this state of affairs the Jordan Government on 18 May 1948 decided to come to the rescue of what remained of Arab Jerusalem, complying with the repeated appeals it had received from the Arab inhabitants. Fierce battles were fought. The lanes of the centre of the Jewish Quarter were dominated by the domes of two synagogues, which overlooked all the streets and houses in the vicinity. From these domes and from the Jewish cemetery overlooking the Old City, Zionist snipers fired constantly at the surrounding quarters whenever an Arab showed himself. The Jordanian troops attempted in vain for two days to spare the synagogues and when fire was opened from them they warned the Jews that they would be obliged to fire. For ten days the Zionist forces in the Old City resisted the Arab Army, withdrawing gradually from house to house. On 28 May the Zionist forces in East Jerusalem surrendered; most of them were Palmach or Haganah soldiers, not residents of the Jewish Quarter. They had been sent in to fight long before the end of the Mandate.

66. That is how East Jerusalem was saved. But West Jerusalem, with its large number of Arab quarters, remained in the hands of the Zionist forces, and its Arab inhabitants were forced to leave.

67. While Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator for Palestine, who was killed later by the Zionist terrorists, was filing his report, Israel was moving towards making the part of Jerusalem under its control an integral part of the Jewish State.

68. In this connexion, may I add, that the so-called Jewish Quarter in the Old City is 95 per cent Arab-owned and governed by the regulations of the charitable and family *Waqf*. The Jewish inhabitants in the pre-1948 period were merely tenants. It was after those tenants that the quarter was called Jewish, after it had been called the Sharaf Quarter.

69. The Jordanian Army which could not save the western part of Jerusalem at least saved the eastern part and maintained its unity with the Arabs of the west bank. The Arabs of the west bank, including those in eastern Jerusalem, immediately called for the constitutional unification of the Arabs on both sides of the river. The Jordanian Government responded to the overwhelming desire of the people of the two banks and to the right of self-determination. In free, constitutional elections and expressions of will, the unity of the two banks was effected in 1949-1950. A new Constitution was drawn up based on the equality of all citizens and equal representation in Parliament and the Government for both banks. The people of both banks, united by history, culture, geography and aspirations were finally joined in a full constitutional union based on democratic representation and full equality. Even before the union, Count Bernadotte, the United Nations representative, made a clear recommendation in his progress report to the General Assembly that:

“In view of the historical connexion and common interests of Transjordan and Palestine, there would be

compelling reasons for merging the Arab territory of Palestine with the territory of Transjordan.”⁴

70. That is why the Jordan Government feels the decisive responsibility to defend its citizens in Jerusalem against occupation and the gross injustices inflicted upon them every day by the occupying authorities.

71. With their new sense of security under Jordanian constitutional government, the people of Jerusalem and their Government proceeded to improve their city and to ensure its special universal character. The Jordanian city was one of the most prosperous, clean and thriving cities in the Middle East. Education, cultural activity, construction and economic prosperity were most clear and visible to any observer before 1967. The many religious denominations coexisted in freedom and co-operation. The freedom of worship and religious tolerance existing is best represented by the fact that it was a Moslem Arab family that continued to hold the keys of the Holy Sepulchre that were freely granted to it many generations ago by the Christian Churches concerned to symbolize spiritual unity and mutual respect. Millions of pilgrims from many denominations from all parts of the world came to visit and worship in their own holy places.

72. Now and again we hear from Mr. Tekoah and the Israeli leaders the accusation that since 1948 Jordan has prohibited Jews from practising their religious worship in the Old City of Jerusalem, denied them access for such purposes and constantly ignored article VIII of the Arab-Israeli Armistice Agreement which made provision for such rights.

73. That accusation is unfounded and totally misleading. The failure of the arrangements embodied in the Armistice Agreements was caused by the repudiation by Israel of the 1949 declaration on Holy Places requested by the Palestine Conciliation Commission together with its subsequent rejection of all United Nations resolutions pertaining to the problem of Palestine. The official records of the fourth session of the General Assembly *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, annex to the summary records of meetings, volume I, 1949, page 32, show that while Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria agreed, in response to an appeal by the Palestine Conciliation Committee, “to guarantee the protection of, and free access to the Holy Places . . . in the territories . . . occupied by them”, Israel refused to do so in response to a similar appeal. The reason why Israel adopted this attitude needs no explanation. The occupation of all Jerusalem in June 1967 offers the answer. That is how Israelis, not Jews, became incapable of entering Jordanian Jerusalem before 1967.

74. In this connexion it would be useful to mention that in Jordan's statement presented to Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the Middle East, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and published as an official document of the Security Council, dated 26 January 1971 [S/10089], the Jordan Government with regard to Jerusalem reiterated its position as follows:

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 11, document A/648, p. 18.*

"The Government of Jordan recognizes the religious and cultural importance of the Arab city of Jerusalem to all faiths. It will therefore guarantee free access to all religious and historical places to all concerned as well as freedom of worship. Jordan stands ready to make all necessary arrangements to this effect."

75. The Israeli claim that now all religious groups can freely have access to the Holy Places in Jerusalem is false, because the Israeli occupation has cut off more Moslems and Christians from the Holy Places than the Israelis cut off before the June war as a result of Israeli intransigence and its unwillingness to abide by all the provisions of the Armistice Agreement. Since Israel's annexation of Jerusalem, it has created a number of inspection and custom posts all around Jerusalem, thus making it inaccessible even to Arabs from the west bank of Jordan. Furthermore, several millions of Christians in the Arab countries and some 700 million Moslems in Arab and non-Arab countries are, for practical reasons, denied access to the Holy Places in Jerusalem.

76. The Israeli representative made several references to internal difficulties and tragic events that occurred in Jordan after 1967. We do not deny that we have had some political, security and human problems in Jerusalem after the occupation of 1967. All those difficulties were caused by the occupation of the west bank of Jordan and other Arab areas and the desperate condition in which many Jordanian and other Arab citizens found themselves as a result of the occupation. Hundreds of thousands of new refugees were forced to flee to East Jordan. Several emotional and social explosions resulted from the tragic situation. My Government has tried to deal with these problems with all its resources and in full understanding of the causes. Most of the disturbance and unrest not only in Jordan but in other Arab countries has resulted directly from the Israeli waves of military incursion into the Arab homeland. Only the ending of Israeli occupation of our territories, including Jerusalem, will normalize Arab national life and the life of the area and bring peace and stability.

77. Mr. President, I request you to ask the Security Council to focus its attention on the measures it must take to save occupied Jerusalem and force Israel to end its annexation. That is the real issue before the Council.

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

79. Mr. MOUSSA (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council met yesterday to consider a problem of extreme gravity: the Israelization of Jerusalem—Jerusalem, which is one of the tragedies of the Middle East, from which formerly, to use the terms of our Foreign Minister in the General Assembly last year, arose the threefold message of God appealing to men for peace and fraternity. The very name of Jerusalem, I am convinced, holds us in awe, regardless of our belief or philosophy.

80. We have said the Israelization of Jerusalem, and yet we read in the press and we hear statements here about the

reunification of Jerusalem, as if Jerusalem needed military force to be what it has always been, the Holy Place of three great monotheistic religions. The faithful on the way to the synagogue, the church or the mosque to meet with God hardly need, indeed are repelled by, soldiers with machine-guns. When we say the Israelization of Jerusalem, exactly what are we referring to? Ever since the creation of the State of Israel, ever since the United Nations and the major Powers imposed the State of Israel on the Arab States, Jerusalem has constituted a source of preoccupation for the international community. But it must also be said that ever since its creation the State of Israel has never ceased to use alternatively war and trickery to seize Jerusalem.

81. In the Trusteeship Council resolution dated 20 December 1949 [114 (S-2)] we read:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Concerned at the removal to Jerusalem of certain ministries and central departments of the Government of Israel,

"Considering that such action ignores and is incompatible with the provisions of paragraph II of General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949,

"1. Is of the opinion that the action of the Government of Israel is likely to render more difficult the implementation of the statute of Jerusalem with which the Council is entrusted by the General Assembly resolution of 9 December 1949;

"2. Requests the President of the Trusteeship Council:

(a) To invite the Government of Israel to submit a written statement on the matters covered by this resolution, to revoke these measures, and to abstain from any action liable to hinder the implementation of the General Assembly resolution of 9 December 1949;

(b) To keep closely in touch with the developments in Jerusalem while the Council is not in session;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to communicate this resolution promptly to all Member States of the United Nations."

82. That, in a sense, is the first condemnation of Israel by the United Nations after Israel had committed one of its first acts toward the Israelization of Jerusalem. It must be said that that resolution was indeed very indulgent.

83. What occurred directly after the six-day war? The facts are clear. On 5 June there was an act of aggression against Arab countries by an Israeli army of which the least that can be said is that it was well prepared to wage war and to win.

84. There was, then, an act of aggression but also the occupation of territory belonging to sovereign and independent States Members of the United Nations. Confronted with that situation, the international community was hesitant. It did not dare order Israel to evacuate in the

immediate future the territories that it had just occupied by military force. But there is an important point in all this: the question of Jerusalem. Israel also occupied Jerusalem, which is Arab and Palestinian but also the hallowed ground of three major religions. On 4 July 1967, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V) at its fifth emergency special session, stating that it was deeply concerned at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City and that it considered that these measures were invalid, and calling on Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem.

85. Another resolution—resolution 2254 (ES-V)—adopted by the General Assembly ten days later, on 14 July 1967,

“*Deplores* the failure of Israel to implement General Assembly resolution 2253 (ES-V)”

and

“*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.”

86. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), concerning the Middle East conflict as a whole, was adopted only towards the end of 1967—on 22 November. It was followed by other Security Council resolutions—resolutions 250 (1968), 251 (1968), 252 (1968), 267 (1969) and 271 (1969)—all of which concern the question of Jerusalem, the last few going even so far as to address a strong warning to Israel.

87. In contrast with this preoccupation of the international community was Israel's preoccupation, going back to the years 1948 and 1949, to make of Jerusalem a city that would be an integral part of Israel—something which, since the creation of that State, it has not been able to bring about and which, even after the occupation of Arab Jerusalem in 1967 gave rise to the objection and the opposition of the international community and of countries with which Israel has had the best of relations. So what was to be done? Israel's strategy is as diabolical as it is disconcertingly simple. It consists in remaining faithful to its intransigent policy on the entire question of the Middle East but especially on certain of its aspects, among them the problem of Jerusalem, by pursuing the most scandalous, the most shocking and the most arrogant of policies, the policy of the *fait accompli*. To do that, it had to flout the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions; to take note, but not too seriously, of the reactions and the actions of the Christian world, which is essentially the Western world; to act as if all the tumult about Jerusalem did not exist; and to pursue a very clear objective: to modify the status of Jerusalem by expropriating the lands and property of the inhabitants; by proceeding to transfer entire populations; by carrying out so-called urbanization programmes, the sole purpose of which was to drive out the Christian and Moslem inhabitants of Jerusalem to make of this Holy City of Jerusalem an exclusively Israeli city; by taking measures the legal significance of which was to integrate

Jerusalem and its environments into the State of Israel and to absorb the Arab population of the Holy City into the Israeli population. As if spending tens of millions of dollars was sufficient to change the status of an entire people. That is, after all, what is at issue.

88. Israel still wishes, by its policy of *fait accompli*, to make Israelis out of the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem. But the inhabitants of Jerusalem are Palestinians, and they will remain Palestinians. Their only aspiration is to recover their native land and to live there in freedom and in dignity.

89. The policy of Tel Aviv represents a threat to the security of the region and to world peace, and Tunisia and its President Habib Bourguiba have always been preoccupied by and sympathetic to the tragedy of Jerusalem. Recently, President Bourguiba sent the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Vatican to speak about this serious problem with His Holiness Pope Paul VI. But the fundamental problem—and Tunisia has always proclaimed it—is the destiny of the Palestinian people, which today is fighting to recover its country wrested from it by violence. No force in the world can divert the Palestinian people from its objective. No force in the world is capable of annihilating it nor of liquidating the sacred cause for which it has waged a relentless struggle. Sooner or later, justice will triumph.

90. In a statement made to the General Assembly on 20 May 1968, the President of the Tunisian Republic, Habib Bourguiba, speaking of the solution of the problem of the Middle East, declared:

“In any case, and whatever that solution may be, it can only be conceived with the participation and with the agreement of the principal party concerned: the Palestinian people.”⁵

That was—and still is—our position on the problem of the Middle East. This position flows from our commitment to the Palestinian people and also from our analysis of the situation and from our conviction that there is no point in closing one's eyes to the fundamental problem and avoiding it.

91. The Security Council has adopted a number of resolutions on the question of Jerusalem and has deplored many times that Israel has failed to implement them.

92. In its recent resolutions the Security Council decided that in the event of a negative reply or the absence of a reply from Israel it would meet without delay to consider what further steps should be taken. Then the rising tide of mutual recriminations came to an end.

93. Is it impossible for the Security Council to go any further?

94. The members of the Security Council have a very great responsibility, and on behalf of my country I would appeal to them to assume that responsibility fully to put an end to the stubbornness of Israel and its challenge to the international community.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1658th meeting, para. 15.

95. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I now call on him.

96. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Whatever the Jordanian representative may wish to tell the Council, he cannot conceal the fundamental truth about the situation in Jerusalem. He cannot veil the fact that Jordan did destroy Jerusalem, while Israel is building it; that Jordan profaned Holy Places and barred access to them, while Israel is safeguarding their sanctity, has ensured their administration and maintenance by their respective religious communities and has guaranteed absolute freedom of access to all.

97. The Jordanian representative cannot shroud the fact that during the period of Jordanian occupation Jerusalem was an amputated, bleeding city, while today it is united, peaceful and prosperous. Whatever he may say cannot change the truth that the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem fare much better than their brethren in Jordan today, and that they are better off than they had been before 1967.

98. The Jordanian complaint demands that progress, development and construction stop, and that backwardness, misery, division and hostility be restored to Jerusalem. There is very little love for Jerusalem in this attitude. There is even less consideration for its sanctity and welfare. In this lies the basic difference between Israel and Jordan. The Jordanian Government represents 19 years of agonizing partition and devastation. Israel stands for 3,000 years of Jerusalem's history, its glory and its martyrdom, its inspiration and its revival.

99. If Jordanians had prayed as we Jews have during 2,000 years, every day, three times a day, for Jerusalem's rebirth in peace, the Jordanian Government would not be advocating the stagnation of Jerusalem and its return to the torment of mutilation. If Jordanians would, as Jews do, turn their thoughts to Jerusalem each time they sit down to table and end every repast of theirs, as Jews do, by imploring, "build Jerusalem speedily in your own days", the representative of Jordan would not have to try to justify a complaint against the reconstruction of the City. If Jordanians had died, as we Jews have, during several thousand years, with Jerusalem's name on our lips, we would hear from Jordan's representative words of greater consideration for Jerusalem's life and happiness. If it is Jerusalem's life and happiness that we are concerned with, then surely the realities of the situation belie the statements we heard from the representatives of Morocco, Lebanon, Jordan and Tunisia. There is an old Hebrew saying that Jerusalem is the city of truth. Mere respect for Jerusalem would require consideration for the truth. To try to re-write history and claim, as the Jordanian representative did today, that Jordan's attack, shelling, destruction and carnage in Jerusalem in 1948 were a mission of mercy does little justice to the documents of the United Nations of that period, which, after all, are available to all—reports signed by Mr. Toukan's own colleagues in Jerusalem in the Consular Commission of the City and by such United Nations personalities as Mr. Ralph Bunche. Nor do they do justice to the descriptions of overt aggression found in the memoirs of Abdallah el-Tal, the Jordanian commander of the invading forces, as quoted by me yesterday, or to such

infamous documents as the telegram dispatched in May 1948 to the United Nations on behalf of the Arab States, including Jordan, announcing a campaign aimed at the massacre of the Jewish population, a massacre "that would be reminiscent of the Mongolian massacres".

100. To speak, as the representatives of Morocco and Lebanon have spoken, of mass deportation of Arab inhabitants from Jerusalem at a time when the Arab population of the City has increased since 1967, at a time when 100,000 Arab tourists from Arab States have visited Jerusalem only in the past two months, may make an impression in the souks of Casablanca in Morocco or Tripoli in Lebanon, but not here.

101. Yesterday I brought before the Council facts and figures indicating the enormous decrease in the Christian population in Jerusalem during the years of Jordanian occupation: from 25,000 to 14,000. I also pointed out that since 1967 the departure has ceased except for the normal movement in and out of the City. I can, of course, understand the concern of Lebanon's Christian representative for the emigration of Christians from the Middle East. However, it is towards the Arab States that he should direct his concern, for Christian emigration from the Arab countries has been massive since the Second World War. Approximately 150,000 members of the Greek Orthodox Church left Egypt during that period, and, according to some estimates, the number of Christian emigrants from Lebanon has been so large that it has upset the delicate demographic balance in that country.

102. To allege that Israel is demolishing Jerusalem, as the representative of Morocco alleged, when even the Jordanian complaint is directed against the construction that is going on in the City, may be suitable for the ignorant, but surely not for enlightened world opinion.

103. To speak of the Judaization of Jerusalem, as the representative of Lebanon again did today—a City which has been inseparable from Jewish existence for 3,000 years, a city with a Jewish majority for generations in modern times—goes all too far in the resuscitation of Hitler's vocabulary and should not be permissible in our times in the United Nations. We Jews still remember all too vividly these expressions from the time of the Nazi holocaust to have to listen to them again today here in the United Nations.

104. To refer to statements made by a number of Christian prelates, as the representative of Lebanon did, without mentioning the fact that these are Arab clergymen and that they live under the repressive boot of the anti-Christian régime of the Syrian Arab Republic does not do justice to the cause of truth on Jerusalem. The representative of Lebanon tried to bolster his arguments by quoting these clergymen and by emphasizing in particular the alleged attitude of the Eastern Christian churches. He did not, of course, refer to the authorities that really speak on behalf of these churches. Thus, for instance, on 12 April 1968 the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Benedictos, made the following declaration:

"It is true, and we would like to stress it again, that the Holy Places in general, monasteries and churches, were

given full respect and protection by the Israelis before the war, during the war and afterwards, and we hope that in the future they will be respected as well and the *status quo* which existed will be safeguarded.”

105. As witnessed not only by the Moslem inhabitants of Jerusalem themselves but also by the 100,000 Arab visitors who came to Jerusalem this summer from Lebanon—yes, from Lebanon—Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and other countries, as witnessed by Moslem leaders from various continents, and also as documented in print by Arab sources quoted by me yesterday, no change has occurred in the status, administration and protection of the holy places of Islam in Jerusalem. As before 1967, they remain under the full jurisdiction of the Moslem authorities. To the statement cited by me yesterday, let me add the following. The Qadi of Jerusalem and Jaffa issued on 1 January 1970 the following declaration:

“As Qadi of Jerusalem and Jaffa . . . I have been paying frequent visits to the city for both religious and secular purposes. I derive great pleasure from my visits to the El-Aqsa mosque on Fridays and particularly on religious holidays, when I join the prayers of my brethren who live in Jerusalem and the surrounding villages. I also join Moslems from other towns throughout Israel who, since Jerusalem’s unification, are now able for the first time since being cut off from the city for 20 years to come to this holy place for which they have been yearning for so many years. At the same time, I reflect on how good it would be if those who have heard unfounded rumours of desecration and interference in the regular work in the Mosque could come to witness the peace and tranquillity which prevail in this holy place during the prayers that are regularly held there.”

106. Mr. Mahamat Rahama Saleh, the Moslem Minister of Public Service of Chad, stated in a press interview on 8 September 1969, following his visit to Moslem and non-Moslem Holy Places in Jerusalem and Nazareth:

“Thank God, I could visit them and find religious communities—Moslems among them—with whose members I spoke for a long time. I found out that they enjoyed absolute freedom in the religious field. In addition, they are receiving much help from the Government for the improvement and safeguarding of the Holy Places.”

107. A distinguished African Moslem leader, the President of Uganda, visited Jerusalem on 17 July of this year, and then expressed to the press his admiration for Israel’s attitude to the Holy Places of Islam and their protection.

108. As for the places holy to Christianity, the simple statement issued only last week by the Executive Council of the National Coalition of American Nuns is perhaps the most persuasive summary of the situation. The statement of 10 September 1971 declares:

“Jews have always been in Jerusalem; it is their spiritual home. And the daily prayer of the Jewish people voices their enduring historic relation to the City. Further, Israel has rebuilt Jerusalem, pouring into it millions of dollars

and, more especially, untold human resources. Jerusalem is now available to all faiths, and never before have the Holy Places been so protected and maintained.

109. Dr. Robert Lindsay, a famous Christian biblical scholar, who has lived in Jerusalem for thirty years and heads the Institute of Biblical Studies, declared in a television interview on ABC on 7 June 1970:

“I think if we look through the long years of time we find that there have been many administrations of the City of Jerusalem. It seems to me that at this juncture in history, as I said, at least for the last many, many years, several hundreds of years, the best administration we have had is this one that we are now seeing.”

110. As I emphasized at the last meeting, Jerusalem is a living city, and any discussion of it cannot ignore its inhabitants. Though we heard yesterday, and to some extent today, from certain Arab representatives that it is of no consequence that the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem are better off now than before 1967, Israel is not ready to brush aside the welfare of the City’s inhabitants, whether Arab or Jewish. The Government of Israel considers that it is of interest and of importance that the Arab residents of Jerusalem are more prosperous than under Jordanian rule; that they live in improved conditions of public health; that they are being moved from slums to better housing; that they enjoy freedom of movement, freedom of thought and speech and freedom of the press.

111. Despite the unfounded charges levelled by the representative of Lebanon, it is to be noted that it is precisely the Lebanese press that is rather outspoken on this question. I shall confine myself to one example. The Beirut daily *Al-Hawadess*, which devotes much attention to the Palestinian Arabs, quotes Arabs from Jerusalem on a visit to Kuwait who spoke to that newspaper’s correspondent. They said, according to *Al-Hawadess* of 27 April 1971:

“We have lived for many years under the shadow of Arab nationalism. We regret to say that we had to wait for the Israeli occupation to feel that we are human beings and citizens.”

112. If we were to examine here the question of Jerusalem on its merits the Security Council would certainly ask itself the question: if the Holy Places of all the three great monotheistic religions enjoy full respect and protection of their rights and privileges, and if the inhabitants of the City, Arabs and Jews alike, live in peace, progress and prosperity, then why should one take exception to such a situation? Why should Member States have reservations regarding the restoration of Jerusalem to its natural state of unity and integrity? What tenet of law justifies Jordan’s complaint that Israel terminated Jordan’s aggression against Jerusalem, perpetrated in 1948 in violation of the Charter and of United Nations resolutions? What is the principle of justice and morality whereby the citizens of Jerusalem should be denied the rights possessed by inhabitants of any other city in the world and forced back into the misery which was theirs during the nineteen years of unnatural division, stagnation and bloodshed?

113. May I suggest respectfully that if it were really the interests of Jerusalem and its Holy Places that this debate were concerned with the Jordanian complaint would be unequivocally dismissed as utterly baseless and irresponsible?

114. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic who wishes to exercise the right of reply, and I now call on him.

115. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. Tekoah's statement yesterday and his remarks in exercise of the right of reply today are perfect illustrations that people have created political mythologies, believed them and then persisted in making other people believe their lies. These creators of political mythologies—like Zionism, the latest one, and Nazism before—always follow the same pattern: to rewrite history and to attribute to others what they themselves have committed.

116. A former Secretary-General of the United Nations wrote:

“A successful lie is doubly a lie. An error which has to be corrected is a heavier burden than truth. Only an uncompromising honesty can reach the bedrock of decency which you should always expect to find even under deep layers of evil.”

117. Such deep layers of evil have been accumulated since the creation of Israel and since the inception of the political mythology on which Israel has been built: namely, Zionism. I therefore beg your indulgence, Mr. President, and that of the members of the Council to uncover those deeper lies which cover the truth. That is indeed a very difficult task.

118. First of all, what is the real issue? The real issue was defined yesterday by the Council itself in its adoption of a provisional agenda which contained the letter of complaint of the representative of Jordan on the situation in Jerusalem, and the reports of the Secretary-General—eight in number—which my delegation had requested be put on the agenda. Therefore, after all the demagoguery and the very base and undignified language in which Mr. Tekoah indulges, and which, I must concede, I cannot really emulate or attempt to imitate because it remains a privilege of Zionism and its mythology, I shall not proceed with the same sort of emotional appeal; I shall not pursue those meaningless things which he has been repeating yesterday and today. If one refers, in fact, to the very first report of the Secretary-General, which was submitted on 10 July 1967 [S/8052] and which embodied a letter communicated by Mr. Tekoah to Secretary-General U Thant, one will find the same things as have been said yesterday and today by Mr. Tekoah; they were stated to the Secretary-General as Israel's answer to the requests put to Israel about implementation of the General Assembly resolutions.

119. Many speakers have referred to the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly—they are five in number—and have quoted paragraphs from them; I shall not repeat them. But the irreducible fact.

no matter how much sophistry Mr. Tekoah is capable of using, remains that from 1967 up till now the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted five resolutions concerning Jerusalem which constitute international legislation in which Israel was condemned in the most categorical and clear terms, and was asked to rescind all measures taken in the occupied City of Jerusalem, and to desist forthwith from further measures.

120. Now, very recently the International Court of Justice submitted to the members of the Security Council a very important Advisory Opinion on which that Court ought to be congratulated. The report is entitled *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)*.⁶ That Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice was submitted on 21 June 1971. There are three paragraphs in that report—short paragraphs but dealing in a rational rather than an emotional way with the consequences of illegality. I repeat, this is from the Advisory Opinion on the consequences of illegality. For we have two analogous situations here: the existence of South Africa in South West Africa having been declared illegal, and South Africa persisting in its occupation of South West Africa. That is why I refer to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the consequences of illegality, because the same situation obtains here: there are five resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, all of which have been completely disregarded by Israel.

121. I quote from the Advisory Opinion:

“110. As to the legal basis of the resolution, Article 24 of the Charter vests in the Security Council the necessary authority to take action such as that taken in the present case. The reference in paragraph 2 of this Article to specific powers of the Security Council under certain chapters of the Charter does not exclude the existence of general powers to discharge the responsibilities conferred in paragraph 1. Reference may be made in this respect to the Secretary-General's Statement, presented to the Security Council on 10 January 1947 to the effect that ‘the powers of the Council under Article 24 are not restricted to the specific grants of authority contained in Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII . . . the Members of the United Nations have conferred upon the Security Council powers commensurate with its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. The only limitations are the fundamental principles and purposes found in Chapter I of the Charter.’

“111. As to the effect to be attributed to the declaration contained in paragraph 2 of resolution 276 (1970), the Court considers that the qualification of a situation as illegal does not by itself put an end to it. It can only be the first, necessary step in an endeavour to bring the illegal situation to an end.

“112. It would be an untenable interpretation to maintain that, once such a declaration had been made by the Security Council under Article 24 of the Charter, on

⁶ *Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

behalf of all Member States, those Members would be free to act in disregard of such illegality, or even to recognize violations of law resulting from it. When confronted with such an internationally unlawful situation, Members of the United Nations would be expected to act in consequence of the declaration made on their behalf. The question therefore arises as to the effect of this decision of the Security Council for States Members of the United Nations in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter.”

122. I contend that the same situation arises now; we are facing it now: there are definite resolutions of the Security Council which Israel has not respected.

123. What are the obligations of Member States? The International Court of Justice, in the Advisory Opinion from which I just read, stated very clearly that to declare a situation illegal is only one step. But it is mandatory for Member States to recognize the illegality of that same act.

124. That is why my delegation yesterday requested that the reports of the Secretary-General be inscribed as sub-item (b) when the agenda was adopted. Our move was prompted by two considerations. The first is the fact that the Secretary-General is entrusted by the Security Council to report on the situation on Jerusalem in accordance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. The reports emanating from an objective source constitute a valuable element in helping the Security Council to assist in dealing with the situation arising from Israeli violations of the legislation of the Security Council, namely, the consequences of an illegal situation. These reports constitute an integral part of United Nations responsibilities and duties towards Jerusalem.

125. The second consideration arises from the fact—a fact reported by the Secretary-General himself in these reports—that Israel encroached also upon United Nations premises in Government House and has therefore extended its annexationist measures to the domain of the United Nations itself. This has led to a legal situation whereby the Secretary-General has become unwillingly also a party in the complaint against Israeli measures affecting the status of Jerusalem and the United Nations.

126. What are the contents of the Secretary-General's reports on Jerusalem? A careful study of these reports reveal the following facts. First, the Secretary-General, in accordance with the mandate given to him by both the General Assembly and the Security Council, has more than six times attempted to obtain from the occupier information as to its willingness to implement United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem, namely, those paragraphs requesting Israel to rescind its annexationist measures and to desist from obliterating the Arab character of the City. The answers to his pleas and requests remain since 10 July 1967 in line with the same stubborn rejection of all United Nations decisions, whatever their contents. Even information on the master plan—denied by Mr. Tekoah in his statement yesterday—the details of which were extensively published in Israeli papers, has not been communicated to the Secretary-General.

127. As to legislation, he had to resort to the official journal of Israel in order to submit to the Security Council

the legislation passed by the Israeli Knesset to expropriate Arab lands—and this is to be found in the reports of the Secretary-General. But Israel does not even condescend to answer the Secretary-General's notes directly. In document S/10124 of 18 February 1971, in paragraph 4, the Secretary-General notes that the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel did not answer the question raised by the Secretary-General on Israeli measures and actions in Jerusalem, in violation of international law and United Nations resolutions. Instead, the then Acting Permanent Representative of Israel unabashedly “assures” the Secretary-General that the position of the Government of Israel remains the same. I wonder whether there could be more cynicism. Moreover, it appears from the reports of the Secretary-General that Israel purposely evades replying to the questions of the Secretary-General with regard to Israeli policies in occupied Jerusalem.

128. The second element in these reports shows that Israeli bulldozers have invaded United Nations premises to erase the United Nations presence in Jerusalem in addition to occupying illegally the premises of Government House where the facilities of the United Nations are located. In the same paragraph of the above-mentioned report, the Secretary-General qualified Israeli aggression against the no-man's-land where Government House is located in the following terms:

“This activity, which coincides with reports appearing in the press about the immediate implementation of a project to erect housing units and other buildings in that area, indicates a further and serious violation of the inviolability of United Nations premises under the Charter of the United Nations and the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.”

That is the context in which our deliberations must take place.

129. Let me now go to some other layers of lies to uncover the truth. I take the statement, consisting of 30 pages which lasted about 115 minutes yesterday, given by Mr. Tekoah in very emotional terms. I refer to the passage concerning the numbers of the population in Jerusalem—to which he returned, in fact, today. I quote from his own figures:

“In 1948 the number of Jews in Jerusalem was 100,000; the number of Christians, 25,000; the number of Moslems, 45,000. In 1967 the number of Jews was 195,000;”—we have to thank Mr. Tekoah for acknowledging that in 1967 the number of Jews has risen from 100,000 to 200,000—“the number of Christians dropped from 25,000 in 1948 to 10,800 in 1967; the number of Moslems increased to 54,963. In 1970 the number of Jews was 215,000”—another increase—“the number of Christians, 11,500; the number of Moslems, 61,600.”
[1580th meeting, para. 63.]

These are figures which exist in the statement of Mr. Tekoah. I was not reading a statement from another place.

130. What is to be remarked concerning these figures and statistics? I remember the story of General Smuts, at one

time the Prime Minister of South Africa, standing in the Parliament of South Africa and juggling with some statistics. Some of his colleagues were amazed. They asked: "How did you work out these figures?", to which Smuts replied, "Well, if there is anyone who can contradict me, let him come forward." This is only to say that it is very easy to play with figures.

131. The first remark on these statistics is to take the first year—1948. But what about 1947? What was the number of the Arabs, Christians and Moslems in 1947? And what were the numbers of the Jews in the City of Jerusalem or in the district of Jerusalem? What was the property of each?

132. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the rewriting of history. He dwelt at great length on Jordan attacking the eastern section of Jerusalem.

133. I wish to refer Mr. Tekoah to his own historians. Some of them now occupy the posts of Deputy Prime Ministers, Ministers, and so on. There is a book in Hebrew called *Sefer Hapalmah*, which means the book of the Palmach—the Palmach being the shock troops of the Haganah. For people to whom these terms might sound strange, I must mention that the terrorist organizations that existed prior to the rise of the State of Israel were: the Palmach, the Haganah, the Irgun Zvai Leumi—to which Mr. Tekoah belonged—and the Stern Gang. The Stern Gang called itself the Stern Gang. Now, they refer to themselves as terrorists.

134. This is not an invention of the Arabs. Here, for instance, is a book by one of the great leaders of the war of liberation of Israel. It is entitled *The Revolt, Story of the Irgun*,⁷ and it was written by Menachem Begin. Menachem Begin, leader of the Herut Party, hero of Dir Yassin, was a member of the coalition government up to a few months ago, when he resigned his post because he is a believer in Eretz Yisrael—in other words, he believes that the conquest has not yet been completed.

135. He refers to the illegal immigration in 1945, 1946 and 1947, and tells how the Irgun and the Haganah helped the illegal immigration to Palestine at that time, and how boats and ships carrying Jewish immigrants from Europe were actually dynamited and sunk by these terrorists themselves. On page 35 of this remarkable book we read: "Jewish 'terrorists' placed a bomb to prevent its departure"—that is, the departure of the *Patria*, which was to sail back with illegal immigrants. Mr. Begin continues: "The bomb exploded and more than 200 Jews were killed or drowned. The British authorities noted the fact that this was not an Irgun Zvai Leumi operation; it was the Haganah which had placed the bomb." So one can see that the followers of political mythologies like nazism and fascism do not stop at any crime, even killing their own people, in order to further their purposes.

136. Now we come back to Jerusalem and to the figures. Again, I draw on Mr. Begin. On page 348 of this remarkable book we read the following, indicating the designs of the Israelis on Jerusalem, before any Arab attack:

"At the end of January, 1948, at a meeting of the Command of the Irgun in which the Planning Section participated, we outlined four strategic objectives: (1) Jerusalem; (2) Jaffa; (3) the Lydda-Ramleh plain; and (4) the Triangle."

Leaving aside the three other sections which were to be part of the Arab State-to-be, Jerusalem was, on 29 October 1947, declared to be a *corpus separatum*—not only the city of Jerusalem but the whole district of Jerusalem.

137. So here we have the first proof that long before the Arabs attempted anything, the terrorists of that period, the Irgun and the Haganah and the Palmach, were aiming at Jerusalem. Now what happened between 1947 and 1948? Again, I draw on Menachem Begir's book. He speaks about the massacre of Dir Yassin, the village just before Jerusalem. Dir Yassin was necessary in order to build a secret air strip to help in the conquest of Jerusalem. Mr. Begin tells us on page 163 that the Commander of the Haganah sent the following order to him:

"I learn that you plan an attack on Dir Yassin. I wish to point out that the capture of Dir Yassin and holding it is one stage in our general plan. I have no objection to your carrying out the operation provided you are able to hold the village. If you are unable to do so I warn you against blowing up the village which will result in its inhabitants abandoning it and its ruins and deserted houses being occupied by foreign forces. This situation will increase our difficulties in the general struggle. A second conquest of the place will involve us in heavy sacrifices. Furthermore, if foreign forces enter the place this will upset the plan . . ."

138. The place was occupied; Dir Yassin was captured; 250 Arabs—men, women and children—were killed; and that is a famous story. But the important thing, which brings us back to the figure, is this commentary by Mr. Begin himself on the following page:

"Arabs throughout the country, induced to believe wild tales of 'Irgun butchery', were seized with limitless panic and started to flee for their lives. This mass flight soon developed into a maddened uncontrollable stampede. Of the about 800,000 Arabs who lived on the present territory of the State of Israel, only 165,000 are still there."

Therefore, if Mr. Tekoah was really objective or had any respect for the truth, he would have started his statistics by mentioning the number of the Arabs in 1947. But already we are told by Mr. Begin that of the 800,000 Arabs, only 165,000 remained.

139. Further proof comes from the then Mandatory Power, the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom, when it submitted the problem of Palestine to the United Nations in 1947, submitted a report.⁸ There were many appendices to that report. I am referring to appendix VI. It speaks of

⁸ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Ad Hoc Committee on the Palestinian Question*, document A/AC.14/32.

⁷ New York, Henry Schuman, 1951.

the Jerusalem district, then Hebron, then Jerusalem, and the Arab ownership and the Jewish ownership in the district of Jerusalem. Here are the figures: Arab ownership, 1,326,571 dunams. For the information of the members of the Council, one dunam equals 1,000 square metres. Jewish ownership, 33,401 dunams. Then there is "Public", which is not owned by the Arabs or by the Jews. According to Moslem law, "Public" is the ownership of the people. For "Public", we have 146,361 dunams. The total is 1,570,785 dunams. Those figures pertain to the city of Jerusalem.

140. For the whole District of Jerusalem the figures are as follows: Arab ownership, 3,993,001; Jewish ownership, 39,679—but of a total of 4,333,534. Thus Arab ownership, according to this report submitted by the Mandatory Power itself—a document of the United Nations, which anybody can check—is exactly 82 per cent of both the City of Jerusalem and the District of Jerusalem.

141. There was another paragraph in the statement of Mr. Tekoah denying the existence of a master plan. He said:

"It is to be observed that housing construction is pursued largely on the basis of plans elaborated by the British administration during the Mandate period and suspended after the Jordanian invasion of 1948. However, contrary to the Jordanian allegations, there is no master plan. Construction is carried on in the conviction that following the termination of Jordan's invasion the development of Jerusalem must once more proceed on its normal course, interrupted by war and the subsequent bisection of the city." [1580th meeting, para. 34.]

142. There is a slight confusion in this paragraph. Who is the invader and who is the invaded? According to Mr. Tekoah the invader is Jordan—although it is not now in Jerusalem at all—and the invaded is Israel. That is the logic of people who follow political mythology because everything becomes mythological and we have to believe them. Here again I shall cite an objective authority. In June of this year, two articles appeared in London under the title "The theft of a sacred city". The second of those articles deals with the plan. It is entitled "The plan". I quote:

"In 1964 the Jewish municipality of Jerusalem, the Israeli Lands Authority, the Israeli Ministry of Housing and the Prime Minister's Office, initiated a master plan for the development of that part of Jerusalem in Israel and to that end established a Master Plan Office. After the Six-Day War of 1967, during which the Israeli Forces occupied the Eastern or Arab part of Jerusalem and in which the Old City lies, the planning office immediately began to reconstruct their plan to incorporate the whole city."

The article continues—and this shows the dimensions and the magnitude of the problem with which the Arabs are faced and I request my colleagues to pay attention to these figures:

"The scheme was based on computerized calculation of population trends from which it emerged that the 266,000 population would have swollen to 400,000 by 1985, but the plan envisaged that other factors might

raise this figure to 600,000 and that by 2010 the population would be 900,000."

143. That proves beyond any doubt that there is a definite office dedicated to carrying out the master plan they are speaking about. Mr. Tekoah with his usual habit and in the classical tradition of political mythologists, spoke of nazism. It seemed as though he was implying that we the Arabs have to pay for the crimes of the nazis. I do not know what logic or legality justifies such an implication. But what was condemned in the Nuremberg trial was not Arab civilization. The first Hebrew grammar was written in the Arabic language. I must say that unfortunately Western civilization gave rise to a mad man called Hitler and to a mad doctrine called nazism, and for the victims of nazism to become nazis themselves—but under a different guise, called Zionism—is a sad aspect of history for which we the Arabs are paying the price, and no one else.

144. To prove my point that the doctrine of Zionism is basically a racist doctrine, I invite attention to the following. On 7 July 1968 a newspaper reported General Dayan, the Minister of Defence, as having said that:

"for a century the nation has been constructing a country by receiving Jewish immigrants and implanting colonies with the aim of enlarging our frontiers. Let no one say that we have already fulfilled our programme; let no one say that we are nearing the desired goal!"

145. In the official publication of the Rabbinate of the Israeli Army the following, dated April 1969 appeared:

"The Arabs, who are elements foreign to the essence and destiny of this country, must be considered from every point of view like the ancient foreign elements. Our war with them was just as inevitable as were our wars with the nations who ruled the country during our ancient colonisation. To live here with the Arabs is impossible, because the Arab turns to Mecca to say his prayer whereas we turn towards Jerusalem. Only he who turns towards Jerusalem is the true son of this country.

"The conclusion is simple: either the Arab will cease to honour the ideals of Mecca and will honour those of Zion and Jerusalem or he will return to the country of Mecca and leave the sons of Zion to fulfil their destiny without bothering them. The Bible is the sole and unique basis of development for this country, it is its very essence. All our steps must be inspired by it."

146. Now this doctrine is based on mythology and the racist belief that the Jews are the chosen people of God. How can they allow themselves to make such pronouncements and issue such directives? A great many Jews dissent from the Zionist State of Israel. I invite the attention of the members of this Council to an appeal that appeared in *The New York Times* today and that was written by Jews. It is entitled "Pogrom in Jerusalem". I will not tax the patience of the members of the Council by reading it. I hope that every one of them will read this appeal made by some Orthodox Jews here in the city of New York.

147. With regard to desecration, I submit to the Council this picture of a chapel just outside the Saint Saviour

Armenian Church on Mount Zion, which was thoroughly ransacked, with crosspieces removed from its wall and left in shambles. That is after the Israeli occupation. And then a picture of a bulldozing operation at the South Wall of the Haram al Sharif. The Dome is that of Al Aqsa Mosque. Archaeological diggings continue on the South Wall of the Haram al Sharif area. Israelis claim that they are seeking the southern entrance which in olden times led directly into the middle of the Temple area.

148. In *Haolam Hazeh* of 10 August 1971, Mr. Dayan said:

“All the rest of the sites (i.e. Christian and Moslem shrines) could be photographed and eliminated because they are concealing and preventing us from seeing the perfect picture.”

149. And here is a picture of Israeli army boots trampling the places of worship. Al Aqsa Mosque, the third holiest shrine of Islam, was burned in such an outrage.

150. Here is a picture of the Reparatrice Convent in Jerusalem, destroyed by the Israeli occupiers.

151. Here is a picture of a mosque at Qibya, destroyed by Israeli armed forces.

152. Here is a picture of the Church of Saint Anne in Jerusalem, a victim of Israeli shelling.

153. But I want to put on record that this follows the pattern of Israeli behaviour in Palestine towards the Arabs. Among the mosques destroyed are those of Birweh, Ghabsiya, Kabri and Kuweikat. Among the churches destroyed are those of Damoun, Sihmata and Kafr Bir'im. The Mosque of Nabi Daoud in Israeli-held Jerusalem was converted into a synagogue. The Mamillah Cemetery in Jerusalem, an area of about 20 acres containing the remains of a large number of Moslem religious dignitaries was seized. Residential and commercial quarters were established in the cemetery. On Good Friday of 1954, the Christian Cemetery in Haifa was desecrated and 73 holy crosses were smashed. A large demonstration of the leaders of the Christian community and Christian citizens of Haifa on 2 May 1954 protested against this act. On 26 February 1953 Monseigneur George Hakim, Archbishop of the Greek Catholic Community in Israel, told the Hebrew daily *Ma'ariv*:

“Many church properties are still illegally seized, priests are not allowed permanent residence in Israel, and religious students are prevented from reaching theological schools. For these and other matters, we received good promises, mostly unfulfilled, as are still unfulfilled many promises given through us to members of the Catholic Church.”

154. This stems from a very basic inherent hatred of the Arabs, be they Christians or Moslems. Mark the following. Dr. Azriel, formerly Chief Editor of the newspaper *Ma'ariv*, wrote in that paper on 1 October 1955:

“Islam is the enemy of all fruitful thought, all genuine initiative and all productive ideas. It has produced

nothing good in the past, nor will it do so in the future. It represents darkness, reaction and imprisonment for 500 million human beings.”

155. Any student of history—not merely general human and world history, but even Jewish history—knows, to give just one instance, that the greatest theologian of Judaism, Maimonides in Latin, whose Hebrew and Arabic name is Moses ben Maimun, lived in Tunisia, Cairo and Damascus, and wrote “Guide to the Perplexed” in Hebrew letters, but when it is read it is read in Arabic. The Jews say about Maimonides, “From Moses to Moses, there is nobody like Moses. He represents one of the climaxes of Jewish renaissance living under the Arabs.

156. And may I ask Mr. Tekoah: why is it that when Spain was regained by the Christians the Jews preferred to migrate with the Arabs and live in North Africa—their descendants live there to the present time—rather than live in Christian Spain? Please do not believe that I am Moslem or that I am speaking because of religious feelings. It so happens that I am a Christian from the Christian community of Syria, which, according to Mr. Tekoah, is a persecuted community in Syria. Why is it that for the last six years I have had the misfortune, or the fortune, to face Mr. Tekoah across this horseshoe table if what he has said is correct? It is not correct. Why is it that there have been Christian Prime Ministers of Syria, which is 90 per cent Moslem, as well as ministers, deputy prime ministers and vice-presidents. We boast of tolerance—genuine tolerance, not fabricated mythological tolerance.

157. Israel is an international law-breaker. This is a fact that must be recognized, and sooner or later a law-breaker, whether national or international, no matter what the forces are behind him, must be brought to court. Mr. Tekoah, who lectured us yesterday and today about respect for the rule of law, is answered by the following statement of his Minister of Defence, Mr. Dayan, which sheds light not only on the situation in Jerusalem but on the situation in all the occupied areas, that is, the Golan Heights, the west bank of the Jordan, the Sinai and Gaza. This is what Defence Minister Moshe Dayan said, as quoted by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on 20 August 1971:

“Defence Minister Moshe Dayan declared today that Israel must regard herself as the permanent régime in the occupied Arab territories, and must carry out necessary projects there without waiting for the day of peace since it may be very late in coming.”

158. That statement of Mr. Dayan at that time made headlines in the American press. *The Christian Science Monitor* and *The New York Times* of 21 August both emphasized the fact that the correct English translation of Dayan's statement should read “permanent and establishment government”.

159. We find this in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 21 August 1971:

“The central and most controversial point in Mr. Dayan's address was that Israel should regard itself as the permanent government of the occupied territories.

(An official English translation issued by the government press office rendered his words as established government, but a more precise equivalent of *memshelet keva*—which is Hebrew—“is permanent government.”)

160. *The New York Times*, on the same date, commented as follows:

“The word *kevuah* used by Mr. Dayan to describe the kind of government he wants means both permanent and established, and his statement is being interpreted both ways here.”

Commenting on this, *The New York Times* stated that even the State Department “took sharp issue with the Israeli Defense Minister”.

161. There is, so I am told, a passage in the Talmud—and the Talmud is a collection of the writings of the wise men of Judaism—which says that ancient Jerusalem was destroyed because its inhabitants “stuck to the strict letter of the law, and did not advance equity”. My colleagues here do not need any lessons illustrating the frequent disparity between equity and the letter of the law. Indeed, that disparity is why the Security Council is meeting to discuss the problem of Jerusalem. But the Jewish wise man who wrote what I have quoted from the Talmud was certainly inspired by the Hebrew prophet Habbakuk, who said: “Woe unto him who builds his house on blood and his city on inequity”.

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

163. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The hour is late, and I do not want to abuse the human rights of the individual members of the Council. By a freak of fate I seem always to speak at a late hour. I can assure you, Mr. President, that if the Council should decide to schedule a meeting soon—tomorrow or perhaps Monday—I shall delay the bulk of my statement until then.

164. However, having taken the floor I wish to remind you, Sir, that in my last statement I said that I would be more explicit about this question of Jerusalem when I spoke again. In order not to contradict what I have just said, I shall take only a little time to refute what Mr. Tekoah said this afternoon. I know that what I say will not be reported by the world press which, to a large extent, is controlled by the Zionists. However, it is enough for a few honest ears to hear what I have to say, and I hope that the substance of my statement will be disseminated where consciences are still alive. This will not be a detailed statement.

165. Mr. Tekoah said that my colleague from Jordan had concealed the fundamental truth, that Jordan had destroyed Jerusalem and that Jerusalem is now united and prosperous under the Israeli flag.

166. Mr. President, I happen to have a good American colleague sitting next to me and, through you, Sir, I would

ask him this: if Manhattan and many parts of the United States were still on the lips of the Red Indians—who no doubt worshipped in this vast land before the white man conquered it—would the Security Council consider restituting to the Red Indians Manhattan or parts of the United States sacred to them? No. Because power is exercised by the white man who conquered this country and constituted himself into a State. Therefore, why should not the Palestinians be like the Red Indians? There are 110 million Arabs and 600 million Moslems who do not concede that the representatives of a couple of million people who claim to be Zionists should have suzerainty over Jerusalem. That is the fact as it obtains. That should be the realistic approach of the Council—not the approach of juridical or political solution. There is a fait accompli by force now facing the Moslems—not to speak of the Christians, because half of them have been brain-washed. I am speaking not of the Christians of the East, but of the Christians elsewhere. But there are 600 or 700 million Moslems who will not accept the fait accompli. Let this Council heed what I say, because, as I said yesterday, it will go round in circles and get nowhere if it does not accept this fact.

167. Mr. Tekoah mentioned Lebanon and said that the Lebanese Christians had been emigrating. Before they were Christians, Lebanese had been emigrating, because they were sailors during the days when they were called Phoenicians. If they had not emigrated, they would not have built the Temple of Solomon. Solomon was the son of David, and David was a shepherd who did not know how to do anything. They lived in tents, as some of us still do in Arabia. There is nothing wrong with that. However, the Jews of ancient times did not know how to build a wall. They had to ask the Lebanese to come and build the Temple of Jerusalem with cedar. But why talk about the Lebanese going to Jerusalem to build a temple for King Solomon? They had travelled around Africa centuries before Christ when the Egyptians were not yet Semitized—they were Hamites—which goes to show that Semitism is a culture and a language and not predicated necessarily on a religion. Take the Christian communities before Protestantism. Religion was not a unifying factor. Catholics killed one another, and then Protestantism came, and they also began to kill one another. Mr. Tekoah wants to create a people from a religion, and I tell him it cannot be done. The Lebanese are still emigrating, like any other people. At least when they went to Cornwall, six or seven centuries before Christ, and what today is Ireland and mined tin, they did not colonize what today is the United Kingdom or Ireland. They established Marseilles. They could not have done so if they only cultivated vineyards and olive trees. What about the Jews? They have been emigrating everywhere too. It is no argument to say that the Lebanese Christians are leaving because they are oppressed. My colleague from Syria has just mentioned that he comes from one of the most ancient families in Syria. He is a Christian and is sitting now representing a State which is 95 per cent Moslem. I happen to be from the Christian branch of the Baroodys. About 50 per cent of us are Moslems and 50 per cent are Christians. I represent the State that happens to be the custodian of Mecca and Medina. Where is the discrimination and the intolerance? I mention this to refute these seditious words that are spoken in order to drive a wedge and in order to fan religious discrimination

and intolerance in our part of the world—as if we do not have enough of it now that Israel has usurped our part of the world. When I speak about Israel I am not thinking of the ancient Israelis, who are at one with us. I am talking about those Khazars from Europe who use religion—a noble religion: Judaism—as a motivation for their economic and political ends. They mentioned Uganda, and possibly next time they will mention other parts of Africa which seem to send emissaries—we know who pays their fare—to Israel. We also have some Lebanese and Syrians there who are emigrants, and they tell us certain things about what goes on. I should like to remind Mr. Tekoah that I know that in the sixties \$19 million was siphoned by certain States—and I do not want to mention them lest I embarrass them—to Israel so that it might spend that money for propaganda in Africa and send experts there. They have many there. They have Europeans there. They have doctors and engineers. For what? As a by-product, as in the days of colonialism. The colonial people benefited from the colonial Powers, but the colonial Powers were there primarily for their own interests. And that is what is going on now. Israeli engineers and doctors are going there to say that Israel is the promised land and the Arabs are barbarians. I will not accept such an argument and let it go unanswered before this Council lest by repetition it may be believed.

168. How can it be expected that the Arabs can trust the Israelis in our midst when only today one can read an advertisement in *The New York Times* entitled “Pogrom in Jerusalem”? The advertisement has been inserted by none other than the Neturei Karta of U.S.A.—the “keepers of the gate”, in other words. They are not all Sephardic Jews; some of them are Ashkenazim. I shall read out this advertisement:

“The brutal pogrom, staged on Saturday, August 7th, by the Israeli police in Jerusalem against innocent Jewish men, women and children, must not be forgotten. Steps must be taken to assure that there will be no repetition.”

That is the first paragraph. I will now read part of the main paragraph. It says:

“The Jewish victims, who had no warning at all, did not resist but the merciless beatings continued until there was a large number of wounded which included scores of American tourists, American students and an American rabbi. Fifteen Americans were among the many hauled off to jail where the shocking mistreatment was relentlessly kept up. The staging of the ‘show’ included a peculiar detail: some policemen systematically forced a number of young boys to throw stones in order to provide suitable ‘action picture’ for the cameras.”

169. And then comes, from the mouths of Jews who are at loggerheads with the Zionists, another quotation from the same advertisement:

“First came the establishment of the Zionist state in the Holy Land, although the Torah forbids any Jewish state before the coming of the Messiah. Now the Zionists continue in the same direction by persecuting those who still uphold the sovereign rule of the Torah among the Jews and who steadfastly have refused to recognize the

legitimacy of the Zionist state. The Zionist fraud and deception is increased by its usurpation of the name of Israel and by the Zionist pretense of representing the Jewish people. Actually, the existence of the Jewish people is based solely on one fundamental principle: the observance of the commandments as specified in the written and oral law of the Torah. Anyone denying this principle excludes himself automatically from the Jewish community.”

And they appeal to us at the United Nations to do something about those Jews who reside in Israel.

170. Mr. Tekoah had the temerity to talk about the brutality of the Arabs, Jordanians or non-Jordanians, and about the paradise which they have been trying to establish in Jerusalem and occupied Palestine.

171. Since Mr. Tekoah is so confident, as he has declared from this table, that everything that Israel has done in Jerusalem is—to use an American idiom—fine and dandy, why does not Israel accept a United Nations-appointed commission to go to Jerusalem and other parts of occupied Palestine to ascertain whether the Arab population, Christian or Moslem, is satisfied under the alleged Israeli golden rule? Why, if they have nothing to fear?

172. I promised that I would not be long but, before reserving the right—with the permission of the members of the Council—to take the floor the next time this Council convenes, I must mention something that may appear a little novel, if not creative, so as to get us out of this impasse.

173. Political Zionism, as interpreted and as it is being fulfilled by the usurping Zionist State, is predicated on the ingathering of all the Jews, including those in the Soviet Union—3 million of them. That is why there is such a campaign against the Soviet Union to let 3 million Jews go to Israel. And they are chiding the American Jews for not going to Israel. There are a couple of million of them in New York City and some 6 million in the United States. They are trying to brainwash them as to the necessity of going to Israel.

174. The other day I quoted just one line from what was said by Rabbi Kahane, who has been pestering everyone here who does not see eye to eye with him. Also I had to go once to see Ambassador Malik. I thought they were living in a fortress. I asked: “What’s wrong?” They said: “Kahane, Kahane and his men.” “Kahane”, we are aware, is from “cohen” originally; and “cohen”—“cahen” in Arabic—means rabbi. He does not have to put a prefix to his name and say “Rabbi Kahane”. If a man of religion does that what has he left to the secular?

175. I am now going to read from the *Paris Herald Tribune* of 7 September 1971, which I picked up on the day I came back from my exploratory trip abroad. It says:

“As Rabbi Kahane approached the platform he received a warm round of applause.”—From whom? From Israeli Jews; by American Jews whom he is trying to brainwash. “He told the delegates that the Zionist body, by giving him the platform, ‘shows it understands a traditional concept of Jewish life—freedom of expression’.

“Regarding emigration to Israel, he said: ‘It is not just a question that Jews should go, but they must go.’”—What Jews? He means the Jews of the United States. He was addressing them. “He said the American Jewish community was confronted with the possibility of ‘another holocaust’ because of what he said were deteriorating conditions in American society.

“‘The Jew is not liked in America,’ Rabbi Kahane said. ‘In times of prosperity those who dislike him are quiet haters. But when life becomes hard—as it has today—they become active haters.’”

176. There must be many other Kahanes—not so vociferous—in other countries; I do not know about Western European countries. No doubt, they may also try to be vociferous in the Soviet Union with regard to the duty of every Jew to go to Israel. That is the philosophy of political Zionism: the ingathering of all the Jews in Palestine.

177. What shall we do about it? The Jews, like the Lebanese and Syrians and other Arabs, are dispersed all over the world. I know, for one thing, that there is no doubt but that there are many American Jews who are very loyal citizens of this United States; there are French Jews who are very loyal French citizens. But the Zionists do not want to leave them alone. How do you expect us Arabs not to harbour fears in the face of this campaign of ingathering of the Jews? And how can the international community expect us not to be apprehensive that Zionism is an expansionist movement—or that Israel’s dream of occupying the territory between the Nile and the Tigris might by force become a nightmare for us? We will resist, but such a nightmare might push this world into the holocaust of a third world war.

178. Well, what is my idea for putting an end to this? I submit that Jews over 21—that is the age of majority in my part of the world; here, incidentally, they have lowered it in order to take men into the army; it is at 18 now, I think, that they are given the vote; but in my part of the world the age of majority is still 21; if you want to make it 18, that is all right—but I say that Jews 21 years of age and above, all over the world, should be asked, by the instrumentality of plebiscites, under the auspices of the United Nations, whether they consider their capital to be Jerusalem or the capitals of their own respective countries. Then we Arabs would know where we stand, because the political Zionists will leave no stone unturned until they bring pressure on Jews everywhere to emigrate to Palestine.

179. Think, Sir, with your colleagues, about this project of having a plebiscite. In that way the Jews who are loyal to the countries of which they are nationals, or whose nationality they have adopted, will be counted; and the Jews who would like to emigrate to Palestine will be counted. Then we Arabs will know where we stand. But so long as the philosophy of Zionism is that all Jews are in duty bound to go to Israel there will be no peace.

180. My next statement will revolve around why, in my opinion, from 52 years’ experience grappling with this question, this Zionist movement was initiated, and what has become of it since the First World War. Since I mention,

time and again, the economic and political motivations, I will, with your permission, Mr. President, and that of the other members of the Council, give you my appraisal of the plans of political Zionism which will make each one of you pause and think whether it is not high time that the Council should act with dispatch.

181. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

182. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, I beg your indulgence and that of members of the Security Council; I assure you that I would not have asked for the floor at this late hour—especially not after the lecture we have just heard on the Protocols of the Elders of Zion—were it not for the fact that the Syrian representative has treated us to his usual concoction of falsehoods attired in a series of distorted quotations. They do not deserve a full reply, but should not, at the same time, be left in Security Council records without some reaction.

183. Of the Syrian representative, I should simply like to ask: if Hitler, as he says, was a madman, and nazism a mad doctrine, why does Syria continue to print, in Arabic, Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*? Why did it distribute it to the Syrian armies in the Golan Heights, which for years rained fire and death on Israeli towns and villages . . .

184. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

185. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): In every part of my statements I have adhered to the item on the agenda as adopted unanimously by the Security Council: namely, the complaint of Jordan on the situation in Jerusalem, and the reports of the Secretary-General. I submit that the situation in Syria, or any allusion to Syria, is outside the subject we are discussing. Therefore, I respectfully request that the representative of Israel be called to order.

186. The PRESIDENT: Once again I appeal to representatives to restrict themselves to our agreed agenda.

187. I call on the representative of Israel.

188. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I submit most respectfully that these debates should be conducted in accordance with the Charter. We are all Members of one Organization, one of the basic principles of which is the sovereign equality of all States. If the Syrian representative dares to accuse Jews and the Jewish State of nazism, I have the right to reply to that very same point. That is why I ask: why is Syria one of the few countries in the world that continue to print and sell in public Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, and why does Syria continue to employ former Nazis—

189. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic who wishes to speak on a point of order.

190. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I respectfully request a ruling from the President on whether the points

raised by the Israeli representative are in order or out of order.

191. The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of Israel to limit his observations strictly to the item on the agenda.

192. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The Syrian representative's regard for fact is almost proverbial in the United Nations. He has engaged us, for instance, in a long analysis of the figures I gave at the previous meeting regarding Jerusalem's population. He challenged me to disprove his allegations. I will very simply. I speak and spoke yesterday of the population of the city of Jerusalem, which has had a Jewish majority for generations. I would suggest that the Syrian representative refrain from juggling with figures by giving the statistics of the population of the district of Jerusalem during the British mandatory period which included many Arab towns and villages.

193. Secondly, the Syrian representative challenged the figures submitted by me by charging that I should have given not those of 1948, as I did yesterday, but those of 1947. Indeed, I am ready to go even further than he suggested and provide him with statistics of 1944. According to statistics published by the British Mandatory Government and submitted in December 1945 and January 1946 to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, the population of Jerusalem as divided between Jews and Moslems in 1944 was as follows: Jews, 97,000; Moslems, 30,630.

194. The figures I gave yesterday come very close to that. What I said was that in 1948 there were 100,000 Jews in Jerusalem; in other words, an increase of about 3,000 as compared with the British figures; and that there were 45,000 Moslems; in other words, an increase of almost 15,000 Moslems in Jerusalem during that same period.

195. On the Syrian representative's charges regarding damage to churches and to mosques, I shall at this very late hour limit myself to one example of his distortions. The Syrian representative produced here a picture of the Armenian Church and alleged that it was destroyed by the Israelis. It so happens that the church to which he refers was situated for 19 years in the area between the lines in Jerusalem, a no-man's land, that most of the damage done resulted from the continuous aggressive shooting by the Jordanian forces on the Israeli civilian citizens of the City, and that after the reunification of Jerusalem Israel was finally able to assist the Armenian Patriarchate in repairing the damage. I shall briefly read one paragraph from a letter sent on this matter on 8 April 1969 by the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem to the Minister of Justice of Israel:

"In this connexion I also present my deep thanks to Your Excellency for your willingness to render us every help in order to restore our monastery of the Holy Saviour and cemetery situated on the front lines since 20 years."

196. I shall end by quoting to the representative of Syria an old Syrian proverb which says:

"Like the Muezzin of Homs, he calls the people to prayer, but he himself goes to his work."

The work of the Syrian representative and his Government is known to all. It is the labour of persistent oppression of Jewish and Christian minorities, of a policy aiming overtly at the destruction of a Member State of the United Nations, of continued warfare against that State and refusal to make peace with it, of rejection of all the fundamental principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and United Nations resolutions in relation to that State.

197. The work to which the Syrian representative and his Government turn, after having preached to us respect for United Nations resolutions, is the brazen rejection of this Security Council's resolution 242 (1967), the basis for all United Nations peace efforts in the Middle East, and the refusal to participate in those efforts. May I say very frankly that Syria and its document-loving but distorting representative are more of a problem to the Security Council on which Syria sits, despite its brazen repudiation of its Charter obligations, than to us—Israel.

198. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Let me first of all deal with the question of figures submitted by the representative of Israel. He said that according to the statistics of the Mandatory Power the number of Jews in the City of Jerusalem was 97,000 and that of Moslems 30,000.

199. There are two observations on those figures. First, gerrymandering, because ultimately we have to put exactly the number of the population within the limits about which we are talking. Secondly, he omitted the Christian Arabs, because it is difficult for the mind of a Zionist to imagine that there are Christian Arabs—and this stems from his basic political mythology that, starting from the premise that all Jews must be Zionists, there cannot be Jews who are non-Zionists. But we submit that being a Christian is not an international concept of law. A Christian can be French, Italian, Spanish, Syrian, Lebanese, Egyptian—he is defined by his nationality, not by his religion.

200. Then he referred to my quotations as distortions. The verbatim record of the Security Council will appear tomorrow. Every quotation is given with its source and page. But those quotations must have hurt Mr. Tekoah for him to go to the extent of calling them distortions. I can understand his dissatisfaction, to the say the least, although I cannot, as I said, use the same base language that he uses and stoop as low as he does in insulting other people's intelligence. I am much more respectful of the Council, and I stand by what I said. The record, as I say, will appear tomorrow or on Monday, and I invite my colleagues to check very carefully the quotations I have made. If anyone finds a distortion, I am ready to be judged. If not, the accuser alleging distortions is himself a distorter.

201. Again, I go back to the fact that we are here looking into the question of Jerusalem. Every other issue is extraneous. The fact remains that from 1967 to this day, the General Assembly, the Security Council, the committees and commissions on human rights, WHO and UNESCO have adopted 53 resolutions, 14 of which condemn Israel

for violations of human rights and of international law, and 19 of which either deplore or strongly deplore Israel's acts of banditry. That record speaks for itself. That is the record of Israel and not of Syria.

202. As to the morbid obsession of the Israeli representative with Syria's membership of the Security Council, that membership, fortunately, was decided by a majority vote of 104 Members of the United Nations and not by Israel. That in itself should make Mr. Tekoah at least aware of his morbid and moribund obsession with the issue of the membership of Syria in the Security Council, to which he returns time and again.

203. *The PRESIDENT:* I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

204. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I would like to point to the fact that one should not cite figures with regard to 1944 and 1948. I am sure that Mr. Tekoah will not answer what I am going to say, but I want to bring to the attention of the Council some facts with regard to figures.

205. In 1919, after the end of the First World War, the Jewish population of Palestine was only 6 per cent, and the Arab population, including Christians and some of our Jewish sephardic brothers, was 93 per cent. There was a margin of 1 per cent consisting of pilgrims who had settled there, in monasteries, from abroad, mostly Christian foreigners.

206. Then I must bring it to the attention of the Council that the United Kingdom was the Mandatory Power, and the League of Nations entrusted the United Kingdom with that Mandate so as to prepare the indigenous population—in other words, the 93 or 94 per cent—for ultimate self-determination and independence. Why cite figures for 1944, or after 1939, when the British were fighting Hitler and they needed the Jews? They admitted Jews. They admitted Jews after 1922, in large numbers, to curry favour with them, for political reasons. Why not mention the 94 per cent or 93 per cent, the indigenous people of Palestine, that were non-Jewish? And what did the United Kingdom do? A perfidious colonial policy of selling out the people whom they were supposed to prepare for self-determination and independence.

207. If one mentions figures, then let one mention figures in their own perspective and not for a given year that suits the speaker, whether he be a Jew or an Arab.

208. The French were the Mandatory Power over Syria and Lebanon. They discharged their mandatory duties and they did not create a problem. I mentioned during my last statement—and I repeat again for the benefit of Mr. Tekoah or those behind him—that the Jewish State was planted amongst us by the British, who hoped that by doing so they would guarantee the route of the British Empire. I remind the Council of what the late Mr. Churchill said: "I was not appointed His Majesty's Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire".

209. Where is the British Empire now? Where will any empire be that supports injustice? It will go down the drain, as other empires have done, including Arab empires when they become tyrannical. Let us have the courage to say, as we say in Arabic: "Anything that is built on an evil and corrupt basis is evil and corrupt". A whole people was sold down the Thames and the Potomac—in 1917; and later at Versailles; and still later, in 1947. And those who connived at selling that people down those two rivers are surely morally responsible. There will be no peace as long as this injustice is done unto a people—whether Arab, non-Arab, African, Asian and of whatever colour. But we are here to establish peace in the United Nations.

210. Again, I say that my heart goes out to the non-Zionist Jews because the writing is on the wall. If the Zionists do not stop pushing them into this new ideology, they may become the scapegoats, and wrongly so, of intolerance wherever it may be found.

211. *The PRESIDENT:* The Council has heard a number of statements by those representatives who have asked to participate in the discussion. It is my understanding that the members of the Council would like to have time to study the statements they have heard and to consult among themselves. I therefore propose to adjourn this meeting and to determine the date of the next meeting, which may take place sometime early next week, after consultations with the members of this Council.

212. I have just received a message from the representatives of Jordan and Lebanon stating that they wish to reserve their right of reply for a later meeting of the Council.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.