

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

DEC 6 1989

UN/SA COLLECTION

2355th MEETING: 16 APRIL 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2355)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14967);	
Letter dated 13 April 1982 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14969)	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.

2355th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 16 April 1982, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA
(Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2355)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14967);
Letter dated 13 April 1982 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14969)

The meeting was called to order at 4.50 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14967);

Letter dated 13 April 1982 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14969)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2352nd to 2354th meeting], I invite the representatives of Israel and Morocco to take places at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Bangladesh, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Malaysia, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber. I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco) took places at the Council table. Mr. Sobhan (Bangladesh), Mr. Coumbassa (Guinea), Mr. Djalal (Indonesia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Iran), Mr. Mohammad (Iraq), Mr. Zainal Abidin (Malaysia), Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Djigo (Senegal), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Kirça (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Abdel Rahman (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Adan (Somalia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Council members have before them document S/14982, containing the text of a letter dated 15 April from the representative of Jordan to the President of the Council.

4. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Only 15 days ago, my delegation stated in the Council how concerned it was over the situation existing in the Arab territories occupied by Israel and over the developments on the West Bank and in Gaza resulting from the measures adopted by the Israeli authorities [2348th meeting, para. 52].

5. That serious concern has now been compounded by the desecration of one of the sacred Islamic sites in the Holy City, which has been the theatre of a bloody, barbarous act resulting in the painful loss of many innocent lives.

6. My delegation and Government share the Islamic community's frustration and grief over this violation

of one of the most venerated places of worship, just as they did in August 1969, when the Al-Aqsa Mosque was also seriously desecrated. The repetition of these sacrilegious acts occurs, unfortunately, in the context of a series of legislative and administrative measures adopted by Israel to alter the status and very character of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in violation of Council resolutions.

7. In denouncing these acts, my delegation deems it necessary to stress that the root of all these problems remains Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories by force. Neither the passage of time nor the unilateral measures which Israel attempts to impose on those territories can consolidate a situation that is contrary to the tenets of international law, to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

8. The delegation of Spain has always spoken in favour of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict which would put an end to the serious problems that for more than 30 years have been the tragic reality in that area. We have always advocated a negotiated solution which, while recognizing the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, would permit all States of the area to enjoy not only peaceful coexistence but also fruitful co-operation in the future. But such a solution, which is desired by Spain, and for the attainment of which this organ bears specific responsibility, will not be achieved until Israel totally and definitively withdraws from the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967. Perpetuation of this occupation only exacerbates existing tensions and leads to incidents such as the one being considered by the Council today. Time is running out, without any solution to this serious conflict in sight, and the patience of those who suffer continuous persecution is coming to an end. It is high time we adopted real solutions, not purely rhetorical ones.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

10. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): Whatever the consequences and the results of our present debate may be, we have now reached the stage when we have to draw some conclusions. The first is that the storming of the Haram al-Sharif was by no means an isolated act, but rather a premeditated stratagem in the policy and practices of Israel. The American-Israeli assassin, with the ironic name of "Goodman", acted in harmonious collusion with the occupation authorities in order to pave the way for future acts of aggression. Ever since the annexation of Jerusalem, Muslims and Christians alike have had well-founded reasons to live under the fear that some additional evil may befall their holy shrines in Jerusalem. The Israeli performance last week presented

the world with a preview of this nightmare—a nightmare which has been haunting us all. Allow me here to think aloud: Who and what can guarantee the safety of the Church of the Nativity, the Holy Sepulchre, the Mosque of Omar—or, for that matter, any of our other spiritual and cultural treasures?

11. The second conclusion to be drawn is that the real significance of the Judaization of Jerusalem should be clear to all. By attempting to empty Jerusalem of Muslims and Christian inhabitants alike, the Israelis are turning our Holy Places into tourist sites. For what is the value of a shrine without true believers? What is an altar without a priest? A minaret without a muezzin? What is an empty church in Jerusalem? A deserted mosque in Jerusalem? And this is what Israel is seeking to achieve: cheap tourism for naïve tourists. The Holy City of Jerusalem is being turned into a Hilton, a Sheraton, a Holiday Inn.

12. The third conclusion is that all those who have spoken in the Council—except for those representing Governments which have neither understanding of nor respect for history, tradition or culture—have expressed the urgent need to check this process of despoliation and to restore to Jerusalem its integrity by all available means.

13. The fourth conclusion is that the Council must not ignore the repercussions of this criminal act or allow it to go without severe punishment. It is precisely because the Israelis know that Jerusalem belongs to us that they see fit to delude the Council and evade the real issue. Rather than bowing in shame, they spew their venom at everybody. Chapter 8, verse 44, of *St. John* says, "he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him."

14. There is no truth in the Zionist spokesman. If parts of the Arab world bleed today, it is because of the Israeli dagger. Yesterday [2354th meeting] the Israeli representative shed crocodile tears over the churches and mosques of Hama and quoted from his master's voice in order to mislead the Council. Yet it is common knowledge that the events of Hama and other similar events in the Syrian Arab Republic and other parts of the Arab world were plotted and executed by his own Government with the help and advice of the United States of America and its allies. While Tel Aviv and Washington possess the original plans, we in Damascus have the irrefutable evidence.

15. I remember seeing a programme on American television on Saturday at a quarter to ten in which it was admitted that mercenaries are being recruited in the United States to be sent to our region.

16. The fifth conclusion is that the Hama conspiracy against Syria and other acts of sabotage, such as the Azbakieh massacre of innocent civilians, were not concocted in Tel Aviv in recent times, but were

planned as early as 1950. I should like to refer members of the Council to the memoirs of Mr. Blum's former boss, who, as early as 1954, was programming a scheme to destroy Syria and Lebanon from inside. Moshe Sharett's personal diaries reveal clearly that Israel's strategic purpose was to employ covert, in-depth terrorist operations inside the Arab world both for espionage and to create fear, tension and instability. The former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel confided, in his memoirs, that as early as 1954 there existed an Israeli blueprint to create a puppet State in Lebanon and to perpetrate subversive activities in Syria.

17. Today, in 1982, Israel has more than ever an interest in bleeding Syria from inside, for Syria remains the garrison of resistance and of steadfastness and fidelity to the Arab cause. We hold both Israel and the United States responsible for all subversive acts, under any banner or denomination, that have taken place in Syria.

18. Our sixth and final conclusion is that the United States is plotting to minimize the gravity of Israeli lawlessness in the whole region in order to absolve its territorial base, Israel, of its crimes, and to justify its sinister designs against Palestinians, Lebanese and Syrians. The designs of the United States are amply clear to us, for no Arab is fooled by American wooing, and no amount of acrobatics or diplomatic buffoonery is likely to amuse us or to deflect our attention. No amount of propaganda will place us on the defensive, for our cause is universally recognized as being just; we are on the offensive.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

20. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Sir, my delegation has already had an opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. Your guidance of the Council in the first half of April, at a time when a number of difficult issues came up before it, has shown that you richly deserve the compliments paid to you by several speakers here.

21. I am grateful to you and to the members of the Council for the opportunity you have given me to present our views on the latest events in the occupied Arab territories, which form the subject of the current debate.

22. The shooting and killing of innocent civilians, particularly women and children, anywhere is regrettable and is to be condemned. It is particularly reprehensible when it occurs in a place of worship. Regardless of faith or religious conviction, one cannot but be overwhelmed by a feeling of shock and indignation. The details regarding the criminal act of sacrilege and

murder perpetrated against the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock have been presented to the Council by His Majesty Hassan II, King of Morocco, in his capacity as Chairman of the Al-Quds Committee, in the message that was read out to the Council by the representative of Morocco [2352nd meeting, para. 15].

23. Further information on the incident and its consequences, in terms both of loss of lives of the faithful and of damage to the holy mosque are contained in the statement issued by the Islamic Higher Council in Jerusalem on 12 April [S/14982, annex]. The representative of Saudi Arabia has articulated the sentiments of shock and indignation of Muslims all over the world [2353rd meeting, para. 60].

24. The news of this wanton act of violence and cruelty against innocent human beings and sacrilege of the holy place of worship held in the highest veneration by all Muslims has been received in India with profound distress and a sense of outrage. The people of India, in particular the millions of Muslims there, share the grave concern and deep anguish of the entire Islamic world over these recent deplorable developments in Jerusalem.

25. Acts of sacrilege against holy places and violence and murder should be condemned wherever they may occur. If they occur in the territories of lawful Governments, the appropriate machinery of the Governments concerned should be able to deal with the problem and to root out the underlying malady. But in the case of Jerusalem, which Israel has occupied and declared its "eternal capital" in total defiance of numerous decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the rule of law does not apply equally to all its inhabitants. Jerusalem, which should have remained the common heritage of the three faiths which consider it holy, has become the scene of constant persecution and humiliation of the people of the Islamic faith. The General Assembly, as well as the Security Council, has declared time and again that attempts made by Israel to alter the status of Jerusalem are illegal and null and void. The United Nations has repeatedly urged Israel to withdraw from Palestine and other occupied territories, including Jerusalem, occupied since 1967. Until and unless such withdrawal is secured, peace and harmony cannot be established in that region, and the repetition of violent and impermissible acts such as the one that occurred a week ago cannot be prevented.

26. Against the background of Israel's intransigence, the perpetration of the recent act in the Al-Aqsa Mosque assumes a sinister significance. It must be seen in the context of the persistent violation by Israel of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the denial of the fundamental rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories. The recent events cannot be divorced from the general atmosphere of hatred and anti-Arab fanaticism, which is being deliberately encouraged.

27. India, which has consistently supported the just cause of the Palestinians and the Arab world, deplores the recent events in Jerusalem. We are particularly perturbed that yet another dangerous dimension has been added to the already explosive situation in West Asia, which continues to threaten international peace and security. We consider these events as symptomatic of the underlying problems in West Asia. It is a rude reminder to the international community that the need to find a just and lasting solution is more urgent than ever before.

28. The Council has once again been asked to deal with a situation that threatens peace and international security. We do hope that the Council will generate sufficient political will to deal with the current situation, as well as to take immediate action to resolve the conflict in West Asia for which a number of proposals have already been presented to the Council over the years.

29. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

30. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): Sir, first of all I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. I should like also to recall the struggle of your country, and of African countries in general, against colonialism and racism—the same problems facing the Palestinian and Arab people.

31. Israel and South Africa exercise the same policy and are both racist entities.

32. Once again the Council convenes to consider the deteriorating situation in the occupied Arab territories resulting from the latest criminal acts, perpetrated last Sunday, by the Zionist occupation troops, who invaded the Al-Aqsa Mosque and fired upon the congregation at prayer, causing loss of lives and inflicting injuries on many.

33. We must not view this criminal act in isolation from the other racist criminal acts committed by the Zionist gangs against the Palestinian people in particular, and against Islamic sites and Muslims in general. The record of the Zionist entity is full of such barbaric criminal acts, of which we shall mention by way of example only the following: the oppression of the Palestinian people, its expulsion from its homeland and the massacre of Deir Yassin; the burning of the Al-Aqsa Mosque in 1969; the excavations conducted beneath the Islamic Holy Places; the annexation of Al-Quds and its designation as an "eternal capital"; the shutting down of schools and universities; the expulsion of and premeditated assassination attempts against Palestinian national leaders, such as Mr. Bas-sam Al-Shaka'a and Mr. Karim Khalaf, the mayors of Nablus and Ramallah; the dissolution of the Munic-

ipal Council of Al-Bireh, the expulsion of the mayor, Mr. Ibrahim Al-Tawil, and the installation of Israeli officers in their place; and the encouragement of and supplying of arms and ammunition to Zionist terrorist organizations.

34. Ever since its forcible acquisition of Palestine, this entity has persistently implemented a racist policy based on aggression, expansionism and the annexation of the occupied Arab territories to achieve Zionist control over them through the confiscation of Arab lands and possessions, the expulsion of Arab inhabitants and the establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories. The objective that the Zionist movement seeks behind these barbaric and criminal acts is the elimination of Islamic sanctuaries and civilization and the establishment of a racist community in which a Zionist who has been living in any country in the world is granted the right of citizenship in Palestine while it is the lot of the Palestinian Arab citizen to be deprived of his citizenship and right to self-determination.

35. The recent Zionist transgression against the Al-Aqsa Mosque was a premeditated act on the part of the occupation authorities. It was not the act of an individual, as claimed by the representative of the Zionist entity in his statement before the Council. Furthermore, it constituted a stark violation of Islamic sanctity and a challenge to the sentiments of Muslims all over the world. That crime also constituted a stark violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.¹

36. The greed of the Zionist entity does not end with the forcible acquisition of Palestine and the annexation of the occupied Arab territories. What we are witnessing and hearing today about the intensified military mobilization against southern Lebanon and the threat of its being occupied on the pretext of maintaining the security of the Zionist entity clearly illustrates the expansionist intentions of that entity. Southern Lebanon is now expected to be the next victim of the Israeli greed for land.

37. However, the Zionist entity would never have been able to persist in these terrorist acts had it not been for the encouragement and the military, economic and political support it receives from the Government of the United States. This is the kind of support that has made out of this entity a striking force in the Middle East capable of directing its terrorist acts against any Arab country, in addition to the fact that the United States is attempting to control and contain the Arab region through the threat of Israel.

38. Resolutions of condemnation alone are no longer sufficient to terminate the terrorist aggressive acts prevailing in the occupied Arab territories. The Zionist entity has consistently ridiculed the resolutions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly, as it has disdained world public opinion. The Council, furthermore, has failed on many occasions to

adopt deterrent resolutions against the Zionist entity as a result of the misuse of the right of veto by the United States. The Council is required to confront this Zionist challenge and to shoulder the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter of the United Nations by imposing the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter against the aggressive Zionist entity.

39. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The recent attack on the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem was a grave incident which caused many casualties among the Arab people. While expressing regret at the incident, the Israeli authorities continue to suppress the Palestinian and Arab inhabitants by dispatching even more troops and police. This atrocity by Israel has aroused indignation and condemnation from the international community. It was correct and timely for the Islamic nations to demand the urgent convening of the Security Council to consider the grave events now taking place in the occupied Palestinian territory, and particularly in Jerusalem. The Chinese delegation fully supports their just action.

40. For a long time, the Israeli authorities have been carrying out a policy of suppression and taking a series of hostile actions against the Palestinian and Arab peoples in the occupied Arab territories. These include arbitrary arrests, expulsions and the murder of Palestinians under various pretexts, interference in the religious faith of the Arab people by different means, desecration of Islamic cultural sites in Jerusalem and the illegal and unilateral annexation of Jerusalem. These outrageous acts on the part of the Israeli authorities have been an insult to Muslims and have provoked massive protests by the Palestinian people. We fully understand the feelings of the Islamic nations and peoples towards Jerusalem and sympathize with them. We support their just position of opposing Israel's atrocities.

41. The sanguinary act of violence that took place on 11 April in Jerusalem has further revealed the designs of the Israeli authorities deliberately to alter the legal status, physical features and demographic composition of the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, in disregard of the norms of international law and the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. Israel's latest act of escalation is by no means isolated. In recent days, Israel has been massing troops along its border with Lebanon and threatening major military action against the Palestinian guerrillas. At the same time, Israel is making excuses to delay its withdrawal from Sinai. Those serious and co-ordinated steps taken by the Begin Government in pursuance of its persistent policy of aggression and expansion endanger peace and security in the Middle East. The development of the present situation requires serious attention from the international community. The Chinese Government strongly condemns Israel for the acts I have just mentioned.

42. The Chinese Government resolutely supports the Palestinian and Arab peoples in their just struggle

to recover the lost territories and restore their national rights. In our view, the Council should strongly condemn Israel for its criminal acts of violating the Charter of the United Nations and human rights in the occupied territories and should take effective measures to ensure the implementation of the relevant Council resolutions and an end to the atrocities committed by Israel in the occupied territories.

43. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I simply wish to inform the Council that today Israel moved its judicial machinery and started implementing its laws and decisions of its courts in the occupied Golan Heights. I need hardly state, because the Council already knows it, that serious disturbances are still going on in the occupied territories, with the accompanying Israeli brutality; people are suffering injury and there is grievous loss of life. I am regularly receiving cables about the events. I shall not enter into details. I shall, however, give some examples and examine what they mean: that is, are they lone incidents or are they a part of a pattern and an objective?

44. For something must come out of this debate which is meaningful to the problems posed by Israel's 15 years of occupation of our people in the occupied territories.

45. The Council has during the week listened to speakers representing a wide spectrum of humanity, representing countries which have expressed their shock and abhorrence in regard to the Zionist entity, which has manifestly gone berserk—and I mean berserk—not only in its sacrilegious acts perpetrated against one of humanity's holy places and legacies, but also in its abominable acts of oppression, cold-blooded murder and relentless striving to commit the genocidal act of eradicating the very survival of the Palestinian people through terror and intimidation of them in their own ancestral homeland.

46. What we have witnessed, and are witnessing every day, is the final phase in this fiendish and ultimate plan of unbridled conquest, oppression and eradication, with hardly any parallels in the annals of the United Nations.

47. An Ambassador from Europe made a pointed and very appropriate remark to me a month ago. He said, "If by some miracle the Palestinian question found a just and lasting solution, we would be hard put to it to fill our agendas in the various forums of the United Nations." I replied that it was far-fetched to expect such a miracle, in the foreseeable future at least, but that we should, if it did take place, use our imagination and concentrate more on issues such as outer space in addition to intractable problems such as the New International Economic Order, genuine disarmament—armaments being the greatest menace to the world—and many other extremely pivotal issues. But in the meantime we find ourselves compelled to deal with the unending catalogue of blatant aggres-

sions which the imposition of zionism and its racist ideology has inflicted not only on the Palestinian people but also throughout the entire Middle East region and beyond.

48. And yet the representative of the Israeli entity has the temerity to complain, with his acknowledged—

49. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

50. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, I would request you to instruct the representative of Jordan to refer to a Member State of the United Nations by the name under which it was admitted to the Organization.

51. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would ask the representative of Jordan to continue his statement.

52. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I think that the answer to what the Israeli representative has just said will become clear as I continue my statement.

53. I repeat: In the meantime we find ourselves compelled to deal with the unending catalogue of blatant aggressions which the imposition of zionism and its racist ideology has inflicted upon the Palestinian people and by corollary throughout the entire Middle East region and beyond.

54. And yet the representative of the Israeli entity has the temerity to complain, with his acknowledged and bellicose theatrics, that Israel is singled out for complaint at the United Nations. We do not initiate—

55. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Point of order.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would ask the representative of Israel not to interrupt the statement of the representative of Jordan. He will soon have an opportunity to speak. I would ask the representative of Jordan to continue his statement.

57. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Point of order. I should again like to request that the representative of Jordan be instructed to refer to my country by its proper name, under which it was admitted to the United Nations.

58. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I continue: And yet the representative of the Israeli entity has the temerity to complain, with his acknowledged and bellicose theatrics, that Israel is singled out for complaint at the United Nations. We do not initiate complaints because we have nothing better to do. In fact, it is eating up—

59. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Point of order.

60. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Mr. President, I think that you have instructed the representative of the Israeli entity to stop interrupting. I hope that he will heed your order—

61. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Jordan.

62. I should like to remind members that it is appropriate to call States by their proper names. I think that that is a tradition of the Council and of the United Nations. I would request the representative of Jordan to bear that comment in mind and to continue his statement.

63. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): As I have said, I have deliberately referred to the representative of "the Israeli entity" for reasons that I am about to explain. He is totally in the wrong when he claims that Israel was admitted to the United Nations under that name, as I shall explain in a minute.

64. We do not initiate complaints because we have nothing better to do. In fact, it is eating up the time we should be giving to our other important duties, as it is eating up the energies of the members of the Council and the energies, resources and tranquillity of life throughout the entire region and beyond it.

65. Let me tell Mr. Blum that under international law and United Nations resolutions, and because of its present expanded and bloated size, the entity he represents is illegitimate. It seized by conquest far larger areas than were allotted to it under the only resolutions which decided the fate of the Mandate for Palestine, namely, General Assembly resolutions 181 (II), on the boundaries, and 194 (III), on the Palestinian people's right to return to their country. It is therefore illegitimate. Indeed, Israel's admission to membership of the United Nations was specifically made conditional upon Israel's implementation of those resolutions, and in 1949 before the General Assembly the Israeli representative made a pledge that Israel, having achieved admission, would implement them. Not only did they renege and defy the United Nations, but they continued their course of expansion, conquest, colonization, annexation and barbaric oppression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

66. Until the mid-1960s the United Nations was seized of not only the question of Palestine but also that of the fate of the Palestinian people who had remained in their territory. They were put under military control. A Palestinian citizen of Nazareth was barred from going to Haifa without getting a military permit—even though Haifa is possibly half-an-hour's ride away. They were placed under military rule between 1948 and 1965. Furthermore, 90 per cent of their lands have been arbitrarily confiscated, with the result that the Palestinians of those territories have been left with only 10 per cent of the land to survive on and have started a protest, called "Land Day", against the continuing confiscation of whatever little has remained in their hands.

67. And yet the representative of an illegitimate entity—and I am talking now in terms of law; I am not attributing any adjectives—who should not have been seated here in the first place under international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the Organization's resolutions, gives himself licence to abuse in his vulgar and monotonous tirades at the end of every meeting each and every Member State for expressing revulsion at the savagery of the entity he represents.

68. It has become a familiar pattern, which should not be dignified by a rebuttal. He never deals with any specific issue which is the subject of a complaint or debate. Indeed, how can he explain the daily misdeeds of his Fascist régime—stealing peoples' lands, properties, water and other resources, annexing occupied territories, acts of oppression, crime, abducting and killing women and children? He talks about the internal affairs of other sovereign, independent States which find themselves under a moral obligation to condemn the practices of his illegitimate authorities.

69. When he talks about the abominable attempt on the life of His Holiness the Pope, he deliberately overlooks the fact that every single Arab and Islamic country and citizen and individual has condemned that foul deed. His Holiness, I would inform him—and I know this very well—sympathizes fully with the plight of the Palestinian people and has constantly prayed for their redemption, as did his predecessors. And while he tries to implicate Turkey he forgets that that would-be assassin had been sentenced to death for a previous crime committed in Turkey.

70. How often does the representative of the Israeli entity have to be reminded that when the Council meets it does so to consider specifically the subject of the complaint which is the item on the agenda before it? The Israeli representative deliberately tries to divert the Council's attention from the issue under consideration and engages in abusive language, on a global basis, against any and every State, which expresses its condemnation of Israel's heinous acts.

71. It is illegal for any State to interfere in the internal affairs of another State, all the more so when the offender, as in this case, is not in its present form a legal entity, properly so called, and will not be until it complies scrupulously with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

72. I believe that the time has come for the international community to cease tolerating any longer a racist régime which vies and co-ordinates with the abominable behaviour of racist South Africa.

73. I shall not burden the Council by reciting the daily acts of abuse against little children, women and other villagers who are made to spend all night outdoors. I need hardly recall how many are being wounded every day by the trigger-happy Israeli soldiers. There have been numerous casualties over the past two to

three weeks, and I shall not even talk about earlier casualties. However, I should like to refer to some of the comments that have been made about those facts by Israeli sources.

74. The widely respected Tel Aviv newspaper *Ha'aretz* said the following in a recent editorial:

"The Government, which thought it ought to allow the Minister of Defence an opportunity to break the Arab resistance, would do well to call a halt to this path. 'Greater Israel' is not worth the brutalization which will spread within us as a result of pursuing methods of repression required to attain it."

75. Amnon Rubenstein, who is Dean of the Law School at Tel Aviv University and the Parliamentary Leader of the tiny Shinui Party, complained during a parliamentary debate that Begin was sacrificing Israel's morality in an effort to control the situation in the occupied territories, and added:

"There is a legitimate discussion concerning territory. There is no doubt that we must have defensible borders. But what will happen to the Jews here—what kind of society will there be here? And what will happen to the Arabs? Does anyone believe that they will [peacefully agree to] be a people without a political voice, without being allowed to have a say in their destiny?"

76. The harshest judgement came from Yeshayahu Leibowitz, a 79-year-old professor at Hebrew University, who was quoted by the *Jerusalem Post* as having said that "all occupation Governments are proto-Nazi".

77. If the occupation lasts long enough, it invites the dehumanization that makes collective punishment of entire villages or even an entire race seem less abhorrent. Israel is sliding down that slippery slope.

78. *Davar*, the voice of the Labour Party, said in an editorial that:

"The most worrisome problem, which should concern all thinking Israelis, is the moral deterioration bound up in forcing Israeli rule on a hostile population."

79. I shall go no further. I shall merely state that what we are debating today is only a symptom of a much more lethal disease which has afflicted the Israelis themselves as well as brutalized and dehumanized the Palestinian people and the entire region, with serious—indeed, dire—consequences for the peace and tranquillity of the world. What we are discussing is not an isolated incident. What chief Rabbi Goren has said to some very senior people, both in Europe and in the United States, is that the time has come to demolish the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock and to build in their place the Temple Mount.

80. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

81. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan—he seems to be getting excited. That is my characterization of his country.

82. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would ask members of the Council to keep calm.

83. In accordance with rule 30 of the provisional rules of procedure, I reminded the Council that it is the practice to refer to States by their official names. I therefore ask members of the Council and others who participate in this debate to abide by that practice.

84. I call on the representative of Israel.

85. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, with all due respect I would say that on several occasions you permitted the Jordanian representative to refer to my country by a designation other than its official one. I see no reason why I should not apply my characterization—which truly reflects the situation on the ground—and use the designation “the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan”; or, if the representative of Jordan so prefers, “the Jordanian entity”; or, again if he so prefers, “the Jordanian non-entity”. He can have his choice. But I think that we should not apply a double standard in this regard too. We apply a double standard in the Organization in so many respects. At least when it comes to the names of States, Mr. President, either you permit the representative of Jordan to deviate from the rule, in regard to Israel, or you do not permit it. But if he is permitted to do so, with all due respect, I think that I am entitled to the same treatment.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I did remind the representative of Jordan that Member States of the United Nations should be addressed by their official names. I wish to say the same thing to the representative of Israel. If this presidential ruling is challenged by anyone I shall have to invoke rule 30 and call for a vote by the Council.

87. Having said that, I take it that this question is now closed, and I call on the representative of Israel to continue his statement.

88. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of Jordan did not challenge your ruling, Mr. President: he just ignored it. So from now on I shall refer to him as the representative of Jordan, it being understood that I regard his country as the Palestinian Arab State.

89. The representative of Jordan quoted one of our European colleagues who asked what would happen to the agenda of the Organization if the Arab-Israeli conflict were resolved. I think it is a good question.

I am not sure that the answer the representative of Jordan gave to that question was a bad one, because I believe that outer space is as remote from earth as are the deliberations on the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Organization from reality. What is more, the flights of hallucination of the Jordanian representative are as remote from the realities on the ground in the Middle East as is outer space from earth.

90. Let us first take his basic thesis, his reliance on General Assembly resolution 181 (II). Here we have this protector, this defender, of resolution 181 (II). Why? Because 34 years after the adoption of that resolution, many memories are apparently short, and quite a number of those seated in this chamber have perhaps forgotten what happened in 1947 and in 1948.

91. Well, just to refresh memories, let me point out that Transjordan—that was the name at that time of the country which Mr. Nuseibeh now represents—together with all other Arab States, rejected General Assembly resolution 181 (II) and resorted to the force of arms to destroy that resolution. The documentation of the United Nations on this point is unequivocal. Let me briefly quote from it.

92. For instance, the United Nations Palestine Commission, in its first special report to the Security Council, dated 16 February 1948, reported to the Council—please listen, Mr. Nuseibeh:

“Powerful Arab interests, both inside and outside Palestine, are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged therein.”¹²

93. Two months later, the Commission reported again that Arab use of force had reached such proportions that the implementation of the resolution had become impossible.

94. Then, on 14 May 1948, the State of Israel was proclaimed, and instantly all Arab countries—among them, the country represented by Mr. Nuseibeh, who now relies on General Assembly resolution 181 (II)—invaded the former Palestine Mandate, with a view to destroying the fledgling State of Israel.

95. Jordan—Transjordan in those days—openly admitted that it entered Palestine in order to destroy that resolution. And the Transjordanian answer came up before the Security Council in May 1948—to be precise, on 22 May. Let me quote from the statement made by the representative of the United States of America, Senator Warren Austin, in this regard:

“Probably the most important and the best evidence we have on that subject”—that is, the subject of Arab aggression—“is contained in the admissions of the countries whose five armies have invaded Palestine that they are carrying on a war.

"Their statements are the best evidence we have of the international character of this aggression. There is nothing in the resolution about aggression; it is a word which is not included in the text but which has been mentioned in the statements of these aggressors"—including Transjordan. "They tell us quite frankly that their business in Palestine is political and that they are there to establish a unitary State. Of course, the statement that they are there to make peace is rather remarkable in view of the fact that they are waging war. We find that this is characterized, on the part of King Abdullah"—King Abdullah of Transjordan—"by a certain contumacy towards the United Nations and the Security Council. He has sent us an answer to our questions. These were questions addressed to him, as a ruler who is occupying land outside his domain, by the Security Council, a body which is organized in the world to ask these questions of him. As will be seen from page 2 of document S/760—the first page of which contains the actual questions—in a reply addressed to the President of the Security Council he answers the questions addressed to him by that body. . . .

"The contumacy of that reply to the Security Council is the very best evidence of the illegal purpose of this Government in invading Palestine with armed forces and conducting the war which it is waging there. It is against the peace; it is not on behalf of the peace. It is an invasion with a definite purpose.

"Therefore, here we have the highest type of evidence of the international violation of the law: the admission by those who are committing this violation." [See 301st meeting, pp. 41 to 43]

So much for the statement of the United States.

96. The representative of France, Mr. Parodi, stated on 20 May 1948:

"the moment the regular forces of several countries crossed their frontiers and entered a territory which, whatever its status, was not their own, the moment fighting continued in these conditions and became more serious, we clearly had to deal with the question of international peace within the meaning of the Charter." [See 297th meeting, p. 17]

Of course, among the countries that crossed the borders that were not their own and entered territory that was not their own was the Kingdom of Transjordan.

97. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Gromyko, stated on 21 May 1948:

"The USSR delegation cannot but express surprise at the position adopted by the Arab States in the Palestine question, and particularly at the fact that those States—or some of them, at least—have resorted to such action as sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine." [See 299th meeting, p. 7]

For those who may ask themselves what liberation movement Mr. Gromyko was referring to, I might point out that it was Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people. I am sure that Mr. Troyanovsky will bear me out on this.

98. Mr. Tarassenko, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, stated on 20 May 1948:

"We are concerned with the plain fact that a number of Palestine's neighbour States have sent their troops into Palestine. Our knowledge of that fact is not based on rumours, or on newspaper reports, but on official documents signed by the Governments of those States informing the Security Council that their troops have entered Palestine. I refer, in particular, to the documents signed and sent by the Governments of Egypt [document S/743] and Transjordan [document S/748].

"Nor can there be any doubt of the purpose for which those forces have entered Palestine. We may be sure they have not gone there for a summer camp vacation or for exercises. Those forces have a definite military and political purpose.

"In these circumstances it is difficult to deny that we are faced with a situation involving a breach of the peace." [See 297th meeting, pp. 4 and 5]

99. I could go on. Those are only some of the statements that were made in the Security Council at the time.

100. Mr. Nuseibeh is banking on the short memory of certain members. Your country, Mr. Nuseibeh, committed aggression in 1948 together with other countries, invaded a territory that was not its own, purported to annex it, illegally, in violation of international law, and you come here before the Council to speak on behalf of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), which your country sought to destroy?

101. It is an affront to history that the representative of the Jordanian entity should complain to this body about Jerusalem. For Jordan stands condemned as the first country in modern history to bombard the Holy City. It was Jordan—or Transjordan as it was called in those days—which, intent on destroying the fledgling State of Israel and on unlawfully grabbing territory

for itself, attacked Jerusalem in 1948 in clear defiance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Transjordan placed Jerusalem under siege and opened fire on its inhabitants and on its historical and religious sites. Jordanian forces attacked and destroyed the densely populated Jewish quarter of Jerusalem's Old City with mortar shells and seized the eastern part of Jerusalem, including the historic walled section, which contains religious shrines holy to Jews, Christians and Muslims.

102. In flagrant violation of the 1949 Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement,³ Jordan then barred access by Jews to their Holy Places and cultural institutions. Further, Mr. Nuseibeh's Government began to eliminate systematically every trace of Jerusalem's Jewish past. Fifty-eight synagogues—58 synagogues, Mr. Nuseibeh—some of them of great antiquity, like the 700-year-old Churva synagogue, were wantonly destroyed and desecrated. And please do not come again with the story about two and possibly four synagogues: I have the full list of all the 58 synagogues here with me. I have read them out before. You left the Council chamber on that occasion. I would not want you to repeat that performance.

103. Those synagogues that were not razed to the ground were converted into toilets, stables and hen-houses, filled with dung-heaps, garbage and carcasses. In the process, hundreds of holy Torah scrolls and books, reverently preserved for generations, were plundered and burnt to ashes. On the Mount of Olives, a hallowed spot for Jews for centuries, 38,000 out of the 50,000 tombstones in the ancient Jewish burial ground were torn up, profaned, broken into pieces and used as flagstones, steps and building materials for public latrines and Jordanian army barracks.

104. Large areas of the cemetery were leveled and converted into parking areas and gas stations. Through the devastated remains of the graves, the Jordanian Government cut an asphalt road to provide a short cut to a new hotel built irreverently on the top of the Mount of Olives, the Inter-Continental Hotel.

105. Nor were the discriminatory policies of Jordan directed only against Jews, who, as is well known, were not permitted to live in the Jordanian-occupied section of Jerusalem, although they constituted in Jerusalem, as they have uninterruptedly for the past 150 years, the vast majority of the city's population. I mention this because a number of speakers have resorted in this debate to the Nazi term of "Judaization": Jerusalem is about to be "Judaized". Now, Jerusalem, as you know, Sir, has been the heart and soul of the Jewish people for the past 3,000 years, and no people except for the Jewish people has made Jerusalem its capital. The majority of Jerusalem's population for the past 150 years, uninterruptedly, has been Jewish. But I think it is proper that the bigots in this debate should use the term "Judaization"; I think it is illustrative of the mentality which prompts them to make those statements.

106. During the Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967, stagnation set in in East Jerusalem and there was considerable emigration from it, since the Jordanian entity discouraged economic development in Jerusalem with a view to ensuring the primacy of Amman. Particularly hard-hit were the Christian residents under Jordanian occupation, and their numbers decreased significantly during that period—from 19,000 in 1948 to 11,000 in 1967.

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

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

109. In October 1966 the Jordanian Government took further measures with a view to discriminating against Christian ecclesiastical institutions and clergy, such as the abolition of exemption from customs duties previously granted to those institutions and clergy. A Jordanian law passed in 1965 was from then on strictly enforced also against Christian educational institutions. It required them to abandon foreign languages of instruction and to substitute Arabic for them. The teaching of the Koran was also introduced on that occasion.

110. When Jerusalem was reunited in 1967, the number of its non-Jewish residents—Muslim and Christians—was about 70,000, roughly one quarter of the population. The non-Jewish population of the City has since risen to more than 112,000. This incidentally, is my response to the strange allegation contained in the strange statement of the representative of Syria. Jerusalem is not being emptied of its Muslim and Christian residents; quite to the contrary, their number has risen by about 60 per cent since 1967.

111. Between 1948 and 1967, during the Jordanian illegal occupation of Judea and Samaria and of the eastern part of Jerusalem, Jordan also barred the Muslim citizens of Israel from visiting and praying in mosques of the Old City of Jerusalem. They gained access to them only in 1967, when the city was reunited.

112. That, then, was the lamentable record of the Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967. The Jordanian representative would do well to remember this before embarking on false charges against other countries.

113. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

114. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): It is customary for the Zionists to be selective about recalling history. In fact it seems to me that for them history starts and ends either with their presence or with their absence from Palestine. For example, whenever they come with the Bible in their hand and speak about the right of the Jews in Palestine, they say: Well, 3,000 years ago there was a Moses who came to Palestine, and since then Palestine is for the Jews since it was given to them by God.

115. Now, before Moses came to Palestine, everyone knows—at least, everyone who believes the Bible—that there were people already there in Palestine. And after the end of Jewish control over Palestine, other people lived there—namely, the Palestinian people. But the Zionists teach the history of Palestine selectively, starting from their presence there and continuing until their absence. For example, the representative of the Government of Menachem Begin does not remember that until 1917 Palestine was inhabited by Palestinian Arabs, 95 per cent of whom were Christians or Muslims and 5 per cent Palestinian Jews; and that over 75 per cent of the inhabitants of Israel today were not present then. In fact, he himself—even in 1948, when the State of Israel was proclaimed—was perhaps in Czechoslovakia. By the date of the proclamation of the State of Israel there were only 750,000 Jews in Palestine while there were over 1.5 million Palestinians. Therefore, two thirds of the population of Palestine, which was one unit, were Palestinians Arabs and one third were colonial settlers, most of whom—and the representative of the United Kingdom can correct me if I am mistaken—came as illegal aliens to Palestine without the permission of the authority in control of Palestine or any consultation of the population of Palestine.

116. Let us review briefly how the State of Israel came to be “proclaimed” in 1948. We know that there were five or six Jewish terrorist gangs in Palestine. One of them was led by none other than the present Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Menachem Begin, who was himself responsible for the massacre at the King David Hotel on 22 July 1946 and for the massacre at Deir Yassin on 9 April 1948—which was a month and five days before the proclamation of the State of Israel.

117. By the date that the State of Israel was “proclaimed”, the Zionist gangs had occupied more terri-

tory than had been allocated to them by the partition resolution [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*]. In fact they had occupied Jaffa and many other parts of Palestine. So the territory over which the State of Israel was “proclaimed” exceeded what had been allocated to the Jewish communities in Palestine in accordance with the partition resolution.

118. We must remember that sovereignty resides in the people. Had the Palestinian people—who were then threatened with extermination by the Jewish Zionist gangs—not called on the other Arab peoples to come to assist them, Israel would have occupied all of Palestine in 1948. The Palestinian people were the people who had been granted the right to establish their own independent State in accordance with General Assembly resolution 181 (II). When they were threatened by the superior power of the Zionist gangs in Palestine, they exercised their sovereign right and called on the Arab countries to come to their assistance. Therefore, when the Arabs entered the land of Palestine they were not violating the sovereignty of the State of Israel illegally established in 1948. They came to assist the Palestinian people at the request of the Palestinian people, who are already being driven out of their homes and property by Zionist Jewish gangs.

119. In the period between 1947—after the adoption of the partition resolution—and 1948—the date of the establishment of the State of Israel—300,000 Palestinians became refugees. And following the establishment of the State of Israel, more than 650,000 others became refugees.

120. It is sufficient for the representative of Israel to look at the memoirs of Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, where he says himself that under instructions from the late Mr. Ben-Gurion, he was ordered to expel the citizens of Lod and Ramla and, together with his troops, to escort them out of Lod to the city of Ramallah, 15 miles away, under gunpoint.

121. So, when the Israeli Zionists speak about the Arab countries’ invasion of Israel, they like to forget what they did to the Palestinians which forced the Palestinians to ask their brothers, the Arabs, to come to their assistance.

122. It is also ironic that the representative of Israel speaks about international law. Now, I want to ask whether international law allows Israel to annex the Golan Heights or to annex Jerusalem. Because if someone wants to abide by international law and invoke international law, he must have full and total respect for international law.

123. Secondly, international law and all international conventions consider the right to self-determination an inalienable right of people. If, as he claims, they represent international law, why do they not respect the international law that is pertinent to the

right of the Palestinian people to self-determination? Or is this right of self-determination for the Palestinian people in contradiction to their international law? I want to know: if one invokes one aspect of international law, does not international law have to be applied in all cases? International law does not allow the occupation of other peoples' territories by the use of force. International law does not allow Israel to expel the citizens of Palestine to other countries. International law does not give Israel permission to kill small children in the streets. International law does not give Israel any legitimacy over occupied Palestinian and Arab territories.

124. So if someone invokes international law, he must respect international law as such. But I know, and everyone in this chamber knows, that Israel has no respect for international law. It has never respected international law and it is willing to accept international law only in so far as such law serves Israel's own interests and expansionism.

125. I challenge the representative of Israel to produce a map of the 1947 partition of Palestine and the map on which the State of Israel was established in 1948. Then we shall see how Israel violated the partition resolution when it declared itself a State.

126. Enough is enough. We have listened so often to the distortions and the manoeuvres of the Israeli representative and his predecessors here in this chamber and everywhere else. They like to accuse everyone of having short memories. It seems to me that they feel that the Palestinian presence in Palestine is an accident; that is what they say now. But it is an accident that lasted 3,000 years—a long accident.

127. Israelis always want people to believe what they have to say, and other people's rights are totally ignored and regarded as having no relevance whatsoever. I posed a question yesterday, and I pose that same question today: it is a moral and a legal question, and I think it should be answered. How can Mr. Alan Goodman, the person who has been called a criminal by everyone, including the Government of Israel, take a plane out of Kennedy Airport and land in Tel Aviv and in two weeks' time become a citizen of Israel and in three weeks' time become a soldier carrying a machine-gun and terrorizing and killing people in my country, in my city, in my Jerusalem, while I, a Palestinian, do not have the right to attend the funeral of my father?

128. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Jordan has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I now call on him.

129. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I happen to be one of those who lived through the period we are discussing right from the start—in fact, starting in 1930. I have today's newspapers, which show pictures of the demonstrations which occurred immediately following

the dastardly act against the Holy Sanctuary. The leaders of that demonstration, which Israel prevented and turned back, arresting many of the participants, were none other than the highest leaders of the Christian churches, as well as Muslim dignitaries. Because we are one people. The Palestinian people do not engage in divisiveness as between Muslim and Christian. And the same applies, of course, to Jordan.

130. The Israeli representative has read out an elaborate statement, which I can refute word for word. I did not even have to take notes in order to be able to prove to the Council the falsehood contained in that statement.

131. To begin with, Palestine was a Palestinian Arab country, and the last word on it, just before it was thrown to the United Nations, was that there should be established a unified State in which Arab and Jew would live in peace, tranquillity, normalcy and co-operation, without discrimination or distinction, and which would be an example to the rest of the world.

132. The entire question was brought to the United Nations. There was a United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, which presented two reports, one of them suggesting the partition of Palestine and the minority report suggesting a federal State. Naturally, the Palestinian people as well as the Arab world were opposed to the dismemberment of their country—and I am sure that no country around this table would accept such a thing. They therefore objected here at the United Nations to the dismembering of a country which had always been one integral territory.

133. But who brought about the events that the representative of Israel has talked about? The Palestinian people were never asked, either by plebiscite or through elections, or through anybody, to express their views as to whether they agreed or disagreed with the United Nations resolution [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*].

134. As a matter of fact, they were not given a chance to exercise that elemental right, which today we all regard as sacrosanct.

135. Three or four days after the adoption of the partition resolution, the Israeli war machine was unleashed against the entire unarmed Palestinian people. I am sure that the United Kingdom delegation would bear me out on this. No one was supposed to carry any arms and yet the Israelis had an organized army in addition to many terrorist and notorious organizations, foremost among which was the Irgun Zvai Leumi of Menachem Begin.

136. Now, during the British Mandate—even during the British Mandate—those people seized by force far more territory than was allocated to them under the partition plan. But that was not the end of the story. They waited until the British administration had

weakened sufficiently to enable them to intensify their seizure of more and more land. And this climaxed on 14-15 May 1947, as I was leaving the New City of Jerusalem, which incidentally is two-thirds Palestinian Arab and has been usurped by force by the Israeli forces. It belongs to us. I am not talking about what is called Arab Jerusalem; I am talking about West Jerusalem, where we own 70 per cent. As I was leaving Jerusalem because they had cut off the electric current, the Israelis started marching on the whole city, starting with the compound, which comprises the law courts and other Government offices, and taking over all the Palestinian Arab quarters, until they managed to seize all those quarters with the exception of two or three.

137. Thereafter they launched an unprovoked all-out attack against the Old City of Jerusalem. Prior to that, a month or two earlier, they had implanted 1,000 of their regular and irregular terrorist groups in the Jewish quarter of the Old City, against the express wishes of the Jewish inhabitants, who had begged them not to place any forces there, saying that they were safe and had nothing to fear. But the Israelis implanted those forces, and on the 15th they launched an all-out attack against the Old City of Jerusalem, in which there were huddled at least 90,000 to 100,000 Jerusalemites from the New City, West Jerusalem and what is now referred to as Arab Jerusalem.

138. It was on 18 May, at dawn, that a small contingent of the Jordan army arrived, at the pleading and urging of the citizens of Jerusalem, who were being subjected to the kind of massacre that the Israelis had carried out throughout Palestine. They asked Jordan to send some assistance. They had expended whatever little ammunition they had bought in the marketplace—at exorbitant prices that no country in the world could afford.

139. The Israeli representative says that Jordan's is an occupation force. The truth—and we have it in the records of the United Nations—is that the Jordan army, then known as the Arab Legion, was present throughout Palestine, and in the most strategic areas thereof, as a part of the allied war effort. The broadcasting station, only a few hundred yards away from the heart of the Jewish quarter in West Jerusalem, namely, Zion Square, was guarded by the Jordan army. It had been in Palestine for four or five years, for the duration of the war. Out of respect for the resolutions of the United Nations it withdrew promptly, by 14 May 1948, remaining outside Palestine until it had to respond to the appeal of the 90,000 or 100,000 citizens of Jerusalem who had been expelled from the western section of Jerusalem and those who had lived in the Old City in the first place. In co-operation with the local inhabitants, it managed to repel the massive attacks that were launched against the Old City.

140. Now I should like to ask a question. According to the Fitzgerald reports, that entire area and almost

all, or two thirds, of West Jerusalem were regarded as Palestinian Arab zones within the over-all *corpus separatum* that was devised by the United Nations. What right did the Israeli forces, including the Palmach, their striking force, have to attack the 90,000 or 100,000 citizens who were huddled in the Old City, most of whom had been expelled from the western parts of the city? If Jordan wanted to occupy or to take over Palestine, it was there for the taking. But in fact they withdrew on 14 May and re-entered only at the dawn of 18 May. There were 600 soldiers in all. They took prisoner the 1,000 Israeli soldiers who had been implanted there against the wishes of the Jewish inhabitants. It was during that fighting that Muslim shrines as well as Israeli synagogues were damaged. It took us years to repair them.

141. It was, then, not the Palestinian people who aborted the implementation of the General Assembly resolution. In fact, the Security Council was entrusted with the implementation of that resolution. The Palestinians were left in limbo. The mandatory Power was disintegrating and had withdrawn without ensuring any safeguards for the inhabitants, who were unarmed and were only beginning to buy arms in the western deserts of the Libyan Jamahiriya, where world-war battles had taken place, and who tried heroically and to the best of their ability to defend themselves until they had spent all their ammunition.

142. The Israeli representative said that the Arab armies entered to destroy Israel, to nip it in the bud. I know for sure—and perhaps this explains why some of the documents in the British Foreign Office have not yet been released—that the Arab leaders, in their talks with the late Mr. Ernest Bevin, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, had agreed that the Arab armies would come in to save the Palestinians from massacre and would stop at the partition and demarcation lines which had been delineated by the United Nations. The records are there; they are available. They did not enter to destroy Tel Aviv. All the Arab armies entered to save the Palestinians who were being massacred at the point of bayonets, in every town and in every village.

143. What is Jaffa? One hundred per cent Palestinian. What is Lydda? One hundred per cent Palestinian. What is Ramla? One hundred per cent Palestinian. What is Acre? One hundred per cent Palestinian. What is Jerusalem? Three quarters Palestinian, if we include Arab Jerusalem and two thirds of western Jerusalem.

144. We did not prevent the Israelis from going to the Wailing Wall. In fact the four Arab Governments concerned then, namely, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria, made a solemn pledge, in response to a request by the Palestine Conciliation Commission, to allow pilgrims, visitors and people belonging to all races and religions to visit their Holy Places. The Concilia-

tion Commission made the same request of the Israeli Government, and Mr Eytan, on behalf of Israel, replied that that needed further deliberations in the General Assembly—because the Israelis were reluctant to face the responsibility of allowing a Palestinian to return to his home a mere few hundred yards from the demarcation line.

145. The Armistice Commission dealt with this problem. I was there. There were certain conditions. One was that the Israelis would restore Jerusalem's centuries-old water supply. The electric company happened to have its engines in the western part, so they cut off the electricity and the water; and they closed the Jerusalem-Bethlehem road for a few miles and thus compelled Jordan to open a road across the hills so as to permit the people of Jerusalem to return to their homes. That is the most natural thing in the world. Yet the Israelis refused to do that, because they were far more interested in taking over our houses and properties and in looting all the savings of the Palestinian people rather than in saying their prayers at the Wailing Wall. That is a fact of life.

146. Let me add that during the period of unity between the West and East Banks, Israeli convoys were allowed to go to the Mount Scopus compound, where Hebrew University and Hadassah Hospital were located, under Jordanian guardianship. But then there was that notorious incident in 1954, when the army discovered that the Israelis were actually smuggling explosives in those convoys that were intended to keep intact Hebrew University and Hadassah Hospital.

147. The Israeli representative talked about discouraging Christian building and so on in Jerusalem. I challenge anyone to go and conduct a plebiscite in all the churches in Jerusalem and see how they feel about the Arabs' presence compared to that of the Israeli racists. The demonstrations that have taken place since Easter Sunday give a clear, unmistakable indication. We venerate all the monotheistic religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam. We make no distinction whatsoever. As far as the Palestinians are

concerned, the Palestinian national movement comprises as many Christians as Muslims.

148. Everybody was allowed to build. Of course, in those days, 30 years ago, we were falling on bad times and we did not expand enough. If we had had the opportunity that was offered a decade later, today Jerusalem would be one of the finest cities in the world—without the desecration and the deformities that the Israelis have inflicted upon it. It is an old city and any repairs or additions made necessary by natural deterioration have always been measured in terms of centuries, not years or decades.

149. Finally, I should like to say the following. I did not need to make any notes. I can answer what the representative of Israel said point by point in a volume, because I have been through it and I know what happened. I want to make this point in relation to the Israeli representative's claim that whereas the population of Jerusalem until 1976 was a mere 70,000, now it is 110,000. It may well be 110,000, but what is the reason? When they occupied all the territory extending from Bethlehem in the south to Ramallah in the north, the district of Jerusalem, according to the census conducted during the elections, comprised 300,000 to 400,000 persons; after the annexation of those areas one will observe a decrease of some 300,000 to 400,000 persons, not an increase. Usually, the Palestinian population doubles about every 18 to 20 years. It is the take-over of those cities and territories and their annexation to Jerusalem that results in the figure of 110,000 Jerusalemites and not 70,000.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series* vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

² *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Special Supplement No. 2*, document S/676; document A/AC.21/9, chap. I, para. 3 (c).

³ *Ibid.*, *Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1*.