

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN/SA COLLECTION

2241st MEETING: 30 JUNE 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2241)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)	1

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.

2241st MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 30 June 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Ole ÅLGÅRD (Norway).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2241)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the previous decisions [2233rd to 2236th and 2238th meetings], I invite the representatives of Israel and Pakistan to take a place at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Naik (Pakistan) took places at the Council table and Mr. Al-Saffar (Bahrain), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Halim (Malaysia), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. La-

raki (Morocco), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Zowawi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Djigo (Senegal), Mr. A. M. Adan (Somalia), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Alaini (Yemen), and Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Chad, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Mali, Oman, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon and the Upper Volta, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bouzarbia (Algeria), Mr. Kessely (Chad), Mr. Al-Hamzah (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Farah Dirir (Djibouti), Mr. Nguema-Mba (Gabon), Mr. Kouyaté (Guinea), Mr. Fernandes (Guinea-Bissau), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Elgariani (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Saleem (Maldives), Mr. Samake (Mali), Mr. Aboul-Nasr (Oman), Mr. Kilara (Uganda), Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon) and Mr. Ouédraogo (Upper Volta) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them a draft resolution sponsored by Bahrain, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates and Yemen [S/14031]. I have been informed by the sponsors that the following countries have joined them as co-sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Chad, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Mali, Oman, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon and Upper Volta.

4. The first speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): The position of Egypt with respect to the Holy City of Jerusalem has already been stated and defined in this debate [2234th meeting]. It would be redundant to restate it. I have asked to speak only to make a few additional points directly related to the Council's deliberations.

6. It is the well-established policy of Egypt to reject every attempt and oppose every measure which purports to alter the juridical and political status of Jerusalem. In that connection, Egypt deeply regrets and objects to the timing and implications of the recently announced Israeli decision to transfer the Prime Minister's office to Arab Jerusalem. It was, moreover, reported this morning on certain radio stations that the Israeli Parliament has decided to begin the first reading of the bill that would declare Jerusalem the capital of Israel. I have no information on that point from my Government, but to select the eve of the scheduled Security Council meetings to announce that provocative and illegal measure is ominous and cynical. If any such measure is taken, it will definitely have the most serious consequences.

7. Over 30 States have submitted a draft resolution [S/14031]. Egypt has carefully studied the draft. We note with satisfaction and appreciation that its provisions emanate from two basic concepts to which we are deeply committed. First, the draft categorically reaffirms previous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which declare all the Israeli measures invalid. Egypt has supported all these resolutions. Secondly, the draft reflects a fundamental legal norm: namely, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. The only logical corollary of this illegal norm is that territories occupied have to be vacated. Occupation and all its political and military ramifications have to be terminated.

8. It also follows that an occupying Power has to comply scrupulously with the relevant binding legal instruments that regulate and enumerate its obligations and responsibilities. It will be recalled that common article I of the four 1949 Geneva Conventions¹ has clearly entrusted all States party to the Conventions with a specific responsibility "to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention[s] in all circumstances." As the organ vested with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council has to assume this joint responsibility on behalf of the international community.

9. Upon instructions from my Government, my delegation has co-sponsored the draft resolution. I should like, moreover, to inform the Council that a few days ago, during the Organization of African Unity meeting in Freetown, Sierra Leone, Egypt initiated and submitted a draft resolution calling for the condemnation of Israel's policy on Jerusalem. This is yet another concrete expression of our rejection of a policy that can only have detrimental effects.

10. In conclusion, it should be emphasized again that Egypt is firmly committed to the attainment of a just, comprehensive and durable peace. All unilateral actions designed to perpetuate a *status quo* brought about by the use of force are illegal and harmful, and they obstruct the quest for peace. Genuine peace cannot be expected miraculously to emerge from short-sighted policies based on an ill-conceived concept to create so-called *faits accomplis*. The spirit of peace initiated by Egypt deserves a fair chance to seep through an accumulation of injustices and a heap of distrust. As President Sadat has recently stated:

"The effort which is wasted on futile exercises should be directed towards imaginative ways and means for promoting peace. Reconciliation cannot be obtained through the expropriation of land and the implanting of hostile entities in the heart of other people's land."

11. The adoption of the draft resolution would, in the view of my Government, undoubtedly be an added confirmation of the illegality of the Israeli policy and the Israeli designs on the Holy City. Egypt once more calls upon Israel to respect its international obligations and to carry out the injunctions of the Council.

12. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Algeria, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

13. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the Algerian delegation would like to reiterate its satisfaction at seeing you conducting the proceedings of the Council, which is meeting today to debate the situation prevailing in the Middle East. As we have already said, the Algerian delegation remains confident in your judgement, because it is you who have the formidable responsibility and privilege of conducting our debates in the course of this particularly busy month.

14. The fact that the Security Council has met several times this month to deal with *apartheid* and the racist régime of South Africa, which for no reason at all has been stepping up its acts of aggression against sovereign States; and the fact that the Council has again been meeting to seek a solution in response to a measure contemplated unilaterally in the Middle East by the Zionist Government, is symptomatic of an international situation which is becoming ever more alarming in the areas concerned, and ever more dangerous to international peace and security.

15. It is significant that this situation should have been created by two régimes similar in all respects. The arrogant and aggressive attitude of both is the result of an ideology they share, the many manifestations of which have so often been mentioned here and so often condemned. Their shared doctrine is racism; their common objective remains expansionism and annexation; their favourite instrument is the use of

force. Furthermore, so far they have been assured of absolute impunity, and consequently, they have both chosen deliberately to scorn international public opinion.

16. The current meetings of the Council are being held at the request of the Islamic Conference, which has already unanimously condemned most vigorously the measure contemplated by the Zionist entity: that of annexing Jerusalem.

17. The many delegations we have listened to attentively here have broadly echoed this indignation and, in so doing, have expressed the international community's refusal to endorse a further step in Israel's policy of escalation. This natural reaction of the community of nations is eloquent proof of the importance of that thrice Holy City. Indeed, Jerusalem has been the capital of Palestine, of which it has always constituted—historically and geographically—an essential and indissoluble part. Moreover, by its very essence, it has assumed a sacred character because of its role as a city of peace, solidarity and tolerance.

18. The gravity of the problem of Jerusalem is sufficiently well known; the interest shown and the solidarity expressed by the international community in the face of the Zionist manoeuvre is the best evidence of this. That is why we shall not tax the patience of the Council by recalling well-known facts, which, in any case, have been dwelt upon at considerable length.

19. Actually, the subject of our meeting is one of the facets of the basic problem: the Palestinian problem in its totality, which for 30 years has vainly been exercising international public opinion.

20. Therefore, we should not dissociate the case we are dealing with today from its natural framework, because, as is well known, the diversionary tactics habitually practised by Israel consist in fragmenting the problem in order to focus international attention on one or another specific effect of its annexationist policy, thus removing from the centre of attention in the debate the underlying reality of the Palestinian question.

21. In this regard, the occupation of territory, the institutionalized repression of the civilian population, the pursuit of a policy of settlement, the repeated acts of aggression against Arab States, as well as the measure now contemplated—all these are part of the same tactics and constitute, within the framework of a deliberate and calculated policy, stages in Israel's determination to achieve the final objective of Zionism and its natural ally, imperialism.

22. In spite of the almost unanimous reprobation of the international community and in spite of the many condemnations, Israel continues to display the same arrogant attitude. That attitude of scorn and defiance

has only been possible thanks to the impunity and unconditional support ensured by imperialism, for which the Zionist entity is a choice instrument for the safeguarding of its interests in that area just as South Africa is in southern Africa.

23. It is also within the framework of that imperialist strategy and in accordance with the Zionist diversionary tactic that we should place the Camp David accords, the purpose of which—now clearly established—was to eliminate the Palestinian problem in its entirety and, by neutralizing one battlefield country, to weaken the ranks of the Arabs in order to strengthen the military and economic potential of Israel. Because it is going against the tide of history, because it disregards the existence and the importance of peoples and because it covers up the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, that strategy, which belongs to another time, is doomed to failure however elaborate it may be.

24. The Algerian delegation has had occasion during these debates on the problem of the Middle East to express its position clearly. It remains convinced that the only solution to this succession of crises must and does require the restoration to the Palestinian people of their full national rights. That people, whose dignity has been trampled underfoot and which has been denied its rights and physically abused, is entitled to expect the international community today to condemn unequivocally the Israeli policy of occupation and oppression.

25. The situation thus created by the Zionist administration's policy of escalation and of *fait accompli* constitutes a constant threat to international peace and security. The responsibility of the Council in that respect makes it imperative that the Council should take all the necessary measures.

26. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to make his statement.

27. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It must have become obvious by now that this debate is yet another link in the long chain of initiatives—or, more accurately, acts of political warfare—conducted through the Council against Israel, with increasing intensity since the beginning of this year.

28. I have already had the opportunity to comment on certain aspects of this debate and to respond to some of the speakers who have preceded me.

29. It would take a long time to respond to each and every allegation and distortion that has been advanced in the course of this debate. Whole structures of ostensibly legal arguments based on dubious assertions were offered here, some of them the products of sheer fantasy. Let me give just one simple but typical illustration. One of the speakers stated that since 1967 approximately 30 per cent of Judea and Samaria had

been absorbed within the city limits of Jerusalem. This completely untrue assertion had already been made before by the representative of Jordan last year and had been duly refuted. For another representative to repeat it again now, is thus more than astonishing.

30. The fact is that the area of Jerusalem within its present city limits is not even 2 per cent of the territory of Judea and Samaria. It is about 108 square kilometres and therefore of almost exactly the same size as the combined areas of the Israeli and Jordanian municipal areas of Jerusalem until 1967.

31. I already had occasion to caution the Council against permitting the injection into this debate of incitement and prejudice. Regrettably, precisely this has dominated our discussions. The Council has been subjected to a series of repetitive statements by speakers representing a certain group of States bent on advancing their own sectarian interests, with little or no regard for the rights and concerns of others, or for the truth, or for the people of Jerusalem. Yet distortions and falsehoods, however often repeated here, remain distortions and falsehoods. An untruth remains an untruth, even if repeated *ad infinitum*.

32. Jerusalem contains Holy Places and shrines held sacred by three great religions. It is also a vibrant, living, growing city—the home of some 420,000 people whose well-being depends on the City's peace and progress. It is the heart and centre of a country, and the capital of a nation. Jerusalem is a city which should be approached with veneration and respect, with reverence and serenity. It should not be an object for political expediency or a pretext for incitement or agitation of any kind.

33. The problems of the Arab-Israel conflict are complex enough. For their solution they require a spirit of reconciliation and a willingness to reach mutual accommodation. They require honest dialogue and genuine negotiation. This is particularly true with regard to Jerusalem. Jerusalem, with its Holy Places venerated by Judaism, Christianity and Islam, is an especially emotive subject. Consequently, it calls for particular care and sensitivity in keeping with the dignity and singular character of Jerusalem.

34. The initiators of this debate view it as another round in their campaign against Israel. This is not the first time that the Arab-Israel conflict has been exploited here for a variety of dubious objectives totally extraneous to that conflict. Frequently debates of this kind are intended primarily to create for their sponsors a semblance of unity, a unity which is otherwise lacking. Exercises of this kind are thus calculated to cover up internal dissensions and rivalries within certain groupings of States.

35. While these are obviously the prime objectives of the sponsors of this debate, others have joined them in an attempt to divert attention away from such

uncomfortable topics as Afghanistan. Thus, both the initiators of this debate and their assorted supporters do not come before the Council in the spirit worthy of Jerusalem's special character. While they ostensibly talk about Jerusalem, it is Kabul that is apparently much more on their minds.

36. The unique association of the Jewish people with the City of Jerusalem for over three millennia is an integral part of world history, inextricably entwined into the fabric of the cultural and spiritual heritage of mankind. Jerusalem has always been, as it is today, the capital of the Jewish people. And it has been the capital of the State of Israel since the restoration of our national independence more than three decades ago.

37. Also, Jerusalem has always been a united city, except for the period between 1948 and 1967, when it was temporarily and artificially divided. While persecution and insecurity reduced the number of its Jewish residents periodically, Jews throughout the world have always clung to Jerusalem and have longed to return to it. Since modern population statistics first became available in the early nineteenth century, those statistics have consistently shown the existence of an uninterrupted Jewish majority among the City's residents.

38. Throughout the ages and up to the end of the British Mandate in 1948, Jerusalem had always been one united city. Until 1948, about two thirds of its population were Jews. The rest included Arabs as well as other non-Arab communities. Thus, in addition to its Jewish and Muslim quarters, the Walled City of Jerusalem—commonly known as the Old City—also contained a Christian and an Armenian quarter, with their residents belonging to a great variety of nationalities.

39. As a result of Arab aggression in 1948, launched with the declared aim of destroying the fledgling State of Israel, the eastern part of Jerusalem was invaded and occupied by Jordan and Jerusalem became a divided city. From then on until 1967, Jordan persistently strove to change the physical character and demographic composition of that part of the City. More particularly, every effort was made by Jordan to eliminate every trace of Jewish presence, as well as of the Jewish past of the City. That situation lasted, as I have just mentioned, for 19 years, until the City was united once again in 1967.

40. All those who are sincerely concerned for the well-being of Jerusalem cannot possibly wish to see a return to the situation which prevailed from 1948 to 1967.

41. Our position on Jerusalem is a matter of public record. It has been stated in numerous debates held in this and other organs of the United Nations since 1948. We have repeatedly stated that no discussion

on Jerusalem can ignore the role of Jerusalem in Jewish history and the role of the Jewish people in the history of the City. Nor can it ignore the fact that the Jewish people—and only the Jewish people—has always regarded Jerusalem as the centre and sole focus of its national and spiritual life.

42. After the six-day war of 1967, our position was presented by the then Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Abba Eban, at the 1529th and 1541st meetings of the General Assembly.² A detailed account of the administrative and municipal measures taken on 27 June 1967 by the Government of Israel with regard to the reunified City of Jerusalem was set out in Mr. Eban's letter of 10 July, appended to the Secretary-General's report of the same date [S/8052].

43. Israel's position was reaffirmed in a letter of 17 September 1978 from the Prime Minister of Israel to the President of the United States. That letter was annexed to the Camp David Accords of the same date, and it reads as follows:

"I have the honour to inform you that on 27 June 1967—Israel's Parliament (the Knesset) promulgated and adopted a law to the effect: 'the Government is empowered by a decree to apply the law, the jurisdiction and administration of the State to any part of Eretz Israel (land of Israel—Palestine), as stated in that decree'.

"On the basis of this law, the Government of Israel decreed in July 1967 that Jerusalem is one city, indivisible, the capital of the State of Israel."

44. There is thus no substance to the allegation that Israel is in the process of altering the existing situation in Jerusalem. It is erroneous to suggest that the Government of Israel proposes to alter the status of Jerusalem, which is the capital of Israel.

45. We are all aware that religious and historical sites in Jerusalem are precious to Christians and Muslims as well as to Jews. Israel is deeply mindful of the spiritual treasures and universal interests in Jerusalem. This is expressed in Israel's policy with regard to Jerusalem's Holy Places, as reflected in the Protection of Holy Places Law of 27 June 1967. Under this law, unrestricted access to all the Holy Places is guaranteed to members of all faiths. Article 1 provides that:

"The Holy Places shall be protected from desecration and any other violation and from anything likely to violate the freedom of access of the members of the different religions to the places sacred to them or their feelings with regard to those places."

Article 2 goes on to say that:

"(a) Whosoever desecrates or otherwise violates a Holy Place shall be liable to imprisonment for a term of seven years.

"(b) Whosoever does anything likely to violate the freedom of access of the members of the different religions to the places sacred to them or their feelings with regard to those places shall be liable to imprisonment for a term of five years."

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

47. During the 19 years of Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem, there had been no legislation to protect the Holy Places in Jerusalem. Instead, Jordan systematically razed the Jewish Quarter within the Walled City of Jerusalem. Fifty-eight synagogues and houses of worship were destroyed. The ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives was desecrated. Jewish religious, cultural and historical treasures in the Holy City were defiled.

48. Since 1967, Jerusalem has once again become a city open and accessible to all. Sacred buildings have been rebuilt, places of worship rededicated. Millions of Muslim and Christian tourists and pilgrims, in addition to Jewish visitors, have visited Jerusalem since 1967 and have prayed and worshipped freely at its mosques and churches. These tourists and pilgrims include hundreds of thousands of citizens of hostile Arab States; they too have been afforded freedom of access to, and worship at, their respective Holy Places. All these visitors can attest to the complete freedom of access to, and worship at, all the Holy Places to the adherents of all faiths, unprecedented in the history of the City.

49. The measures taken by the Government of Israel to secure the protection of the Holy Places are only one part of its effort to ensure respect for universal interests in Jerusalem. Israel has abundantly displayed its will and capacity to secure these universal interests. It has ensured that the Holy Places of the three great monotheistic faiths are administered by the respective religious authorities which hold them sacred, so that, for the first time in the City's history, the universal character of the Holy Places has found effective expression.

50. I have already pointed to the purpose of this debate. Let me add one more word. There is a danger that this debate might be exploited to play upon religious sentiments and to fan the flames of incitement, both religious and political. Surely, all the members of the Council must agree that the injection of fanaticism, incitement and hatred into the proceedings of the Council is highly undesirable.

51. Experience has shown that questions of this kind require a balanced approach. This cannot be achieved and maintained in the contentious atmosphere prevailing here in the deliberations on any aspect of the

Arab-Israel conflict. If there were any doubts in anybody's mind regarding the unsuitability of the Council to deal with this issue in a positive manner, they surely have been dispelled by the form and substance of this debate. Anyone with even a rudimentary knowledge of the history and reality of Jerusalem surely must have been appalled by the flood of ignorance and prejudice, distortion and falsehood that has been let loose in this chamber over the past week. Nor were these distortions and falsehoods confined to Jerusalem, which was ostensibly the subject of our discussion. The champions of hatred and incitement seized this occasion to widen the debate into yet another round in their relentless campaign of vilification against Israel. The Council must not let itself be led into adopting positions which can only be to the detriment of Jerusalem and obstructive to the cause of peace.

52. Israel for its part will continue to work for the peace and well-being of Jerusalem and its people, as well as for the preservation of the special place which Jerusalem holds in the hearts of people of diverse faiths around the globe.

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

54. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The representative of Israel has made several references to what he called his country. How can it be that a man who only in the 1930s came from Czechoslovakia—a country for which I have the deepest and greatest respect—claims Jerusalem as his country? Secondly, when I mentioned a year or two ago that the Israelis had confiscated almost 30 per cent of the occupied territory, I made it categorically clear that that was the area colonized in the West Bank, including Jerusalem. I itemized the areas in which all that colonization was carried out which ate up the heartland of the West Bank. The Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) endorsed my facts and figures, and the Council itself also endorsed them.

55. My reference to Jerusalem was that it had been expanded many times so that it now extends from the doorstep of Ramallah in the north to the doorstep of Bethlehem in the south, let alone to the east, at Khan Al-Ahmar, and to the entire hilly region in the west.

56. I have on many occasions already replied to Israeli policies and deeds which have led to the dismemberment of Jerusalem. I do not intend at this point to repeat myself again. Let me come now to Israel's claim that Jerusalem has always been the capital of Israel.

57. We are now bringing a week's debate on the destiny of Holy Jerusalem—Al-Quds Al-Sharif—to a close and therefore it is essential to highlight a few established facts.

58. First, and within the historical dimension upon which the Zionists lean so heavily and with such dis-

tortion in trying to justify a universally obnoxious, unacceptable and illegal military conquest and colonialism, scientific and archaeological scrutiny have established beyond any shadow of a doubt that the indigenous and ancestral inhabitants of Jerusalem and Palestine were the Canaanite Semitic Arabs who had migrated to Palestine from the Arabian Peninsula more than 5,000 years ago—that is, 2,000 years before the emergence of the prophet Moses and his followers in the land of Canaan. The Jews, or the Haribus—meaning Nomads—acquired their cultural orientation, their spiritual experience, their traditions and even their dialects from the Canaanites, the Arameans and the Phoenicians, all of whom heralded from the Arabian Peninsula and spread into the Fertile Crescent, where they created the five great Semitic civilizations in the Near East—the Acadean, the Babylonian, the Assyrian, the Chaldean and, finally, the Arab-Islamic commonwealth. No wonder Professor Toynbee referred to the Israelis as a fossil of Syriac civilization. It was from that area of civilization, as well as, especially, during their sojourn in Egypt during the reign of Akhnaton, that the followers of the prophet Moses had learned the concept of monotheism in place of the exclusive henotheism.

59. Furthermore, scholars are almost unanimous in their conviction that the Canaanites and their kinsmen, the Phoenicians—they were linked with each other—were the first Arabs to invent the alphabet and to pass it on between 850 B.C. and 750 B.C. to the Greeks, the Latins and beyond. Subsequently, the Aramean Arabs spread it throughout natural Syria, the Near East, and it is known by its Arabic origin Alef Baa—the alphabet.

60. It is deplorable that there is a deliberate historical distortion regarding the forefather of all the prophets—Ibrahim Al-Khalil—Abraham. Scholars are agreed that his era dates back to 1,900 years B.C. It was a purely Arab era in language, nationality and religion, and it is divided from the age of the prophet Moses, who came to Palestine subsequent to Abraham from Egypt, by 700 years. Abraham was, of course, a Semitic Aramean Arab leader whose original roots were in the Arabian peninsula before he migrated and settled in Iraq. This explains why he is venerated as the founder on the Ka'ba, God's oldest house of worship in Mecca. He preached the worship of La Illaha Illa Allah, the universal God whose message encompasses the whole of mankind. The prophet Moses felt his origins in Egypt and moved into the land of Canaan 13 centuries B.C. His followers deviated from his teachings and followed their own exclusive God, Yahweh, considering themselves to be the chosen people.

61. Throughout the entire period, including the 72-year-old Israeli hegemony over the West Bank, which is a drop in the bucket compared with 5,000 years of uninterrupted Canaanite habitation, the Canaanites were the overwhelming majority in Jerusalem and the

occupied territories, which we are now discussing. The citadel of Uru Salem, which was known as the citadel of Canaan or the citadel of Zion on Mount Zion—Al-Nabi-Daoud—remained impregnable to all conquerors 2,000 years before the era of the prophet Moses and for 300 years following it until King David succeeded in occupying it by seizing its water supply, according to archaeologists and historians.

62. I would not wish to delve into historical details any further, out of respect for the Council's precious time. But in view of the falsifications and slanders which the ancient Hebrews heaped mercilessly upon, in particular, the indigenous ancient Palestinians, much as the Israelis are now heaping them on the present-day Palestinians through the mass media, it would be an immeasurable contribution to truth and to the history of the evolution of modern civilization if the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization were to form a team of high-level scholars without any preconceived ideas, prejudices or misguided emotions to study the history of Palestine analytically, objectively and archaeologically as part of the great Syriac civilization and within an integrated and unified theory of the Near Eastern civilization. Representatives of all faiths, including those who do not subscribe to monotheism, should and could participate in such a study. The only criterion should be integrity and the pursuit of truth. Since the struggle over the fate of Jerusalem, because of Zionist intransigence and exclusivity, is going to be a prolonged one—the Israelis today announced that they were going to have their first reading of that notorious bill before the Knesset—the Council and the rest of the world are entitled to know the truth as it really is and not as the Zionists want them to know it.

63. If anyone thinks that this would be redundant and does not fall within the purview of the United Nations, let me declare my own deep conviction that perversions, misconceptions and outright falsifications have, directly and indirectly, contributed substantially to the downfall of the people of Jerusalem and of the rest of Palestine.

64. Secondly, there is universal agreement about the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force both in the Jerusalem of 1948 and the Jerusalem of after 1967. The applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949³ is a *sine qua non* and has been repeatedly reiterated by the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as by all other relevant organs of the United Nations. And yet, and without prejudice to all other measures vested in the Security Council by the Charter, it may be helpful if, at the request of the Council, the Secretary-General were to seek a definitive and judicious opinion from the International Court of Justice as to the legal imperatives which must govern the fate and future of Jerusalem in its entirety—barring, of course, the illegality of military conquest.

65. Thirdly, the Security Council has been rendered ineffectual by the blind *carte blanche* support that is accorded to the Israeli conquest in real terms. As we see it, since almost the whole of the rest of the world supports the universal character of Jerusalem, it is within our means, impelled by the massive forces of humanity and of the faithful, to impose a wide range of extremely potent sanctions against Israel and whom-ever aids and abets its conquests and annexations. I am sure that the responsible people in our part of the world will see to that. As long as we enjoy the moral support of the United Nations, it is incumbent upon us to implement the most effective measures to save Jerusalem from the clutches of night-mongering. Our decision-makers and our vast masses will not shrink from their responsibilities in this most sacrosanct of human and spiritual issues.

66. Fourthly, the Israeli representative has indulged in his usual distortions. I shall spare the Council's precious time and not refute them now. I shall do so in writing, addressing myself to the President and members of the Council, point for point and word for word.

67. May I, in conclusion, express my gratitude to the President of the Council, for having called upon me once more. I would express gratitude to all the Member States whose conscience, sense of justice and legality have not succumbed to mundane and ultimately unworthy expediency. I can only pray for the souls of those who have succumbed and who have deviated from the path of righteousness.

68. Mr. HUSSON (France) (*interpretation from French*): According to the very statements of the highest authorities of Israel, the Parliament of that country will soon have before it a bill that would annex the Arab part of Jerusalem and make the city the capital of the country. France cannot concur in such a plan, which would have serious consequences, and we hope that it will not be carried out. In fact, the plan goes beyond the measures to integrate the Arab part of Jerusalem in a unified administrative entity, which have already been condemned time and again; it aims at modifying the status of the city.

69. The Council has had this problem before it a number of times since 1967. In its resolutions 252 (1968) and 267 (1969), the Council censured in the strongest terms all measures taken to change the status of the City of Jerusalem and in fact declared them invalid. Neither of those resolutions, and none of the many others, many of them adopted unanimously, have been implemented by the Member State to which they were addressed. It is, then, in defiance of the will of the international community that Israel has pursued its policy of *fait accompli*.

70. The plans that have occasioned this meeting of the Council have understandably aroused strong feelings among most of those who belong to the three

major religions devoted to the preservation of an indivisible spiritual heritage. Jerusalem is a Holy City for Islam, for Christianity and for Judaism, and it must not be allowed to become a prize to be fought over. It must remain a symbol of peace. That which makes Jerusalem unique and universal must be safeguarded.

71. For that reason, France feels that all legislative and other measures adopted by the Israeli authorities to integrate the part of Jerusalem that has been occupied since 1967 are, like the creation and extension of the settlements, contrary to the rules of international law under which the Administering Power must preserve the demographic, economic and cultural character of the occupied areas. It has been quite properly recalled here that, at its last meeting, in Venice, on 13 June, the European Council adopted the following position:

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

72. It is quite clear that this excerpt from the declaration of the heads of State and Government of the countries members of the European Community cannot be dissociated from their position on the entire question of the Middle East. If there is no global settlement in keeping with the principles and conditions proposed at Venice, the problem of Jerusalem cannot be resolved unilaterally.

73. I would solemnly warn the Government of Israel against the plans that have occasioned these meetings of the Council. I appeal to it not to commit irreparable acts that would only provoke violent reactions and compromise the chances of peace. The very name of Jerusalem commands that we seek peace along the path of justice within the community of the faithful.

74. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): My delegation has followed the course of this debate with the closest attention. I have been profoundly impressed by the quality of some of the statements we have heard. We have listened to sombre words of warning all the more telling because of the restrained and measured language in which some speakers have uttered them.

75. This debate has heavily underscored once again the universal importance of the question of the status of Jerusalem. We, the British, after many centuries of close involvement in the area now known as the Middle East, are of all people unlikely to forget how strong are the chords which Jerusalem strikes in the hearts and minds of men and women not only in the area but throughout the continents of the world.

76. My Government’s position is clear, and I believe it is no secret to the Council. East Jerusalem is part of the territories occupied in the war of 1967. It is subject to the principles emphasized in resolution 242 (1967), including the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war.

77. We have consistently maintained our policy that no unilateral action should or can change the status of Jerusalem. No such action should be allowed to prejudice the future of the City. That position was most recently reaffirmed in the declaration by the nine heads of State and Government of the European Community at Venice on 13 June. What the Community said has been quoted by a number of speakers in this debate, most recently by the last speaker, the representative of France. I will therefore not repeat it.

78. My delegation deplores the changes which Israel has made to the physical and demographic character of Jerusalem in the years since the June 1967 war. We deplore Israel’s failure to heed earlier Council resolutions on this subject. In view of the special significance of the city to hundreds of millions of followers of the three great religions, we strongly urge Israel to eschew further such actions, which can only serve to stoke the fires of resentment, frustration and mistrust throughout the area and beyond, thus adding to the burdens of the already desperately difficult search for a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

79. By the same token, and turning to the draft resolution in front of us [S/14031], my delegation could have wished that some of the language in it had been less abrasive. We understand the strong feelings of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but we frankly doubt whether the use of such language in resolutions is likely to produce the effect desired by all of us.

80. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2233rd meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table in order to make his statement.

81. Mr. MAKSOUD: During this debate we have been subjected by the representative of Israel to the spectacle of a sort of semantic acrobatics, which was an attempt to defuse the impact of the universal condemnation of Israel’s measures in the further annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem. In that regard, we are faced with what is perhaps a unique situation, in which we find the Israeli representative seeking to undermine the credibility of the sponsors of the draft resolution and the universality of attitude and perception held by the world community with respect to Jerusalem.

82. To question even the attitude of the partners in the Camp David accords concerning Jerusalem—in

those agreements reference to Jerusalem was not spelt out, although it is central—the Israeli representative has ascertained that the letter which Mr. Begin sent to President Carter on that particular issue establishes by inference the status of Jerusalem as perceived in the Camp David accords. We are not sure that the other partners to those agreements subscribe to the precise terms contained in the definition given in the codicil to the Camp David accords, as understood by Mr. Begin.

83. In that regard, we find in the Egyptian interpretation of this debate and of its subject a definite refusal to accept a determination to dissociate itself from Israel's definition of the term Jerusalem as it is described in the letter that was read out this morning by the Israeli representative. We are also sure that the United States does not subscribe precisely to the terms of reference found in that letter. Therefore, in addition to the universal condemnation of the international community, even the partners in the Camp David accords do not subscribe to Israel's determination on the status of Jerusalem.

84. Hence, we find this is an attempt to impose on the international community, in an *ex cathedra* manner, not only a unilateral definition by Israel of the status of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel but the idea that Israel is within its rights in changing the status of Jerusalem in deciding whatever it wishes to do inside Jerusalem, irrespective of the consequences for the region or of the question of peace in the region.

85. What is it that enables the Israeli representative, aside from uttering a repetition of insults to this body and attributing motives to the sponsors of the draft resolution that are extraneous to this debate—what is it that enables him alone, unilaterally, without inhibition, to state *ex cathedra* that Jerusalem is not only the capital of Israel but the capital of the so-called Jewish people?

86. We are thus faced with a situation whereby Israel wants to present the Council and the world community with *faits accomplis*, finally established facts that render any minor compliance of Israel with the international consensus a major sacrifice on its part. That is what I meant by semantic acrobatics.

87. Jerusalem is a Holy City for three principal religions of the world—Judaism, Christianity and Islam. But as the representative of the United Kingdom just said, Jerusalem is an occupied city: East Jerusalem has been occupied since the 1967 war. Therefore its annexation is illegal. The attempt on the part of Israel unilaterally to determine the fate of Jerusalem, which is an Arab city, is an attempt to pre-empt the role of the Council, which is responsible for deciding what measures shall be taken and what measures may be considered relevant or credible. Israel feels that it has the power to paralyse the will of the international

community. It is doing so effectively in Jerusalem. To the extent it is doing so, we consider that the unilateral declaration, and the codicil constituted by the letter from Mr. Begin to President Carter, show to a large extent the looseness of the terms of reference of the Camp David accords, the imperative necessity of dissociating ourselves from them, and the need—especially for the partners in the Camp David accords—to be clearer about their position of condemning the unilateral interpretation of the status of Jerusalem put forward by Israel.

88. It is this *ex cathedra* approach on the part of Israel that shows the degree to which the Zionist State of Israel seeks not only to arrogate to itself the right to sanctify its measures merely on the grounds that they have been taken, but to impose the idea that any measures taken by Israel must be approved by its partners. This is therefore the time for the partners of Israel in the Camp David accords to put an end to the equivocation that has characterized their approach and attitude to the question of Jerusalem and to the question of the Palestinians.

89. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply. I call on him.

90. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): At the outset, I should like to shed some light on the credibility of the Zionist entity.

91. Way back in July 1948, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Sharrett, made the following statement:

“Morally, we do not regard ourselves as bound by our agreement to the November 29 decision concerning Jerusalem, even though we do not consider the time has come for us to make any clear decisions concerning our new position.”

92. I think this set the pattern for the credibility of the policy and the statements made by the representatives of Tel Aviv. However, the time has come to recall some biblical statements.

I am thinking of Micah, when he says:

“Hear this, . . . ye heads of the house of Jacob and princes of the house of Israel, that abhor judgement and pervert all equity.

“They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity.”⁴

“Woe to them that devise iniquity . . .

“They covet fields and take them by violence; and houses and take them away:

"So they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage.

"Therefore, thus saith the Lord; Behold, against this family do I devise an evil, from which ye shall not remove your necks; neither shall ye go haughtily: for this time is evil".⁵

93. We have listened to the representative of Tel Aviv and heard him say: "Jerusalem is a city which should be approached with veneration and respect, with reverence and serenity" [para. 32 above]. Since when do the Zionists consider Jerusalem with serenity and reverence? Those who dropped bombs on Jerusalem in 1947 and 1948, those who planted mines and explosives in the streets of the Old City of Jerusalem have no reverence for Jerusalem. They are murderers. Those who blew up the civilian secretariat of the Mandate's administration, killing more than 100 civilians, are criminals and they have no reverence for the City.

94. I quote again: "[there is] an attempt to divert attention away from such uncomfortable topics as Afghanistan" [para. 35 above]. The Security Council has been considering the acts of aggression, the atrocities committed by the Zionists for decades now, long before the question of Afghanistan came up. But of course, the United States and its lackey, the State of Israel, are happy with the obsession with Afghanistan because this obsession enables the United States to avoid taking any action to stop its agent in the Middle East from committing those crimes and atrocities against the people of the Middle East. If anybody is making any use of the problem of Afghanistan, it is the United States and Israel.

95. Now I quote again:

"Since modern population statistics first became available in the early nineteenth century, those statistics have consistently shown the existence of an uninterrupted Jewish majority among the City's residents". [para. 37 above.]

But what does this mean? Let us have a look at the statistics as of 31 December 1946 concerning the population in Palestine. There were 1,845,560 Palestinians, of whom there were 608,230 of the Jewish faith. So if statistics mean anything and the rights of the majority of inhabitants mean anything, then one would say that Palestine does not in any way belong to those of the Jewish faith. But let us examine the question of Jerusalem. In the district of Jerusalem there were 395,320 Palestinians of whom 102,820 were of Jewish faith. But if one has to confine oneself to a small area and say that in that area there are a certain number of members of a certain faith and so claim title to that area, then I really do not know what the criterion should be. This is another distortion of fact; or one could say that they are really misconstruing it in a fallacious way.

96. Then reference was made to the diktat of Mr. Eban in July 1967. But we all know what that diktat meant. It was rejected by the General Assembly at its emergency special session; it was rejected by the Security Council, as one can infer from resolutions 252 (1968), 267 (1969), 271 (1969) and, lately, resolutions 465 (1980).

97. But it so happens that the racists, who still think in militarist terms, and who try to impose their diktat on the international community, come here and make a statement and expect the rest of the world to accept it. But then the rest of the world does not accept their diktat. Then, some reference is made to the Camp David accords. Now, what is this? The Camp David framework was rejected in the General Assembly and was considered invalid. Anything based on an approach which is not valid has no validity whatsoever. Notwithstanding what may have been agreed as far as the future of the Palestinian people is concerned, the General Assembly and the Palestinian people have said that the Camp David accords have no validity whatsoever.

98. Reference was also made to an Israeli law, article 1 of which provides that the Holy Places shall be protected. But this is a departure from the Zionist doctrine that considers the beautiful dreamer of Nazareth as a man who came to sow the seeds of hatred. Do you really think any Christian would believe that those Zionists who consider Christ as a breeder of hate would consider the Christian shrine as something sacred and holy?

99. It was also stated that: "since 1967, Jerusalem has once again become a city open and accessible to all" [para. 48 above]. The question, however, is not one of accessibility. The question is one of the fate of the worshippers and of the believers there. What do you do with the believers in the City?

100. Now, *L'Osservatore Romano* of today's date has a beautiful article, from which I quote: "No less than the monuments and Holy Places, the situation of these communities cannot fail to be a matter of concern for all." And *L'Osservatore Romano* is referring to the religious communities of Jerusalem and the international community, so it is not only the question of the buildings. The buildings mean nothing if they do not have worshippers. They could be museums. As a matter of fact, His Holiness the Pope had mentioned that he was really concerned lest the places of worship in Jerusalem should eventually become museums for lack of worshippers. This is what we are interested in. We are interested in the fate of people—the human element—not just in the buildings.

101. The Council has on several occasions affirmed that all the actions taken by the occupying Power to change the characteristics of the City were invalid. The Council is called upon to take adequate measures

to prevent the further deterioration and exacerbation of this situation.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

⁴ Micah 3: 9-10.

⁵ Micah 2: 1-3.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
