

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1553rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 14 July 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. The PRESIDENT: I informed the Assembly yesterday afternoon of my intention regarding the programme of work. I said that if I did not hear any suggestions from Members, I would take it that the Assembly agreed with my tentative suggestions, and would therefore proceed accordingly. Between the time of the adjournment of the meeting yesterday evening and the convening of this meeting, no new suggestions have been made. Therefore, the situation now is as follows. The list of speakers in the debate is closed. After hearing all the speakers in the debate, we shall proceed to explanations of vote before the voting begins.

2. I request Members to co-operate with me by agreeing to close by 1 o'clock this afternoon the list of speakers in explanation of vote before the voting. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT: A revised text of the draft resolution has been circulated as document A/L.528/Rev.1.

4. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): This is not the time to start all over again a general debate on all the questions arising from the recent conflict.

5. Throughout the long debates in this Assembly and in the Security Council, my Government has been anxious to concentrate attention not on accusations and generalizations but on proposals for effective, practical, immediate and impartial United Nations action. We have throughout advocated the need for practical steps, however limited, in the right direction.

6. We warmly welcome what the United Nations has already been able to do in achieving a cease-fire, in ensuring that it is observed, and in making a start in dealing with the vast problem of relief of suffering and hardship. We have constantly advo-

cated that amongst the first steps should be a request to the Secretary-General to send his special representative to the area to consult with all concerned on disengagement, withdrawal, and the building of foundations for a permanent settlement.

Mr. Csatorday (Hungary), Vice-President, took the Chair.

7. We also warmly welcome the efforts to find common ground of agreement. And we believe that there is, in fact, far more general agreement than our public speeches allow to appear. Goodwill and good sense make slow but steady progress upstream, against a torrent of recrimination.

8. I am bold enough to believe that the framework of a lasting settlement is clear to most of us. There must be disengagement and withdrawal; there must equally be final security against renewed hostility; there must be relief and rehabilitation on a new and imaginative scale never before contemplated. There must be demilitarized frontiers; there must be an end of the arms race; there must be a restoration of international authority. All the peoples concerned must be enabled to earn their living in peace and security and hope. The Holy City must be not a centre of discord and conflict but a summit of concord and conciliation.

9. When I was myself twenty-one years of age I first went to live and work in Jerusalem. In my first week in my first post I saw the first Wailing Wall riots, one of the bloodiest communal riots that even the Holy Land has known. I saw then the terrible results of religious and political violence and conflict. In the intervening decades there has been division and dispute and bitterness and bloodshed. The time has come to finish it. We have an opportunity now, so I trust, to bring good out of evil. The very intensity of recent animosities and the counteracting influences of opposing interests give us at last, so I believe, the hope of a secure settlement.

10. It is the question of the Holy City which is the immediate issue. This is the heart of the problem. This is the issue which excites both the fiercest feeling and the noblest aspirations.

11. When the Foreign Minister of Israel comes to advocate the deep longings of his people for freedom and unity and peace, his brilliant advocacy touches us all. When he speaks of relief and reconciliation, we all should welcome what he says. We respect the depth of his feelings and the sincerity of his devotion. But he would not claim that his people have any exclusive concern for the Holy Sites sacred to three great religions. Moslems and Christians too have a deep and passionate concern.

12. It is this coincidence of concern and this common devotion which must now be respected, and it is this concept of joint interest which led my Foreign Secretary to give his solemn warning in this Assembly last month [1529th meeting] that Israel should not purport to annex the Old City or legislate for its annexation. He warned, as you will remember, against any such step which would isolate Israel from world opinion.

13. We certainly welcome any steps to relieve distress and dislocation and to facilitate the return of refugees. But what we have already stated would be wrong, and what we maintain would be wrong now, is any attempt now to alter or prejudice the future status of the City. We trust that Israel will recognize and accept the force of that conviction and that strong contention.

14. In the immediate situation our first obligation is for the welfare and relief of all the people concerned and in particular that there should be an easing and not a worsening of the refugee problem.

15. We have noted all that the Israeli Foreign Minister has said, but we remain convinced that the Assembly was right to judge the Israeli measures invalid. They were invalid because they went beyond the competence of an occupying Power as defined in international law.

16. We are not here today to deal with long-term solutions. Some speak of proposals for internationalization. We are of course fully in favour of freedom of access for all to the Holy Sites, but we think it would be wiser to defer for the time being consideration of the ultimate settlement. We are not dealing with the ultimate settlement now. We are dealing with an immediate question. We deplore any immediate and unilateral action on a separate issue. We believe that all such issues of conflict should be settled in the framework of an eventual general settlement.

17. Accordingly, we restate and reinforce our statement that there should be no annexation of the Old City. There should not be any other present action which prejudices the City's future status. It was for that reason that we voted for the resolution adopted on 4 July [2253 (ES-V)]. We have not changed our strong views on this central question. Neither by unilateral legislation nor by annexation can or should the future of Jerusalem be now determined. It should be determined by a subsequent settlement in which the interests of all must be fully protected and permanently ensured.

18. Mr. AL-KHALIDI (Iraq): On 4 July the General Assembly adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V) by ninety-nine votes in favour and none against, expressing deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City. The Assembly considered these measures invalid. It called upon Israel to rescind them. It called upon Israel forthwith to desist from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. It requested the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on the implementation of the resolution not later than one week from its adoption.

19. The week has passed. And what has happened? Israel has persisted in strengthening its stranglehold on Jerusalem. It has thrown out its legalistic and pseudo-administrative hooks at Arab Jerusalem. The Mayor of Israeli Jerusalem tried to browbeat and bully the democratically elected Arab Municipal Council of Jordanian Jerusalem. When the bluff and threats failed, he marched out at the head of Israeli thugs armed with sub-machine guns and declared the Jordanian Municipal Council dismissed by diktat.

20. The annexation of Arab Jerusalem to Israel is being consolidated hourly by terror and blackmail. The resistance of the Arab population of Jerusalem is being undermined by a combination of psychological warfare, punitive economic legislation and a deliberate policy of starvation. In short, Israel has thrown the resolution of the General Assembly into the waste-paper basket. Mr. Eban has been as good as his word. He promised that Israel would refuse to accept the resolutions of the General Assembly. He has kept his promise.

21. In his speech on Wednesday [1550th meeting], Mr. Eban spoke of motherhood. If the United Nations is anybody's mother, it is Israel's mother. Without the United Nations, Israel, of all the nations in the world, would not today be in existence.

22. By ignoring United Nations resolution 2253 (ES-V) on Jerusalem, Israel has virtually slapped the United Nations in the face. This, and nothing else, is the purport of the reply of the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations [see A/6753] and of the speech made by Mr. Eban on Wednesday. No glib talk or argumentation can hide this central fact or detract from it. No fabricated allegations and misrepresentations of historical fact can change it.

23. The heart of the matter is that Israel refuses compliance with the General Assembly resolution and expresses its refusal with an arrogant contempt for the existence of this body and for the intelligence of its Members that has become the hallmark of Israel's attitude towards the United Nations.

24. We have no intention to refute all the calculated falsifications of fact that Israel's representatives have uttered in their attempt to divert attention from this one focal point: Israel's defiant rejection of the wish of the international community. But we feel compelled, for the record, to draw attention to some of these falsifications.

25. The most monstrous of these fabrications was the allegation that the Arab Governments, and Jordan in particular, had refused to safeguard free access to the Holy Places. The truth of the matter is that, in response to an appeal by the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, the Arab Governments of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria pledged themselves to the following declaration on 15 November 1949. The preamble to the declaration states:

"The undersigned representatives of Egypt, the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Lebanon and Syria to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, duly authorized by their respective Governments, hereby make the following declaration on behalf of their Governments."

The preamble further states that these Governments:

"Solemnly undertake by the provisions of the present declaration to guarantee the protection of, and free access to, the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites of Palestine, situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem or, pending that settlement, in the territory at present occupied by them under armistice agreements."

Article 4, the operative article, states:

"The Governments of Egypt, the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Lebanon and Syria undertake to guarantee freedom of access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem, or, pending that settlement, in the territory at present occupied by them under armistice agreements; and, pursuant to this undertaking, will guarantee rights of entry and of transit to ministers of religion, pilgrims and visitors without distinction as to nationality or faith, subject only to considerations of national security, all the above in conformity with the status quo prior to 14 May 1948." ^{1/}

This was the solemn declaration which the Arab Governments, in response to the appeal of the Conciliation Commission, pledged themselves to abide by.

26. What was the response of Israel to a similar appeal made to it at the same time by the Conciliation Commission? Israel, to quote the record verbatim, was

"of the opinion...that it would in the circumstances be in the interests of a constructive and final settlement if the matter of formulation were dealt with after more far-reaching consideration of these problems by the General Assembly." ^{2/}

In short, and cutting through the verbiage, it was Israel which, for reasons better known to itself, refused to make a declaration on the Holy Places similar to that made by the Arab Governments. Therefore, if access to the Holy Places has been denied in certain instances since 1949, Israel has to thank only its own intransigence for that.

27. No less monstrous is the Israeli allegation that there has been Arab desecration of Hebrew Holy Places. It is a matter of historical record, known to all and sundry, that the religious status quo in Jerusalem was the object of the scrupulous, reverent and impartial guardianship of Islam for more than a millenium. Nor is there anything surprising in this. To Islam, Jews and Christians are People of the Book. Successive generations of Moslem pilgrims over the centuries rubbed their cheeks on the thresholds of the Tombs of Abraham, David, Solomon and Moses in humility and supplication. Millions of Moslems across the arch of history have sobbed in reverence at the birthplace of Jesus and the Tomb of the Virgin Mary.

28. Partly because of this fact, and partly because there are Arab Jews, Arab Christians and Arab Moslems, the Arabs are perhaps uniquely fitted to be titular guardians of the Holy Places, their traditional role and privilege in Jerusalem. It is in this context that it can be argued in love and modesty that Judaism does not, because of the chronological accident of its birth prior to the two other great monotheistic faiths, absorb subjectively in its ken these two faiths quite in the same manner as they do.

29. Be that as it may, it is surely not with these abstruse theological problems that we are concerned today, but with the blatant secular policy of the Government of Israel. The Zionist attitude to religion being what it is, it is not surprising, though it is abhorrent, that the Zionist and Israel have shown little regard for the sanctity of the shrines and Holy Places of other faiths. Hundreds of mosques in hundreds of Arab villages in Israel have disappeared from the surface of the earth. Some of the mosques in the north of Israel today serve as beatnik studios or worse. The shores of the Sea of Galilee, itself one of the most sacred localities in Christianity, are studded with cabarets and nightclubs, a phenomenon observed and condemned as early as 1946 by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

30. The Jordan River, the waters of baptism, have been fouled by the dumping of saline water in it, so that today the Jordan is a stinking and fetid rivulet, thanks to Zionism. In Jerusalem, the Moslem graveyard at Mamillah, containing the tombs of generations of Moslem scholars and saints, has been desecrated. Christian clergymen wearing their clerical robes have not been spared, and at least one such clergyman, the Warden of the Garden Tomb in Jerusalem, was shot in cold blood on 7 June. Today, access to the interior of the Al Aqsa mosque is denied, the five daily prayers are forbidden and the call of the muezzin that has reverberated for centuries without interruption, summoning the faithful to prayer, has been stifled for the first time in history.

31. Mr. Eban informed us of one reason, among many, for the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem. Jerusalem, he said, was the head and Israel the body. I must say it did not come as a surprise to me that Israel had lost its head; that fact was observable from many of Mr. Eban's utterances. But it is macabre indeed that the truncated body of Israel should choose an Arab head.

32. But the body politic of the Palestinian Arab community has always been treated in this cavalier fashion by the Zionists. The partition of Palestine was no less than the vivisection of the Palestinian Arab community. Limb by limb, the body politic of the Palestinian Arab community was devoured by the political and territorial cannibalism of Zionism. With 5 June came the opportunity, or so it seemed to Israel, to finish off the head at Jerusalem and the bleeding torso on the Western bank. Those who talk about the Arab refusal to recognize the right of Israel to exist sometimes forget that under the floorboards of every Israeli home lies a fragment of the corpse of the Palestinian Arab body. It is against this background that Mr. Eban's statements about the extension of social amenities to Jerusalem Arabs,

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. I, document A/1113, sect. C.

^{2/} Ibid., sect. B.

and particularly the opportunity given them "for intermingling and union" with the Jewish sector, assume their full cynical dimensions.

33. Let it first be stated that it was the Arabs who always stood for the union of Palestine, and it was the Zionists who intrigued and pressed and agitated for partition. No less than 15,000 Arab casualties resulted from the great Arab rebellion between 1936 and 1939 against the first plan for the partition of the country, and at least an equal number of casualties occurred in the desperate struggle to prevent partition again in 1947. It is Zionism that has brought arson and rapine hate and suffering, barbed wires and minefields to Palestine.

34. But let us examine for a moment this allegation about the advantages of union and intermingling for the Jerusalem Arabs. Within the city boundaries, both old and new, Jewish ownership of property in Jerusalem constituted on the eve of partition in 1947 no more than 25 per cent. As a result of carefully planned military operations, the Zionists acquired 84.13 per cent of the city boundaries in the 1948 war. This loot of war comprised entire Arab commercial centres and residential quarters: Talbiyeh, Qatamon, Wa'riya Upper Baq'a, Lower Baq'a, and so forth. The Arab residents of these quarters were driven out by terror and slaughter. The houses, shops, cinemas, offices, hospitals—all the buildings and sites that make up a city—were confiscated and promptly filled with new immigrants.

35. The Arab residents of these areas stayed on the Jordanian side, within sight of their properties. To these residents permission seems to have been granted to "intermingle" with Israeli Jerusalem. Translated into English, "intermingle" here means permission to view their former properties, the scenes of their childhood, the inheritance of their fathers, the fruit of their toil and savings—to view all this, irretrievably lost, occupied by an alien people, but nevertheless to view it at close quarters. In other words, the Arab residents may now touch their former homes from the outside; they may even smell them, if they want to. For this, the Arabs and all of us here must burst out in praise and adulation for the magnanimity of Israel.

36. The Arab resident of Jordanian Jerusalem would be well advised not to linger too nostalgically on the Israeli side. He would be well advised to stay put in his property on the Jordan side. It is this which is now at stake. For Jewish property on the Jordanian side constitutes less than 0.6 per cent of the area within the city boundary; and experience has taught us that Israeli legislation, municipal and other, is allergic to such ratios.

37. There are two aspects to the question of Jerusalem. The first is the sovereign right of Jordan to its side of the city, the sovereign right of Jordan to the territorial integrity of its side of the city, the sovereign right of the Arab residents to their side of the city. This right is part and parcel of Arab sovereign rights over the entire western bank, the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula, the Syrian heights and the Kuneitra region. This sovereign right has been challenged by the Israeli announce-

ment of the annexation of Jordanian Jerusalem. The General Assembly has already acknowledged the Arab sovereign right to the Jordanian side of Jerusalem in its resolution of 4 July. The Arab sovereign right to Jordanian Jerusalem is unquestioned and unquestionable, no matter what Israel does. The other aspect is the question of accessibility to the Holy Places and of arrangements pertaining to them. This is a different problem. It must not be confused with the question of Jordan's sovereign right to its side of the city.

38. In this connexion, as has already been pointed out, the Jordanian side of Jerusalem is not confined to the Holy Places. The Holy Places, in terms of acreage, constitute only a section of Jordanian Jerusalem. In addition to the Holy Places, Jordanian Jerusalem is a thriving city on its own. In addition to "housing" the Holy Places, as it were, Jordanian Jerusalem is also a city of commercial centres and residential quarters, of schools, museums, hospitals, cinemas, libraries, hotels and business blocks. Its population is about 60,000. It is one of the largest cities of Jordan. That is why I emphasize that the question of the Holy Places should be distinguished from that of the sovereign right of the Arab inhabitants of Jordanian Jerusalem to their national and independent existence as an integral part of the State of Jordan.

39. Arrangements pertaining to access to the Holy Places can be worked out within the framework of Jordanian sovereignty. I have already pointed out that it was Israel which repudiated these arrangements in 1949. It is clear that Israel is attempting to confuse the two issues; the clear and obvious right of Jordan to its side of the city, and the question of arrangements pertaining to accessibility to the Holy Places. It is also clear that Israel is giving the false impression that the question of accessibility can be solved only within the framework of an Israeli Jerusalem.

40. There never really was a question of accessibility, *per se*. The Holy Places, under Jordan, were fully accessible to Christians of all denominations, including Christians from Israel. Every year thousands of Israeli Christians crossed over to Jordanian Jerusalem. The failure of these arrangements with regard to Jews was directly due to the repudiation by Israel of the 1949 declaration on Holy Places requested by the Conciliation Commission for Palestine and the subsequent refusal by Israel of all United Nations resolutions pertaining to the repatriation and compensation of Arab refugees.

41. Israel is warned not to play with fire in Jerusalem. Its very resort to *blitzkrieg* tactics, even with regard to the Holy Places, is an index of its inherent disrespect for them and its incapacity to appraise their universal significance.

42. Israel's sponsors are also warned not to play with fire in Jerusalem. This issue cannot be fitted into their chronic frame of reference of power politics. A sense of history is called for, however difficult it may be to achieve. We are confident that the American people do possess this sense of history.

43. To Islam, Jerusalem is not only the first direction of prayer—the Qibla—but also the site to which the Prophet Mohammed journeyed on his nocturnal flight—the Isra'—whence he ascended to within two bow-lengths of the Throne of God—the Mi'radj.

44. This is not, and will never be, the parade ground for Israeli troops under review by this or that Israeli personality, however notorious. With Judaism, Islam is, and will always remain, faithfully and hopefully in dialogue; with the forces of territorial aggrandizement and terror there can be no dialogue. Nothing that Israel gives away or tries to give away in Jerusalem is valid. An end must be put to charity by Israel and its sponsors at Arab expense.

45. Extraterritorial solutions are no solutions. They are even less solutions when conducted with vengeance and in consolidation of military conquest. Even if for argument's sake they were to be contemplated in theory, their application could not be selective and punitive, nor confined to one side. There is no doubt in our minds that it is in this light, and sub specie aeternitatis, that the matter is viewed on the continent of Europe. That is why we are full of confidence that there will be no panic under the weight of Israeli blackmail.

46. Israel cannot hide behind ecumenical slogans to perpetuate its stranglehold over Jerusalem. Mr. Eban objects to the use of the word "annex". We promise not to use that word any more. But might we suggest "swallow" instead?

47. It is as clear as daylight why Israel wants Jordanian Jerusalem. It is the strategic key to the West Bank. It isolates the southern half of the West Bank around Hebron from the northern half around Nablus. By controlling Jordanian Jerusalem, Israel can dominate the entire West Bank, control its commerce and communications, shatter its civic harmony, disrupt its administrative life, dominate the approaches to the River Jordan, suck out the handsome annual revenues that accrue from the tourist traffic and pilgrimages, and pounce at will upon any attractive prey in sight, whether moving or stationary.

48. This is the real intention of Tel Aviv. This is why the sponsors of Israel must speak out unequivocally on this issue. This is why the General Assembly must not fail in its duty. This is why Mr. Eban would be more consistent with the spirit of his Government, and more particularly with the spirit of his colleague, Mr. Menachem Begin, the hero of Deir Yassin, if he were to put aside the absurd sacerdotal robes which he has donned to sell this Assembly his latest brain-wave.

49. It is on these grounds that, on behalf of my Government, I urge this Assembly to vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/L.528/Rev.1] introduced by the representative of Pakistan and sponsored by the representatives of Afghanistan, Guinea, Iran, Mali, Somalia and Turkey.

50. Mr. BANZAR (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): In seeking a just solution to the question of eliminating the aftermath of Israel's aggression

against the Arab States, my delegation is guided by the following basic principles.

51. First the aggressor must be condemned and punished for his crime.

52. Secondly, Israel must immediately withdraw all its armed forces, without exception, from the territories they now occupy in Arab States.

53. It is now ten days since the General Assembly, at its present session, adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution [2253 (ES-V)] which called upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of the city of Jerusalem. However, the ruling circles of Israel show not the slightest intention of carrying out the General Assembly resolution; indeed, they are strengthening their positions in the occupied part of the city and, under the guise of administrative measures, are in actual fact annexing foreign territory and legitimizing their seizure of it.

54. In addition, the Israel representatives are trying to prove that peace and general well-being reign in that city. The real situation, however, by no means corresponds to the picture they paint. We thus have every reason to believe that the ruling circles of Tel Aviv, after Jerusalem, will confront us with a fait accompli with regard to the other Arab territories which they are stubbornly refusing to leave.

55. This behaviour, these acts of usurpation on the part of the Israel extremists, constitute a direct challenge to this exalted Organization and to world opinion. The Israel aggressors are still pursuing their headlong course to disaster. Their invasion of the neighbouring Arab States is accompanied by mass reprisals against the peaceable population. By threats, and the use of force, the Israel military is driving tens of thousands of Arabs from the occupied villages and towns.

56. While here, at the Headquarters of the United Nations, from the lips of the Israel representative comes a flow of words about peace and humanitarianism, in the Middle East, hundreds of Arabs are dying because of the criminal behaviour of the Israel aggressors.

57. It has now become clear to all that, in treacherously attacking neighbouring Arab States, the ruling circles of Israel pursued the objective of seizing new territories and of overthrowing anti-imperialist progressive régimes in the United Arab Republic and Syria, thereby paralysing the entire national liberation movement in the Arab world and forcing the Arab peoples to serve the interests of the principal imperialist Powers. But the aggressors and their patrons have miscalculated. Throughout the Arab world a great wave of hostility has arisen and the peoples have intensified their struggle against imperialism.

58. The entire world is today witness to the fact that Israel is annexing the Jordanian sector of the city of Jerusalem. This policy of hostility towards the Arabs pursued by Israel, the rejection by the Israel Government of numerous United Nations resolutions, particularly the resolution concerning the

return of the Palestinian Arabs to their homeland [194 (III)], is a principal cause of the tension in the Middle East. But another, and more important cause is to be found in the economic, military and political interests of the imperialist Powers, above all of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, which are using Israel as a springboard in combating the anti-imperialist movement of the Arab peoples.

59. The Security Council cease-fire resolution is merely the first step to restrain the aggressor. Following this first and necessary step the United Nations must take other and more effective measures to condemn Israel as an aggressor and to secure the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops from the occupied Arab territories.

60. The occupation by Israel of foreign territories and the continuing presence of Israel troops in the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan are a blatant violation of the United Nations Charter and a constant threat to peace and security in the Middle East. At the present time, when the imperialists are using the situation in the Middle East—a situation which has been created by the aggression perpetrated by Israel against the Arab States—to further their own selfish interests, the urgent task of our Organization, in my delegation's opinion is to secure the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops from the occupied territories to positions behind the Armistice Line.

61. Events of recent days show clearly that any delay in obtaining the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the occupied Arab territories will lead to fresh conflicts and will increase tension in that area.

62. My delegation considers that, in the present circumstances, we must demand once again that Israel should desist from annexation. If Israel fails to comply with the resolutions of the present emergency special session of the General Assembly, sanctions should be applied against it in accordance with the provision of the United Nations Charter.

63. In view of what I have just said, my delegation, which voted for resolution 2253 (ES-V), is prepared to support the draft resolution [A/L.528/Rev.1] submitted by the delegations of Pakistan and other States.

64. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (translated from French): In the speech that I made here on 3 July [1546th meeting], I had occasion to recall certain of the principles by which the attitude of the French Government towards the crisis now destroying the Middle East has been inspired. At the risk of being repetitious, I think it worth while to reiterate them today, for they seem to me to be calculated to introduce an element of clarity into the debate that has begun on the matter of the status of Jerusalem.

65. No one will doubt our deep and abiding interest in this holy city, which has already been the stake in so many rivalries and struggles. We would that it might cease to be an element of discord and become the symbol of peace in a part of the world which we hold dear.

66. Well before the outbreak of hostilities, General de Gaulle had served warning that we would not approve of resort to force of arms. This stand was

in accordance with the Charter and with logic, for force, in our eyes, is not a means of settling political problems. When, despite everything, violence prevailed, the French Government again made itself heard; it indicated, and Mr. Couve de Murville himself repeated in this Assembly, that:

"No fait accompli on the spot regarding territorial limits and the status of the citizens of the States concerned can be accepted as permanent," and also that "only a freely negotiated settlement, accepted by all parties involved and recognized by the international community, can eventually solve the problems as a whole." [1531st meeting, para. 104.]

67. This gives an indication of the anxiety that we feel over the measures recently taken by the Government of Israel in Jerusalem. As soon as they became known, my Government indicated that it could not recognize the decision taken by the Government of Israel regarding the unification of Jerusalem. Even if, as Mr. Eban affirms in his reply to the Secretary-General's letter of 5 July, it was a question only of "the integration of Jerusalem in the administrative and municipal spheres" [see A/6753], the decisions of 27 June and their immediate putting into effect would appear to us inopportune, with no basis in law, and likely to aggravate still further a situation already fraught with tension and danger.

68. We do not dispute the intentions of the Israel authorities when they assure us that all the necessary steps will be taken to protect the Holy Places and to ensure free access for all, without discrimination, to the places of worship of the three religions chiefly concerned. We consider, however, that the statutory amendments which have affected the administration of the city go far beyond that and touch upon questions of sovereignty to which this Assembly cannot be indifferent.

69. We listened closely to the statements made by Mr. Eban on 12 July [1550th meeting]. It seemed to us that in dealing with the question of Jerusalem the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel tended to neglect, for the benefit of the religious aspects of the problem, its fundamental features, which are essentially legal and political. Similarly, when he referred to the effects of the measures taken by his Government, including the fact that "the Jews and Arabs in Jerusalem should live together in peace instead of living apart in hostility" [1550th meeting, para. 97], he lost sight, in our view, of the basis for all unity and all peace, namely the free consent of the peoples and Governments concerned.

70. My delegation regrets that neither in his reply to the Secretary-General nor in his statement on Wednesday did Mr. Eban see fit to specify that the measures taken by the Government of Israel in Jerusalem could only be temporary, prompted by the requirements of the moment. Such an affirmation would, I am sure, have been welcomed by the Assembly, and some of us, reassured about the city's future, might perhaps have been more understanding of the practical utility of these measures.

71. The French delegation took part in the adoption of resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July. Taking into account the most recent developments in Jerusalem,

as also the letter and the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, to which I just referred, it seems to us essential that the provisions of that resolution should be reaffirmed. We shall therefore vote in favour of the revised draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Afghanistan, Guinea, Iran, Mali, Pakistan, Somalia, and Turkey [A/L.528/Rev.1]. We should, however, like paragraph 4 to be reworded in such a way that the Security Council would be asked to consider as a matter of urgency the situation that would be created by a further refusal by Israel to apply resolution 2253 (ES-V), and to take the matter up within the framework of the wider problems which have arisen at Jerusalem.

72. In the course of this session many delegations have pointed out that might does not make right. It is from this standpoint that we consider that the Assembly must react against the establishment of a precedent which would add still further to the complexity of the problems at present before it.

73. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the last speaker, I have been asked to remind Members that the General Assembly decided this morning to close at 1 o'clock today the list of speakers in explanation of their vote before the voting.

74. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): Once again the Assembly resumes its deliberations dealing with the Israeli aggression and its consequences, and we hope that by now it is abundantly clear that this aggression is in fact unique and unprecedented in the annals of the United Nations. It is unique because the aggressor, on various occasions and through its channels in and outside of this world Organization, has been trying very hard to convince the Members and others that it is, rather, the victim of aggression. It is unique because the aggressor, in complete defiance of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the resolutions of the General Assembly, and the very philosophy on which this world Organization is built, would like the Assembly not only to overlook his aggression, but also to adopt his new thesis that the aggressor may enjoy the fruits of his aggression. To this we will never subscribe; let there be no miscalculation about that.

75. At the same time, the Israeli aggression is unprecedented because, in spite of all the evidence that Tel Aviv circles committed the aggression, the Assembly has not been able up to the present time, for obvious reasons, either to condemn the aggressor or to force it to withdraw from the territories which it has illegally occupied since 5 June. The unprecedented situation which the Assembly has faced since the beginning of this emergency special session is ample proof of the hazards which will face the United Nations if this state of inaction on the part of the General Assembly continues. For the General Assembly to be incapacitated to the extent that the principles of the Charter become paralysed only because of the support of certain Western Powers for Israeli aggression is most harmful to the future of the United Nations and to the very interest of all its Member States. I am sure I would be interpreting the feeling of the Members if I came to the conclusion that because of Israel—this "tiny State", as Mr. Eban prefers to call it—the

foundation of this Organization is crumbling and its future cannot be guaranteed. The result would be that havoc and international anarchy would reign once again on the international plane.

76. In whose interest, may I ask, is it that the Members of the United Nations follow a different path? In whose interest is it that Israel and its supporters—namely, the United States—would like to create the very dangerous precedent that when an aggression is committed, the aggressor can dictate his terms, and the Assembly is expected to condone his behaviour? Sometimes we wonder whether the United States and Israel, jointly or otherwise, realize the seriousness of the situation and to what consequences it would lead if this state of affairs were to persist.

77. Having said that, I must state that the debate during the last two weeks has shown beyond any doubt that Israel must withdraw its forces from territories which it occupied in June 1967; and that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States cannot and should not be violated if we still firmly believe in the Charter of the United Nations. Similarly, the debate has shown that the Assembly does not accept the incessant Israeli endeavours and justification of its unilateral action in formally annexing this or that piece of territory under any pretext whatever, be it historical, civil, or administrative. No falsifications of any kind, phrased or paraphrased in the usual style of Mr. Eban or his authorities, can hide the naked fact that they are challenging this world Organization and its decisions. No soft talk can disguise the illegal actions of the Israelis in trying to realize certain dreams which from time to time they have entertained, namely, annexing Gaza or Jerusalem.

78. If we take as an example the declared and official position of Israel on Jerusalem, we come to the conclusion that Israeli machinations are designed to present Israel's illegal annexation of Jerusalem as a very simple question—as a humanitarian question, as a touristic question, as a civil question, and sometimes as an administrative question—whereas the naked fact is that Mr. Eban believes in lecturing the Members of this Assembly in the most humiliating manner, belittling the Members' considered opinion as it was manifested in resolution 2253 (ES-V) which was adopted by this Assembly on 4 July 1967.

79. I have to confess that after going through Mr. Eban's statement I was inclined to feel sorry for him, because he was in fact going round in a vicious circle, trying to cover up and justify the policy of his Government to annex Jerusalem. This act of annexation is against all the decisions of the Security Council regarding the cease-fire, and, as such, is considered a violation of the decisions of the Council, which, in accordance with its responsibilities, should take prompt action, having in mind the resolution which the Assembly adopted unanimously on 4 July and the forthcoming resolution which the Assembly will undoubtedly uphold.

80. For those reasons, the United Nations, in the General Assembly or in the Security Council, cannot recognize the unilateral action of Israel.

81. In this respect, I venture to inform the Assembly that the United Nations, and the United Nations alone, is responsible for seeing to it that this Israeli aggression is not legalized through any negotiations, arrangements or understandings carried out outside this Organization by the Israelis or any other source whatsoever.

82. No Government or anyone else is entitled, in our opinion, to encourage or assist Israel in camouflaging its aggressions. It is both untenable and unacceptable that there should be any negotiations between Israel and other parties based on the assumption of legalizing the Israeli occupation of the Arab sector of Jerusalem, which occupation has already been condemned virtually unanimously by the General Assembly and ordered to be immediately terminated.

83. I do not believe that anyone in this Assembly, even for the sake of Mr. Eban's fantasy, can entertain any misconception of what is really happening in Jerusalem. It is not really true that under the Israeli authorities the Holy Places will, for the first time, be accessible to all religions. It is equally not true that the Israelis' real concern is to ensure the safety and universal character of the Holy Places of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. But the crux of the matter is not that these Holy Places would be under the control of one religion or another, but that, if Israel succeeds in its annexation, they would be at the mercy of world Zionism, which, as you all know, is a political movement with unlimited aims. This is the real truth which you will all face and from which you will all suffer.

84. World Zionism has no limits, and, despite Mr. Eban's claim, its ambition is not to ensure the holiness of the Holy Places. Zionism regards the Holy Places as yet another piece of territory to be annexed to Israel from which it can further its aims for more expansion in the Middle East.

85. So we hope that the letter which Mr. Eban sent to the Secretary-General [see A/6753] will be examined with this background in mind.

86. To prove the political, non-religious approach of Israel to the Jerusalem problem, it is interesting to draw your attention to the voting on the resolution adopted by the Assembly on 4 July. The United States was the only big Power to abstain from the vote on that draft resolution. The United States abstention could not be justified or even explained, because it stood almost alone against the overwhelming majority of the Member States. The United States position does not need any elaboration. It could not be motivated by religious factors, but is undoubtedly determined by political considerations. The United States, which shares with Israel the responsibility for the last aggression in the Middle East, is fully aware of the Israeli policies and intentions regarding Jerusalem. Those intentions also are most probably shared with Israel, and thus there are joint Israeli-American plans to cover up the Israeli aggression in Jerusalem and other territories in the Middle East.

87. Those are the crude facts of the situation. And no denials on the part of the United States could convince anyone of the reasons why it was not possible for the United States to go along with the

ninety-nine votes of the membership at large. The United States, in this connexion, did not pay due regard to or respect the opinions of Western, African or Asian countries, or even Latin American sentiments. It may be that these are facts of life and that we are witnessing a very interesting new phenomenon by which the United States does not have even the freedom to demonstrate its solidarity with its allies and has been forced to forgo that solidarity for the sake of Tel Aviv.

88. I wonder whether the meek attitude of the United States Government towards the Israeli defiance of the United Nations is due to its being blackmailed by the Tel Aviv authorities lest they reveal from their side the collusion and the participation of the United States in the latest aggression against the Arab peoples.

89. As to the United Kingdom, the other accomplice, it is trying, behind the scenes, to foil any attempt to condemn Israel, and is endeavouring to render it every assistance in attaining its goals. It is evidently a most astute division of labour among the imperialist Powers and their agents.

90. Even The New York Times, in its editorial of 13 July, summed up the situation regarding the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem in the following words:

"World opinion is against the unilateral measures Israel has taken regarding the Old City of Jerusalem. These measures approximate annexation..."

"The civic, social, health and other steps taken to administer the Old City would not alone prejudice the ultimate peace settlement any more than similar measures in other Israeli-occupied territory. But the parliamentary and governmental actions Israel has taken on the Old City go well beyond this and amount to its incorporation into a unified, Israeli Jerusalem—even if Mr. Eban rejects the word 'annexation'."

91. As I have said before, even The New York Times has put the Israeli action in its proper perspective. And, for all these reasons, we are sure that the Assembly, in its wisdom, will adopt unanimously the very responsible and forthright move proposed by the representative of Pakistan when he submitted his draft resolution [A/L.528/Rev.1].

92. The Israeli plans for the annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem are in themselves a new aggression and an extension of the physical armed aggression which they committed against the Arab countries on 5 June. The Israelis must withdraw from Jerusalem, as well as from all territories which they occupy as a result of their aggression. Israel cannot claim that it has peaceful intentions, and no one should be deceived by this professed policy as long as Israel continues to occupy territory as a result of its aggression.

93. Similarly, it is fallacious to contend here and to try to make others believe, that Israel's security is in danger, when we know that Israel itself has been condemned more than once by various organs of the United Nations because of its aggression against each and every Arab country during the last twenty years or so. The fallacy of this theory of

the insecurity of Israel cannot overshadow the real issues involved in the present crisis.

94. In all candour, what has happened in the Middle East in the recent past is symptomatic of what is going on all over the world. Israel, as an agent of the colonial Powers, has committed naked and premeditated aggression, justifying it all by its personal interests and need for security. These are the very reasons which colonial and other Powers practising neo-colonialism always use as a pretext for their aggressions. Be it in Africa, Asia, or Latin America, colonial Powers always justify their aggressions on the basis of their national security and interests.

95. If this continues, the world will pass through further episodes of lawlessness, anarchy and vandalism. The Israeli aggression against the Arabs is the same as aggression against any country, be it in Asia, Africa or in Latin America; and, as such, it should be repelled and condemned. Under the umbrella of the United Nations and its Charter, aggression cannot be dealt with using different yardsticks. The law of the United Nations is one law, and peace is possible only if it is based on justice, not on diktat or blackmail. Nothing in the United Nations Charter gives any country the right to commit any aggression against another. Nothing in the Charter can be construed to mean that aggression should be rewarded. So let us follow the course of the Charter and stop being used by the aggressor as a tool to abet the aggressor, but rather let us repel the aggressor and restore the authority of the United Nations and the rule of law.

96. Mr. PEREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Venezuela deeply regrets that the Government of Israel is not prepared to comply with the resolution on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V)] submitted at this emergency special session, as is clear from the report of the Secretary-General [A/6753].

97. The Venezuelan delegation has already expressed its views on this important issue unequivocally to the Assembly. It is intolerable that the attempt to annex the part of a city held in veneration by three major world religions should be consummated by the refusal of the Government of Israel to implement the General Assembly resolution. There can be no possible justification for this or for any annexation brought about by force, and it is outrageous that the fact that the inhabitants of the Old City are now enjoying the social services of Israel should be advanced as an argument to justify this illegal act vis-à-vis the United Nations. This is in flat contradiction to the principles and purposes upheld by the United Nations in regard to co-operation between industrialized and developing countries in the economic and social fields.

98. The action and the attitude of the Government of Israel pre-judge any ultimate decision the General Assembly may make with respect to the City of Jerusalem; for this reason the delegation of Venezuela, I repeat, profoundly deplores these measures and trusts that they will be rescinded in the near future by the Israel authorities.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.