

**UN-Secretariat matters -
Security Council:
UN-Secretariat matters -
Securit...**

HS L 179:93b



Dag Hammarskjöld's saml.

SECCO affairs 1953

Press Release 11 Dec.

Statement by Charles Maliki (Repr. of Lebanon on the SECCO)
in the meeting of the Council on Dec. 11, on the complaint
by Syria against Israel for the diversion of the waters of the
Jordan river.

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Bureau
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media--not an official record)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

STATEMENT BY DR. CHARLES MALIK, REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON
ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL, IN THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ON
DECEMBER 11, 1953, ON THE COMPLAINT BY SYRIA AGAINST
ISRAEL FOR THE DIVERSION OF THE WATERS OF THE JORDAN RIVER

I.

To descend from the heights to which President Eisenhower lifted us the other day in the General Assembly to the fallow plains of the Palestine Question is, on the face of it, an experience of a most sordid character. I never felt as apologetic as I do in having to treat again this Question before the Council, when the highest issues of war and peace and history have just been dramatically raised and when we all have to grapple with them for many weeks and months to come. But puny and insignificant as our problems in the Near East are by comparison, they are nevertheless very real. The temple of peace is built up of a multitude of separate stones, and unless each stone is sound and firm, who can be sure that the edifice as a whole will stand? Our little stone in the Near East is, alas, far from ready to take its place in the total structure, and requires still much expert polishing by the architects of peace.

I shall endeavor to be guided hereafter by a spirit of fairness, truth and good will. If anything I shall say is untrue, even in the least little degree, I apologize for and recant it in advance. If I am unfair in any attitude I take, I shall be deeply sorry for it. And I pray that everything I utter should proceed from a ground of good will. Thus my spirit is not that of one having a "crusade" to fight or a "cause" to defend or a "movement" to further. My spirit, I trust, is to seek the truth, no matter how ugly or formidable, but always in fairness and on a basis of absolute good will. For I am persuaded only truth, fairness and good will -- and not politics or diplomacy -- can bring about real, lasting peace in the Near East.

I had the honor to make at the six hundred and thirty-ninth meeting of the Council a statement in which I respectfully submitted that the work on the Canal Project which Israel started in the Demilitarized Zone between Israel and Syria should not have started and should not now be resumed without the mutual consent of the two parties to the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement. The details and arguments which have since been presented to the Council confirmed my Delegation in its belief in the validity of our contention. We listened with keen interest

(more)

to the dissertation on geography, history and topography to which the Council was treated. However, we are still convinced of the following, which we believe to be objectively demonstrable truths:

1. To allow the work on the Canal Project to be resumed in the Demilitarized Zone without a mutual agreement between Israel and Syria is to give a de facto recognition of the annexation of the Zone by one party to the Armistice Agreement.

2. To condition the resumption of the work upon a prior agreement between Israel and Syria is not to dishonor the past jurisdiction of the Council in the Huleh case, but, as we shall show, precisely to be consistent with that jurisdiction and with the provisions of the Armistice Agreement which are applicable to the present case.

3. To allow the work to be resumed without the consent of the two parties to the Armistice Agreement is to further, or at least condone, the expansionist ambitions of Israel to the waters of the area and thereby to undermine any possibility of a regional cooperation for the exploitation of these waters.

4. To allow the work to be unilaterally resumed is to play into the hands of those who, for the sake of self-justification, have advanced the dangerous doctrine of "progress at any price," even if that price be human rights, international order and the sanctity of international agreements.

In accordance with right order I propose now to develop and demonstrate these four conclusions, one after the other. I shall also at the end set forth a general conclusion to which I attach some importance.

II.

Since we are considering a case related to the Demilitarized Zone created by the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement, I wish I did not have to raise again the question of sovereignty over the Zone. For it has been clearly stated in all the authoritative interpretations given to the provisions of the Agreement, and particularly to Article 5, that the question of sovereignty over the Zone was left to the final settlement. Despite this, it seems that one party to the Agreement does not want to leave this matter to the final settlement, but wants instead to exercise itself sovereignty over the Zone. In fact, it is already exercising this sovereignty in violation of its plighted word with respect to the Armistice Agreement. The Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization gave many instances of this unilateral and illegal exercise of sovereignty in his reports to the Council on the Qibya case. (S/PV. 630 and 635). He said in his brief consideration of the question of the implementation of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria: "The difficulties which have arisen are

(more)

connected with the application of the provisions relating to the Demilitarized Zone.....The other difficulties are those which General Riley has reported upon during the past two years: the economic situation of the Arabs in the Demilitarized Zone, encroachments on Arab lands, control exercised by the Israeli police over the greater part of the Zone, Israel opposition to the fulfillment by the Chairman and United Nations observers of their responsibility for ensuring the implementation of Article V of the General Armistice Agreement." In his second report General Bennike gives further details about this exercise of sovereignty; he shows that despite all protests of United Nations officials it has been going on for years in all demilitarized zones created by the Armistice Agreements. He says in particular: "In the course of their duties, United Nations military observers have met with some obstruction on the part of Israeli civilians and some over-zealous Israeli officials in the two demilitarized zones created by the Israeli-Egyptian and Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreements and in the Mount Scopus Demilitarized Zone."

Referring to the constancy of the exercise of Israeli sovereignty in the Demilitarized Zone created by the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement, and quoting in this respect a report addressed to the Security Council by General Riley on 6 November, 1951, in which General Riley mentioned that he obtained from Israel an assurance of the cessation of the exercise of this sovereignty, General Bennike says: "The assurance thus given to my predecessor has not always been fully observed. One year later, in his report to the Security Council of 30 October, 1952 (S/2833), Lt. General W.E. Riley described the situation as it then existed in the Demilitarized Zone. For example, he stated in paragraph 58 of his report: '.....Israeli police acting under orders from police headquarters outside the Demilitarized Zone, exercise control over practically the entire Demilitarized Zone. The Chairman has maintained that the provisions of Article V of the General Armistice Agreement and the Explanatory Note of Dr. Bunche quoted in the Security Council resolution of 18 May, 1951, call for police of a local character within the Demilitarized Zone. Israeli authorities, however, have not agreed to remove their non-local police from the Demilitarized Zone and no arrangement has been worked out...' There has been no change in the situation as described by my predecessor." (S/PV. 635 (Annex) pp. 25, 26). General Bennike gives an explanation of all these illegal practices. He says: "Israeli officials and citizens have repeatedly shown their impatience with limitations to their activities in an area which they consider as under Israel sovereignty." (S/PV. 635 (Annex) p. 27). (On this whole question of Israel's general disregard for her obligations under

(more)

the Armistice Agreements, see especially Proposition VI, "Israel does not respect her obligations under the General Armistice Agreements with respect to the Demilitarized Zones between Israel and Syria, between Israel and Egypt and at Mount Scopus," and Proposition VII, "Obstruction to the work of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization appears to have come only from Israel," in the System of Qibya, S/PV. 643, pp. 51-54).

Instead of considering with his Government the ways and means of putting an end to this impatience, the distinguished representative of Israel has done his utmost to defend it and to justify it. Dozens of quotations can be taken from his statements before the Council on the Huleh case and on the Canal Project case in which he affirmed effective Israeli sovereignty over the Zone. (Cf. especially S/PV. 542, pages 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 15, and S/PV. 547, page 12, and S/PV. 639, pages 28-29.) There is in the practice of Israel and in the statements of the representative of Israel a complete disregard for the historical fact that the Demilitarized Zone was up to 15 May, 1948, a Palestinian territory, and that since that time it was for a much longer period under Syrian control than it was under Israeli. There is in them also an avowed tendency to identify Israel with Palestine and to consider as Israel's boundaries either those which were laid down in the United Nations Resolution of November 29, 1947, on the partition of Palestine, or those which were determined by the force of arms (Cf. the interesting observation by the representative of Israel with respect to the Syrian occupation of the Demilitarized Zone before the Armistice: "Military occupation itself does not give rise to legal sovereignty." S/PV. 542, page 15.), according to whichever of these two determinations extended most. But it is obvious that Israel is not Palestine, no matter how much some might wish it to be, or might be working and scheming to make it. It is also obvious that Israel is a state without fixed boundaries, and it will continue to have this undetermined shape so long as its neighbors have not recognized its boundaries, for a boundary, by definition, is the mutual recognition of a fixed line between neighbors. Therefore any attempt to "Israelize" the Demilitarized Zone is but another step in the execution of a premeditated plan to gradually "Israelize" all Palestine. Because such a plan clearly means aggression, the Security Council will certainly prevent its execution.

The diversion of the waters of the Zone, which are neither Israeli nor Syrian waters, is one more measure toward the integral Israelization of the Zone. The project of diversion, as General Bennike said in his report, is sponsored by the Israeli Government. The diversion is effected, as the representative of Israel affirmed, not for the good of the people of the Zone but for the benefit of the

(more)

State of Israel. It is true that many other changes were brought about in the Zone on Israeli initiative, but none of them had the importance or the far-reaching consequences of the present one. If the Chief of Staff of the United Nations or the Council authorized changes in the past, they did so with the firm conviction that such changes would neither modify the status of the Zone nor prejudice its fate. This was affirmed in the several reservations repeated about the question of sovereignty. It seems that such formal reservations are no more enough to preserve to the Zone its legal status. One party to the Armistice Agreement is actually creating in the Zone a situation which is contradictory to these reservations. When the time for a final settlement will come, the parties concerned will find themselves before a fait accompli. The creation of this fait accompli is a violation of Article 5 of the Armistice Agreement. Therefore we may not expect the Council to limit itself this time to mere formal assurances on the matter of sovereignty in the Zone, for we have seen that these assurances have never been respected by Israel, but we have every right, we think, to expect the Council to make sure this time that no work would be undertaken in the Zone which will prejudice the final settlement, and that practical measures will be taken to prevent the alteration of the status of the Zone to the advantage of either party to the Armistice Agreement, without a previous understanding with the other party. I use the word "understanding" on purpose. For it has been assumed that one party is anxious to develop the economic life of the Zone, and indeed of the whole region, while the other party, embracing a static view of things, wishes only to veto that development. This is either a false assumption or one that proceeds from a basic ill will. It is surprising that it emanates from the party which has always sung the glories of direct negotiations. It is also surprising that it is advanced in complete disregard for precedents in which agreement between the two parties within the Mixed Armistice Commission was possible. General Bennil mentioned in his report to the Council (S/3122) that "On 22 January, 1952, the Chairman reached an agreement with both parties whereby the checking-gates could be operated for a period of about three weeks in order to effect emergency repairs to the Banat Yacoub Bridge." It is not the party which has been accused here of obstruction that prevented a final agreement on the matter. For it is affirmed in the same quotation that: "The owners of Buteiha Farm, with the concurrence of the Senior Syrian Delegate, offered to agree to controlled use of the checking-gates if prompt payment for resulting damage was made by Israel. This offer was not accepted." Here is one of many instances in which a party obstructs agreements and accuses the other party of obstruction; and the accusation is levelled

(more)

while there has not been even an attempt at any consultation for the sake of agreement. If thus direct consultations within the machinery of the Armistice Commission are deemed vain and useless, any other direct talk on any other subject cannot prove more fruitful. For our part, we think the normal and only right course is to seek understanding with the other party through the machinery of the Mixed Armistice Commission, for this is the only available machinery which might yield positive results.

If we attach a particular importance to this question of sovereignty, it is because the modern history of Palestine has taught us that development and settlement were never pursued in the Holy Land for innocent purposes: they always concealed ulterior ends. Territorial expansion and the dispossession of others of their sovereign rights have been behind all such allegedly dynamic and constructive moves. Everything points to the possibility that Israel has now decided that the time has come for a new pulsating surge forwards at the expense of the Arabs, and therefore the Council is called upon in effect either to close its eyes to this intention or to endeavor to curb it. I quote the British author, George Kirk, in the first edition of his book, "The Middle East in the War," published by the Oxford University Press, on one of a thousand examples that I can fully substantiate of exploitation of economic development for the sake of expansion. Kirk writes: "The Royal Commission's recommendation in 1937 of the partition of Palestine had caused the Jewish National Fund to give greater consideration than formerly to political factors in its program for land purchases: 'Preference was given to those areas which might be of decisive importance when the delimitation of frontiers and similar matters came up for consideration. When, for example, the partition of Palestine.....was suggested, the Fund expedited its purchases in the north.....notably in Upper Galilee, buying more land in the frontier regions.....Tracts have also been acquired in other parts of the country in order to.....expand the frontiers as envisaged, for instance, by the Peel Commission.'" (Page 233, underscoring mine.) The changes promoted by Israel in the Demilitarized Zone in contravention of the Armistice Agreement are indeed in line with the policy revealed in this quotation. It is interesting to note how much the language of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel in his letter of 24 September, 1953, to General Bennike in justification of the changes in the Zone sounds like the language of the above-mentioned quotation taken from a report of the Jewish National Fund. A quiet meditation on these phenomena will show that we are here face to face with a dynamic thrust that has no inner principle of self-restraint, but that will keep on expanding, attacking, encroaching upon, eating

(more)

into its immediate surroundings indefinitely, until it is physically stopped from without. The question therefore arises: Where, when, how and by whom and by what will it stop? It is thus fair to conclude that to permit a change as radical as that which will be brought about by the Canal Project is to sanction once more this policy of unending encroachment, and to give a tacit consent to the annexation of the Zone by one party to the Armistice Agreement. I hold that the Council, with its gaze always upon peace and security, will never do that.

III.

I come now to the question of the relation of the jurisdiction of the Council on the Huleh case to our present debate. We find ourselves here in the presence of two contentions: the contention of the distinguished representative of Israel, who is willing to assimilate the Canal Project case to the Huleh case; and the contention of both the Chief of Staff and the distinguished delegate of Syria that the two cases are basically different from each other. It is argued in the first contention that consistency should now dictate on the Council a decision similar to its past one. But the differences between the two cases have been set forth at length by the distinguished delegate of Syria and by the Chief of Staff. It is useful to recall here at least some of the differences pointed out by the Chief of Staff. The basic difference between the two projects is for him that "Lake Huleh and the Huleh marshes are outside the Demilitarized Zone, while the Jordan, between Lake Huleh and Lake Tiberias, flows in the Zone. As Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission, entrusted with special responsibilities in the Demilitarized Zone under Article V, 5(c), of the General Armistice Agreement, I have considered the military aspect of the diversion of a considerable quantity of water from the present river bed with reference to the provisions of Article V." (S/3122, Annex III, p. 9.) The brazen negation of these basic differences causes the representative of Israel to see consistency in asking the Council to take a decision on the Canal Project similar to its decision on the Huleh Project. Those who recognize these differences think that consistency imposes different decisions on different cases. Consistency then is a matter of spirit and principle and not of mechanical uniformity of application. The true principle of consistency is: be true to each separate case as its own concrete nature demands, and certainly not: impose arbitrarily upon essentially different cases the same abstract structure. This is certainly the right empirical method which Locke and Berkeley and William James have taught the world. My Delegation supported the second contention without any feeling of embarrassment about the Huleh precedent

(more)

and without any request to the Council to dishonor any of its jurisdictions. The view of my Delegation is that if the principles confirmed or laid down in the Huleh decision were well understood, genuinely interpreted and fully respected, the work on the Canal Project should not have been started the way it was started and it would not be allowed to be resumed without the mutual consent of the two parties. Since then what is required is a consistency of principle, the disengagement of the fundamental principles of the Huleh jurisdiction is of crucial importance. A brief analysis therefore of that jurisdiction and of the opinions and the conclusions of the Delegates who voted for it is necessary at this point.

There were in that jurisdiction the following four principles:

A: An emphasis on the importance and workability of the Armistice Agreement.

This emphasis is rather embarrassing to those who are showing great impatience with the system of the Armistice Agreements and who are doing their utmost to undermine it. The Council declared in that decision "that in order to promote the return of permanent peace in Palestine, it is essential that the Governments of Israel and Syria observe faithfully the General Armistice Agreement of 20 July, 1949." (Underscoring mine). The faithful implementation of the Agreement and not its violation was laid down as a condition sine qua non of the return to the real and positive peace of which we all dream. The Chief of Staff as well as many delegates put a particular stress on this point. "I am confident," said the Chief of Staff at the 542nd meeting of the Council, "that the Armistice Agreement can be made to work. Indeed, for almost two years it has worked well. It is certainly in the interests of both parties that they should make it work." The delegate of the United States endorsed the Chief of Staff's opinion in both the beginning and the conclusion of the statement that he made on the Huleh case at the 546th meeting of the Council. "I believe," he said, "we may note with confidence the assurances given us by General Riley.....when he stated that he was confident the Armistice Agreements could be made to work." Recently the delegate of the United States affirmed in connection with the Qibya affair: "While adherence to the Armistice Agreement will not alone bring peace, peace is impossible without that adherence." (S/PV. 640, pp. 4-5).

These affirmations given in 1951 by General Riley and endorsed then and recently by the representatives of the United States were further confirmed by General Bennike before this Council. Referring to Israeli criticism of the Armistice Agreements, General Bennike said in his report to the Council (S/PV. 630): "These opposite criticisms should not, in my opinion, lead to the conclusion that the General Armistice Agreements should be discarded before they can

(more)

be replaced by peace settlements. The Armistice Agreements have lasted too long not to have lost part of their effectiveness. They still constitute, however, a barrier to breaches of the peace in the Middle East." This same position of the inviolability of the Armistice Agreements in the interests of peace and of a final peace settlement was recently reaffirmed by the Council in the Qibya resolution. It is thus clear that the passage of time has made the assurances of the Chief of Staff supported by the Council on the value of the Armistice Agreements more important than ever. From all these assurances a conclusion with the force of a categorical imperative can be drawn: Unless Israel, in good faith, makes its Armistice Agreements with the Arab States work well, no other possible agreement would work or could be worked out.

B. An endorsement of the request of the Chief of Staff for the suspension of the work of drainage which constituted a confirmation of the principle of subordination of projects of development to the implementation of the provisions of the Armistice Agreement. It gave these provisions a priority over any alleged advantage of economic development. This principle was strongly defended by many delegates in their comments on the decision. "Whilst my government," said the delegate of the United Kingdom at the 546th meeting of the Council, "fully recognizes the general benefit that would result from the completion of the Lake Huleh drainage scheme, it is firmly of the view that it should not be proceeded with in violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement." The French delegate expressed the same view when he gave at the same meeting his statement on the question of principle that I quoted in the first part of my address to the Council on this matter. It seems that the only delegate who was not only embarrassed but actually perplexed by the confirmation of this principle and by the conclusive remarks of the delegates about it was the delegate of Israel. He said at the 547th meeting of the Council: "My Delegation is perplexed by the remarks of some representatives who have declared their positive interest in the Huleh project but have, nevertheless, seen nothing wrong with the text of the draft resolution.....Anyone who supports this text is effectively, and despite his good intentions, against the project." Ten of the members of the Council voted for the resolution. According to the reasoning of the representative of Israel, the ten were against the Huleh Project. The fact was that they were against its resumption in violation of the Armistice Agreement, for they decisively subordinated everything else to the absolute necessity of honoring the Armistice Agreement. Today the representative of Israel is telling us that everything -- armistice, peace,

(more)

the Security Council, the United Nations, the Arabs -- are as a matter of fact subordinate to the "dynamic" plans of the economic development of Israel. We hold a different view. We are requesting the honorable members of the Council to take a similar attitude of principle on the Canal Project to that taken by the Council in the Huleh case: namely, that peace and armistice and the honoring of one's international engagements come first, and everything else, including Israel and her real or imagined interests, second.

C. A condemnation of unilateral acts committed in the Demilitarized Zone.
It happened that most of these acts were committed by one party; therefore, the condemnation fell almost all on that party. Without reproducing all the parts of the resolution on this point, I wish to mention only the condemnation of the refusal of Israel to cease the work, of her failure to attend the meetings of the Armistice Commission, of the use of her police in the Zone, of her aerial action against Syrian territory, and of her expulsion of the Arab inhabitants of the Zone. Most of the delegates expressed a firm condemnation of all unilateral actions. "No unilateral action," said the delegate of the Netherlands at the 547th meeting, "should be taken, but agreement between the interested parties should be obtained." He said also: "There can be no question of unilateral decision by either of the parties. Much less can there be any justification for aggressive action by one party to force the practical implications of its own interpretation upon the other." The Israeli delegate was so shocked by the condemnation of the unilateral aggressive action of his country that he called it, at the 547th meeting of the Council, ".....a severe censure.....almost without precedent in the jurisdiction of the Security Council." We have heard this same language from the representative of Israel in a recent case. It happened that the same party which by unilateral actions violated in the Huleh case the Armistice Agreement has committed also in the present case unilateral actions in violation of the same Agreement. These actions were impressively described in the report of the Chief of Staff, General Bennike (S/3122). The Council will therefore be perfectly consistent with itself when it condemns again all unilateral actions, whether committed by Syria or by Israel. For it is obvious that, in a sense, all unilateral action is a form of aggression, and certainly the Council is against aggression. The Council will be even more consistent with itself when it takes the necessary measures to prevent the recurrence of such actions in the future. It is obvious that the most effective measure against unilateral action is to require the submission of a work like the Canal Project to the consent of the other party.

(more)

D. The confirmation of the legal status of the Zone as established in Article 5 of the Armistice Agreement, as this Article was interpreted by Dr. Bunche and the Chief of Staff, and the confirmation of the principle of a restrictive restoration of civilian life to the Demilitarized Zone. The restriction was caused by the recognition of the absence of any sovereignty over the Zone. The authority of the Chief of Staff to supervise the restoration of civilian life was reaffirmed with the clear understanding that its restoration should be effected on a local basis and without prejudice to a final settlement. Many paragraphs of the resolution stressed these restrictions. It was Dr. Bunche who initiated this idea in his interpretation of Article 5 of the Agreement. He was quoted by General Riley at the 542nd meeting of the Council as stating that: "It was recognized.....that the gradual restoration of normal civilian life in the Demilitarized Zone could neither be automatic nor left to the discretion of the conflicting parties.....Neither party could validly claim to have a free hand in the Demilitarized Zone over civilian activity, while military activity was totally excluded." In its resolution the Council adopted this interpretation. The delegate of the United Kingdom concluded from a study of the provisions of the Armistice Agreement concerning the Demilitarized Zone and the interpretations of these provisions that, as he stated at the 546th meeting of the Council, ".....Both the Governments of Israel and Syria have a duty under the Agreement to assist the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission to organize the administration of the Demilitarized Zone on a purely local basis; to abstain from any effort to assert their sovereignty." (Underscoring mine). The delegate of Turkey stated at the same meeting of the Council: "Civilian activity also, in our understanding of Article V of the Armistice Agreement, is not unrestricted in the Demilitarized Zone." The Delegate of the Netherlands said at the 547th meeting of the Council in support of the views of his colleagues: "Since the Demilitarized Zone was defined with a view to.....while providing for the gradual restoration of normal civilian life in the area, without prejudice to the ultimate settlement, it stands to reason, I think, that neither of the parties can exercise sovereign rights in the Demilitarized Zone during the armistice, as though the situation had already found its ultimate settlement and had been accepted by all parties concerned." The Delegate of Israel was the only one to oppose this view which was almost unanimously expressed by the Council. "Demilitarization," he said at the 542nd meeting of the Council, "has never, never yet been considered as investing the area concerned with any peculiar or particular status in international law.....The theory that Israel's laws, civil jurisdiction or freedom of development in the Demilitarized Zone are in abeyance and may legitimately be challenged under the Armistice Agreement is contrary to the established practice of the Agreement." The real truth,

(more)

as we have already proven and as can be easily ascertained from the Armistice Agreement, from its authoritative interpretations and from the decisions of the Council, is the precise opposite of this brazen claim of the representative of Israel.

It is on the basis of these valid restrictions to the exercise of sovereignty and to the restoration of civilian life in the Demilitarized Zone that we are asking the Council to consider the case which is before us. The same party which challenged illegally these legal restrictions in the Huleh case has actually violated them, again illegally, in the Canal Project. However, the representative of this party has been grounding his request for consistency upon the jurisdiction of the Council in the Huleh case. According to the report of the Chief of Staff, all the rules established either by the Armistice Agreement or by the Resolution of the Huleh case for the restoration of civilian life were violated by this same party. But I doubt not that the Council will reassert its authority and the authority of its own agent, the Chief of Staff, by rebuking these violations and ordering that they be not persisted in, but instead justice and the rule of law restored to the Demilitarized Zone.

The Council empowered the Chief of Staff to assure the implementation of its resolution on the Huleh case. By doing so it confirmed his power to supervise the implementation of the Armistice Agreement, to supervise the restoration of civilian life to the Demilitarized Zone and to interpret the provisions of the Armistice Agreement that he is entitled to interpret. Using this power, the Chief of Staff gave his clear findings on the basic differences, from the legal, agricultural, demographic, economic and military angles, between the Huleh case and the Canal Project case. The Council would be fully consistent with itself by accepting the conclusions of its own authoritative representative, and by drawing from them, as indeed they plainly and unreservedly indicate, a jurisdiction beyond the previous one. We do not place any arbitrary limitation upon the authority of the Chief of Staff, but we suggest that because of the differences between the two cases established by him, the Council is called upon to instruct him in the present case to make sure of the consent of the two parties before the resumption of the work on the Canal Project is allowed.

IV.

The next matter to be taken up is the question of the waters of the area. Our discussion should have been limited only to the waters of the Demilitarized Zone, but in the interest of confusion and of self-justification the representative of Israel has seen fit to broaden the discussion. The waters of the Zone, which

(more)

is neither Israeli nor Syrian, have been called Israeli waters. The Israeli approach to the whole problem of water has been touched upon. The historical background of this problem as well as its present importance were revealed to the Council only partially, and only from the point of view of one of the parties to the dispute. I feel therefore it has become necessary for me to disclose to the Council the total historical picture and to draw its attention to the vital importance of the waters to all the states of the area, and not only to the last state imposed upon the Near East. The Near East, its peoples and its waters have been there for millenia, and it is only impudence and intolerable aggressive design that invest the latest newcomer with any special rights to the natural resources of our part of the world. I am convinced that partial or half truths lead nowhere, or lead only where they actually mislead. In order to understand correctly a situation and to deal justly with it the whole truth about it must be known.

I shall quote first from the statement of Secretary of State Dulles after his return from the Near East last June. He said: "Throughout the area the cry is for water for irrigation." He thus did not single out Israel. The Honorable Secretary of State who visited all the countries of the area came to the right conclusion that the cry for water was not only heard in Israel but in all the countries he visited. The need for water is as desperate and crying in the Arab countries as it is in Israel. For obvious reasons, the question of water has had throughout Arab history such an impact on the Arab mind that the Koran has affirmed: "God has made all living things out of water." In fact one may define Arab existence as the death of the desert turned to some life through the boon of water. In the Yemen, in Iraq, in Egypt, in Syria and in Lebanon the earliest systems of irrigation were established which provided these cradles of human civilization with the water needed for the welfare of man. Nowhere is the desert so overpowering and therefore water so scarce and so dear as in Arab lands. Each one of these countries is engaged in projects for the exploitation of every drop of its water for the betterment of the standard of living of its people. The waters of the Jordan River and of its tributaries are much more needed in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria than they are in Israel. I quote again from the statement of the Honorable the Secretary of State. "Irrigation needs," he said, "became more vivid as we motored from Jerusalem to Amman, the capital of Jordan. The road goes through the Dead Sea area, a scene of desolation with no sign of life other than the tens of thousands of refugees who survive precariously on the parched land largely by aid of United Nations doles. Later on as we flew north, we observed the water of the Yarmuk River, which could perhaps be diverted so as to return some of these vast desert valleys into fertile land." (Underscoring mine)

(more)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

Irrigation needs are, in fact, most vivid in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria because these countries have to rely for their economic development on their own natural resources exclusively. On the other hand, since the creation of Israel the new state has received private financial assistance from the outside world of the order of one billion dollars; she received about half a billion dollars in official aid, and she is now receiving another billion dollars from Germany. I say it in absolute good will: I am not grudging Israel any of her sources of income. I am however only saying two things: (a) the world must remember, when all this unseemly beating on the breast is exhibited before the Council, that no such extraordinary resources have been available either to Jordan, or to Syria or to Lebanon; and (b) the Arabs have every right to remind the world that, while being as generous as it pleases towards Israel, it must nevertheless make sure that Israel does not use these extraordinary resources to threaten or weaken or encroach upon or attack the Arabs. Regardless of the motives or the justification for such aid, the fact remains that it is obtained by one state and that this state is able to rely on it, while the other states have to rely on their natural resources only.

Water is also more needed in these states, particularly in Jordan, because there live in these states the one million of Palestinian refugees who are the real and legitimate owners of every drop of the waters of the Jordan River. Again one must tell the powers that be, by which I mean ultimately the Great Powers: if you have done nothing so far to prevent Israel from driving out the original inhabitant of Palestine, is it too much to ask you at least to prevent her from depriving them of these waters? The Jordan may be considered either as an international or as a national river. Considered with its tributaries, it would be an international river belonging to Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine. Considered without its tributaries, it would be rather Palestinian-Jordanian than Israeli. For it is an established geographical fact that most of its waters are still flowing in the Demilitarized Zone, in the territory assigned by the United Nations to the Arabs of Palestine or in Jordan. Therefore to call the river Israeli is another manifestation of Israel's intention to expropriate the river, to just seize it, both by confusing and distorting the issues, and by creating faits accomplis, an intention that I am sure the Council, which exists to prevent aggression, will rise to thwart. It is of a piece with calling Palestine Israel.

This misuse of terms reveals a policy on lands and waters which was pursued since the Balfour Declaration in 1917. Those who had at the back of their mind the conversion of Palestine into a "country as Jewish as Britain is British and France is French"--the reference is to President Weizmann's statement before the Peace Conference in Paris--did their utmost to have the frontiers of Palestine as

(more)

Press Release FM/2764
11 December 1953

large as possible, covering all the area of the rivers in the South of Lebanon and Syria. Lloyd George's memoirs and the Minutes of the Peace Conference were partially quoted before the Council, but the ambitious claims of the Zionists on the frontiers and on the waters were completely omitted. The distinguished American Zionist leader, Justice Brandeis, addressed a telegram to the Peace Conference which was quoted by Lloyd George. In this telegram Justice Brandeis said: "16th February. Please convey Prime Minister Lloyd George following message from myself and all those associated with me in the Zionist Organization of America quote My associates of the Zionist Organization of America cable me from Paris that in Conference in Turkish Treaty France now insists upon terms of Sykes-Picot Agreement stop If this contention of French should prevail it would defeat full realization of promise of Jewish Home for Sykes-Picot Agreement divides country in complete disregard historic boundaries and actual necessity rational northern and eastern boundaries indispensable to self-sustaining community and economic development of country on North Palestine must include Litani River watersheds of Hermon on East must include Plain of Jaulan Hauran if Balfour Declaration subscribed to by France as well as other Allied and Associated Powers is to be made effective these boundaries must be conceded to Palestine.....etc." ("The Truth About the Peace Treaties," by David Lloyd George, Volume II, London, 1938, p.1180, underscoring mine.) Commenting on this telegram and similar claims of other Zionist organizations, Frank Manuel, the author of the book, "The Realities of American-Palestine Relations," quoted Sheldon Whitehouse of the Near Eastern Division of the United States State Department as saying that: "The frontiers proposed by Justice Brandeis would double the size of Palestine agreed to under the Sykes-Picot Agreement and bring the northern frontier right up to Beirut and Damascus." According to the same author, President "Wilson, ailing, received a letter in the same sense from Brandeis, with the addition of a paragraph in which the Justice wrote that a denial of the economic boundary lines would be a betrayal of the promise of Christendom." (p. 256-257). The failure of these plans was mostly due to the energetic attitude of the French Delegation at the Peace Conference, and Lebanon and Syria during the French Mandate owe much to French firmness and vigilance against the designs of the Zionists: for which the peoples of Lebanon and Syria are and will always remain grateful to France.

The representative of Israel in speaking of the Jordan River stressed what he called "human design." Human design indeed there was and still is; we were grateful he spared us reference so far to divine intent.

The failure of the Zionists to include all the waters of Southern Lebanon and Syria within the boundaries of Palestine led to the second stage of their attempt

(more)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

to expropriate the waters of the area. This stage, which started with the establishment of the British Mandate over Palestine, was characterized by a systematic effort to obtain through concessions from the Mandatory power, and by the creation of settlements on the banks of the Jordan, the maximum possible control of Palestinian waters.

President Weizmann, the most authoritative voice that spoke for Zionism during the last half century, gave the ultimate reason for the attempt to control the waters of Palestine. He stated in a speech before the Zionist Federation of Great Britain that he was against any partition of Palestine because "the development of Palestine, both agriculturally and industrially, is based on some simple factors. The agricultural development is based on water. Now in Palestine the water is in the north. And the vast territories which are still free and can be irrigated are in the south. If you want to irrigate the Negev with the waters of the Jordan, you cannot cut Palestine into two, because then development becomes impossible." (Zionist Review, February 4, 1944, p. 910). Many projects, including the most famous of all, the Lowdermilk scheme, were designed for the fulfillment of the end envisaged by Weizmann.

From all this a few conclusions can be drawn with reason and justice.

(a) There has been an active expansionist Zionist plan for the expropriation of all the waters of the area, including Lebanese and Syrian waters, a plan still very much alive in the mind of Israeli leaders. Many instances can prove this contention. It is sufficient now to recall Israel's suggestion to include the Litani River in schemes for the regional exploitation of waters. The Litani is a national river: it springs, flows and ends in Lebanon. To suggest its involvement in any projected regional scheme, as the representative of Israel unabashedly did at the 639th meeting of the Council, is simply to attempt to confuse the status of the Litani with the status of the Jordan, and once more to bring into the open the underlying Israeli ambition to lay hands upon the waters of other lands. Technicians have been working for three years on a plan for the full exploitation of the waters of this river of Lebanon for the welfare of the people of Lebanon. We take some pride in Lebanon in our cultural and social development, but the southern part of the country, where the Litani flows, is perhaps the most backward part of Lebanon. The all-round exploitation of the Litani basin is the only hope for the development of that region, and every hydroelectric or irrigational potentiality of this river will be needed for that development. Israel can only reach the Litani by military aggression, and I am sure there be some who dream of that.

(more)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

(b) There has been a Zionist plan for the exclusive and unilateral use of the waters of the Jordan by Israel, and for the diversion of these waters to the Negev. In addition to the above-mentioned statement of President Weizmann, many other documents reveal the existence of such a plan. An article on the "Disputed Water of Jordan," which was inserted in the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of ^{the} United States House of Representatives (83rd Congress), states that the intention of the authors of the Lowdermilk-Hayes project is "to take every possible drop of water out of the upper Jordan and use it outside the valley for the Jewish settled areas." In the same article, Mr. Neuman, the former President of the Zionist Organization of America, is quoted as saying in his foreword to Mr. Hayes' TVA on the Jordan, "That in the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947, in favor of partition, 'the Jewish state was awarded an area embracing the upper reaches of the Jordan in the north....thereby the opportunity was given for carrying out the basic conception of the Lowdermilk-Hayes project'." An article distributed to the press by the Associated Press on the occasion of the present discussion of the Canal Project by the Council states the following: Israel's national irrigation plan, as shown on the large map, is still in the blueprint stage but preparations are moving fast. When completed, Israel's irrigation system will link the country's rivers and lakes by long distance canals and pipe lines, providing water requirements for more than four million people--more than double the present population. The problem is to take water from the north where it is abundant and land is scarce to the south where the arid Negev is virtually unpopulated." The special Jerusalem correspondent of the New York newspaper "Israel Speaks", (November 13, 1953), stating the reasons for an eventual Israeli rejection of the regional scheme for the exploitation of the Jordan waters which was suggested by the special envoy of President Eisenhower, Mr. Eric Johnston, wrote the following: "If the main scheme were implemented in its present form, little or no water would remain for the Negev. For Israel this is unthinkable as it means condemning the Negev to perpetual aridity. The soil of the Negev can produce rich crops if it gets water; otherwise it will remain a desert, as it has been for so many hundreds of years." Professor Lowdermilk himself, commenting on Eric Johnston's mission, told the Israeli press on November 10 that, "the water plan which was proposed by President Eisenhower's special envoy may be feasible, but that Israel cannot wait for its implementation." (Jerusalem Broadcast, November 10, 1953, underscoring mine.) Finally, the Foreign Minister of Israel on November 30 of this year declared before the Israeli Parliament:

"Another matter which is still under discussion is the future of our work at the diversion of the Jordan River for the purpose of generating electric power, a

(more)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

project which is also connected with future irrigation plans. We invested great effort in this project and continue to insist on our right to continue and complete the work which we began. We interrupted it temporarily in order to give the Security Council a short time to discuss the matter in a quiet atmosphere....

"As to the question of regional water planning, we were the first who declared our willingness to sit together with our three neighbors who may have joint water interests with us, namely, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon, for the purpose of discussing a regional arrangement based on a just distribution of water sources. As long as no arrangement of this sort exists because the neighbor states refuse to meet with Israel, we consider ourselves free to use the water of the rivers which flow in our country as our property. We are convinced that the undisturbed continuation of Israeli development works constitutes perhaps the most effective method to insure regional cooperation.

"We are willing to investigate with good will any regional water plan which may be submitted by an international institution. We promised to approach in this spirit the study of a plan which some time ago was proposed on behalf of the U.S. Government. Our method of studying such plans is twofold:

"1--A thorough investigation of the technical and scientific assumptions on which the plan is based in consultation with reputable experts in whom we trust.

"2--A firm insistence on the water rights which are necessary for Israel's economic development and even its existence. The plan which was submitted to us showed serious defects in these two respects as well as other respects.

"Those who are interested in cooperating with us in this sphere should realize that water constitutes the source of life and bread for Israel's people. Without large-scale irrigation projects, we cannot attain high production and economic independence. This should be taken into consideration by everybody who comes to conduct negotiations with us on water affairs.

"This applies, first of all, to the United States which is in a position to give valuable aid for the efficient exploitation of this region's water resources. We need the aid of the United States and very much appreciate this aid. In the same manner, however, as Israel does not give up its freedom of policy and independent opinion in exchange for American aid or any other aid whatsoever, it cannot be attracted by immediate foreign aid to such an extent that it would give up the prospects of its future development and consolidation." (Underscoring mine).

On this important statement by the Foreign Minister of Israel I wish to make, in passing, a few brief observations. (i) The intransigence with respect to the Canal Project seems to be absolute, for the interruption in the work is described as "temporary," without any hint that Israel will abide by the considered

(more)

Press Release FM/2764
11 December 1953

conclusions of the Council, whatever they be. (ii) The Canal Project is not only hydroelectric, but "is also connected with future irrigation plans." (iii) In the absence of an arrangement with the neighboring states "based on a just distribution of water resources" (and it is not difficult to show that by "just" is here probably meant what is advantageous to Israel alone), Mr. Sharrett says, "We consider ourselves free to use the water of the rivers which flow in our country as our property." In other words, he seems to be telling the Arabs: "You either agree with us on our own terms, or else!" And this "or else" here means: "We will use the waters that touch or pass through our country as we please, even if these waters originate in your country or if after passing for a short while in our country they continue for the most part to flow in yours." I submit this attitude cannot make for peace or understanding. (iv) The sentence, "We are convinced that the undisturbed continuation of Israeli development works constitutes perhaps the most effective method to insure regional cooperation," plainly means--with or without the "perhaps"--that the Israeli concept of development is not that Israel should be modestly fitted into a total regional scheme, but that Israeli development comes first, and this then will "insure regional cooperation." Israel, then, is not a member, but a master of the region. (v) Any plan, we are told, should be passed upon by "reputable experts in whom we trust." The concept then is one in which the right of veto is rigidly held by Israel to the very end, not one in which Israel humbly accepts accommodation, negotiation, equality with others; much less still one in which Israel accepts to subordinate herself, in objective justice, to a larger regional whole. (vi) Israel will display "a firm insistence on the water rights which are necessary for Israel's economic development and even its existence." Since "economic development" can easily degenerate into an "infinite concept," in Hegel's "bad" sense of the term "infinite," it is obvious that Israel's "water rights" are infinite. This is the "boundless ambition" of which I always speak and to which an objective check must be put. (vii) The Johnston plan is described as showing "serious defects" in respect both of the judgment which "reputable experts in whom we trust" have passed on it, and of ensuring for Israel her "water rights." This means that the Johnston plan is rejected by Israel, and that, contrary to what Mr. Sharrett's own representative here in the Council told the Council, the Canal Project and the Johnston scheme cannot be harmonized.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of these positions of Israel for the item under debate by the Council, and indeed for the whole prospect of peace and regional cooperation in the Near East.

(more)

(c) In the light of all these statements it becomes clear that the Canal Project is a step toward the implementation of the Israeli unilateral plan for the diversion of the waters of the Jordan. Any encouragement of this project is an encouragement of the principle of unilateral exploitation of the waters of the Jordan and will undermine any possibility of an eventual regional cooperation. All the unilateral assurances which have been given to the Council on the possibility of the integration of the Canal Project in regional schemes are not convincing. We have seen how Israel herself does not really believe in them. The unlawful diversion of waters and the creation of a fait accompli, far from helping to promote regional cooperation, actually prevent and undermine it. Therefore we think that the continued suspension of the work on the Canal Project in the Demilitarized Zone is not only required for a faithful implementation of the Armistice Agreement but also for the preservation of whatever chance there is for a regional exploitation of the waters of the Jordan. It follows that no one who really wishes to see some day the emergence of a just and equitable scheme involving genuine regional cooperation in the exploitation of the water resources of the Jordan Valley can possibly support this Canal Project. On the contrary, we think he must oppose it with all his might.

V.

I come now to the special doctrine of progress which has been invoked by the Israelis for the justification of their violation of legal obligations in the interest of implementing their economic projects. (On the glorification of this doctrine, see especially S/PV. 633, pp. 29, 37, 47, 51, 52 and 59-60; and S/PV. 639, pp. 19, 27, 42, 44, 45, and 49-50.) It is not an exaggeration to say that the original legitimate people of Palestine have been sacrificed on the altar of such a seductive but false doctrine. More unnecessary and unjust sacrifices are yet to ensue if this doctrine is not subordinated to ethical standards, legal norms and objective reality. We have in the case of the Demilitarized Zone one more instance which demonstrates the urgency of a thorough consideration of the doctrine. The statement of Dr. Bunche that the Demilitarized Zone should not remain a wasteland has been inordinately and repeatedly exploited for the justification of every Israeli move in the Demilitarized Zone, regardless of whether it was permitted by the Armistice Agreement or not. "The end justifies the means" is understood and applied radically, unconditionally. All the other parts of Dr. Bunche's statements regarding the legal status of the Zone have been either distorted or ignored. In the same spirit, references are often made by the Israeli representative to the clauses of the Charter of the United Nations on economic progress, while the principles of the Charter on peace, on friendly relations between peoples and nations, on respect for international obligations, are glossed over. The highest criterion
(more)

of the worth of any act is apparently whether it is "progressive," by which is meant whether it conduces to economic development, and in particular, the economic development of Israel. What effect the act might have on the peaceful relations of Israel to her immediate world, on the development of a peaceful integration of Israel in her world, on the moral and spiritual tone of the Near East, on the traditional Near Eastern values of decency and loyalty and trust and honor, all this is brushed aside as infantile. Nor is more attention paid to whether the act, both in its motives and its consequences, is in harmony with the ethical teachings of the Prophets of Israel -- Prophets who are binding on us all no less than on Israel but who are, or should be, we think, especially binding on Israel.

Now "progress," in some sense, is certainly the ultimate end of human endeavor but it all depends on how "progress" is pursued and above all on "progress" toward what. Is the end an intolerant exclusivism? Is it a radical form of nationalism which can only live if others die? Or is it a genuine, grounded, universal humanism based upon love and reason and trust and self-giving, a humanism which, by fixing upon a real point of reference above man, lifts all men -- Jew and Gentile, Jew and Arab, Jew, Christian and Moslem -- onto a transcendent destiny not of this world? I pray to God that I be mistaken, but the "progressive" state of mind which seems so far to be dominating Israel does not appear to be reassuring. Two statements made on different occasions by one of the most distinguished leaders of Israel, Mr. Ben-Gurion, are eloquently expressive of this state of mind. The first was reported in the above-mentioned book of George Kirk, The Middle East in the War. The author says, the "typically Zionist concept of mutual understanding and cooperation with the Arabs was repeated by Ben-Gurion before the United Nations Special Committee on 7 July, 1947: 'We will go to them,' said Mr. Ben-Gurion, 'and tell them, here is a decision in our favor. We are right. We want to sit down with you and settle the question amicably. If your answer is no, then we will use force against you'." (Underscoring mine.) (P.243) When the Council was considering the request of Syria for the suspension of the work in the Huleh, Mr. Ben-Gurion said: "the work on the drainage will continue and it is up to Syria to choose war or peace." Now this work, just like the present Canal Project, was described as being in the name and for the sake of "progress." "Progress" -- and we are still left in the lurch as to what its end is -- was thus promoted under the threat of the use of force. Is this the idea of "progress" which Israel is importing into the Near East? Is this the new dispensation wherewith we are to be saved? Is this the new absolute, the new God, before which we should bow the knee? And what about the old God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, the Living God to whom Pascal cried in the most crucial moment of his life? Has Israel outgrown this God?

(more)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

Besides the threat of force, the new dynamic doctrine of "progress" seems to advocate the disregarding of individual human rights. We are repeatedly told that the people of the Demilitarized Zone should not stand in the way of the total development of Israel. I think I am not unfair when I observe that there has been a dangerous undercurrent of totalitarianism in the theory and practice of Israel so far. Israel, which, more than any other people, stands under the judgment of the deepest ethical insight of mankind--which is its own insight--cannot apply to the Arabs the same standards of treatment under which it suffered at the hands of others. Totalitarian disregard for human rights is the last conceivable thing Israel can afford.

Israel must offer us in the Near East more than the sword as the instrument of "progress" and more than totalitarian economism, radical nationalism, and fanatical racialism, as the content and end of "progress". If it is in the name of these that Israel in the end justifies her actions, then the Security Council, entirely apart from Demilitarized Zones and Armistice Agreements, may rightly tell Israel that these things can never promote peace anywhere, especially in the Near East. The representative of Israel has complained of what he called the policy of "ostracism and non-contact" of the Arabs. Surely it must have occurred to him that perhaps this policy is a reaction to the total exclusivism of Israel, and exclusivism which has already reduced the few Arabs that have remained in Israel to precisely the status of second-class citizens from which the Jews had suffered in Gentile lands, and which quite openly refuses to take back the Palestinian Arab refugees on the ground that they would become fifth-columnists in the Israeli body politic. The greatest tragedy of the Near East is that this latter-day, radical, racialistic nationalism is inducing an exact image of itself among the Arabs, and this at a time when everything cries for grounded universalism, and when the Arabs need nothing more than to learn to trust the world, and to be drawn into the joy of common responsibility and participation.

Many people have depicted Israel as the bearer of democracy and "progress" to the Near East. Thus Mrs. Roosevelt in a recent book speaks of Israel's mission in applying her science and technology to the development of our part of the world. But first, how can Israel do that if she is not allowed by the peoples of the Near East to do it? Obviously therefore the political and spiritual precedes the economic and scientific. Secondly, if the "progress" of Israel is her science and technology, surely we can learn these, as we have been doing, at their source, namely, in Europe and America. Our centuries-old association with the peoples of Europe and America, when the political issues are settled, has been on the whole beneficent to us, and we would rather learn "progress" at the Sorbonne, at the London School

(more)

Press Release PM/2764
11 December 1953

of Economics, and at Harvard, than in Tel Aviv. Thus the "progress" of Israel will not be able to develop us, for we would rather develop ourselves.

Real progress is of the spirit. It is progress in understanding and wisdom, in charity, in humility, in the knowledge of one's own limitations, in victory over one's own passions, in self-restraint, in the right ordering of values, in loving one's neighbor, in being the Good Samaritan, in trusting and knowing God. I have not invented these things; it is precisely the total positive meaning of the Jews in history, including above all Christ, that has deposited this priceless heritage for the entire world. From what we can superficially tell from the utterances and attitudes of the representatives and leaders of Israel, and from what we can infer with certainty from her actions, I think we are not unjustified or uncharitable in concluding that these virtues do not over-abound in Israel today. The accent seems to be rather on the political, the material, the sensuous, the racial, the nationalistic, the exclusive, the exploitation of pressure groups, the manipulation of international agencies, the arbitrament of force. It is not difficult to imagine how people like Ezekiel or Spinoza or Magnes or Martin Buber--not to mention Christ or Paul who were also Jews--would judge this type of "progress."

VI.

I think I have now fully demonstrated the four theses with which I started this speech. I shall therefore quietly affirm the truth of these four positions and challenge, in all love, anybody to disprove them.

A question must have repeatedly suggested itself to the thoughtful student of Palestinian affairs: How is it that Israel can afford to be so bold in her defiance and violations? I am thinking, in particular, of Jerusalem, of Qibya, and now of the present Canal Project. When the Qibya aggression was brought by the three Western powers to the attention of the Security Council, the Honorable the Secretary of State of the United States, John Foster Dulles, explained why the Western powers took such an initiative. "We considered," he said in a speech before the New York Herald Tribune Forum in New York, on October 20, 1953, "the grave incidents of violence which mar Israel's relations with its neighbors. It was the United Nations which played an essential part in creating the state of Israel, and we felt that this was clearly an occasion to invoke the concept of decent respect for the opinion of mankind as represented by the United Nations." (Underscoring mine). I think a responsible inquiry into how Israel can afford to disregard this "decent respect for the opinion of mankind" will throw light upon the present case under review by the Security Council.

But I shall not go into this matter at present. I will only say that such an inquiry will reveal that Israel's boldness involves six phenomena. (a) The

(more)

deliberate confusion by Israel between peace and the final settlement. (b) The faith in force as the means of bringing about this final settlement. (c) The support of pressure groups all over the world. (d) The abnormal state of existence of Israel. (e) The general confusion in which the Arabs find themselves, a confusion, however, that is not going to last forever. (f) Perhaps a certain deliberate policy on the part of the Western Powers.

I hold that he is not a friend of Israel, no matter how well-meaning he might be, who encourages her in this her boldness. He alone serves the end of peace and concord in the Near East who helps Israel find her humble and true place in the scheme of things. But for Israel always to be able to get away with her boldness before the world, for her always to be able to count on high influence to swing decisions -- whether right or wrong, just or unjust -- in her favor, can never, it seems to me, conduce to peace in the Near East; least of all, let me add, to peace for Israel herself.

For the pure of heart, the conditions of a final settlement are not far to seek. I will make one final attempt to state them.

1. The strictest observance of the Armistice Agreements.
2. A serious determination to implement the standing decisions of the United Nations with respect to boundaries, to the internationalization of Jerusalem, and to Arab refugees.
3. A fundamental change of spirit on the part of everybody.
4. Putting an end to the immigration policy of Israel.
5. The prevention of Israel, or of anybody, from the inordinate manipulation of international agencies.
6. The honest demonstration by the Western world of real impartiality, justice and firmness.
7. The emancipation of Western policy from viewing the Near East only as a function of the development and destiny of Israel.
8. Freedom of Western policy towards the Near East from subordination to excessive influence of pressure groups.
9. The just solution of the problem of Arab refugees.
10. The strengthening of the Arabs, including placing no artificial obstacles in the way of their drawing as closely together as they naturally can.

None of these things is impossible of realization; none is easy to achieve; all are necessary to usher in the new age of brilliance in the Near East for which all men of good will crave. May it be said in the final reckoning of history that none of us around this table has failed to perceive this challenge and to respond to it.