Chapter II

THE ARMISTICE AND THE UNEASY PEACE

The situation in Palestine, after the withdrawal of British administration, had further deteriorated. The Zionists were now free to conduct their terrorist activities against local Arab population of Palestine. Israel, a Jewish State, was proclaimed on May 15, 1948. The Zionists had stepped up their systematic and well planned attacks on Arab life and property. The armed forces of Arab States had gone to Palestine to save the world from another war. Their aim was to prevent the local conflagration from proliferating to neighbouring areas. While Arab Israeli forces were engaged in fighting, the United Nations stepped in and the Security Council adopted a resolution on May 22, 1948 calling upon all parties to abstain from any hostile military action in Palestine and ordered ceasefire. Israel did not observe the truce and stubbornly stuck to its policy of expansion in Arab Land at the cost of indigenous people. The truce was flagrantly violated and Arab territory was annexed by Israel. The United Nations was kept informed of Israeli violations of the truce but the world organization proved to be too ineffective to prevent Israel from adopting reckless and expansionist attitude. The Arab States were still hopeful of the United Nations delivering good and justice to them.

On October 23, 1948, the Egyptian representative addressed a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations informing him about Israel's violations of the truce and recording deep concern of his Government at the deteriorating situation. The representative wrote: "the Zionist forces in Palestine are constantly violating the
truce and defying the ceasefire orders given by the Council. The representative told the United Nations Secretary General of the dangers inherent in Israeli violations of the Council's directives. He stated (1) that the violations were not ordinary to be overlooked, they were "being done to such an extent as to endanger the safety of our troops and to render it imminently inevitable for them to take the necessary counter-measures, unless the Security Council acts in proper time". The Security Council met to consider the situation in Palestine but it failed to act as an instrument of restoring peace. The Security Council was trapped in a marathon debate on technicalities and procedural questions. The time was slipping off and Israel conscious of the United Nations ineffectiveness, refused to see reason and kept its policy of expansionism in full gear. Israel's invasion of the Negeb came as a shock and it posed a serious threat to the territorial integrity of the Middle Eastern states. The Negeb invasion was deliberate, meticulously planned, ruthlessly and unscrupulously executed. The Acting Mediator condemned Israel for "serious breach of the truce". In his report submitted to the Security Council he wrote: "A serious breach of the truce is involved in the Negeb outbreak as defined in the resolutions of the Security Council on May 29, July 15 and August 19. The resolution of July 15 ordered an indefinite ceasefire, while the resolution of August 19 specifically precludes acts of reprisals and retaliation".

The Zionists' attack on the Negeb was preplanned and unprovoked. It was launched in order to gain administrative and political control over the territory of which assassinated Mediator,

Count Bernadotte, had deprived them and which they wanted to conquer to present the United Nations with a *fait accompli*. The Zionist attack was well-planned and the Acting Mediator in his report said: (2)

"It would seem clear that the military action of the last few days on a large scale which could only be undertaken after considerable preparation and could scarcely be explained as simple retaliatory action for an attack on a convoy".

The Acting Mediator also referred to "widespread attack on the Egyptian positions by Israeli Land and air forces in the Negeb and heavy shelling and ariel bombing of Gaza." The Security Council heard the report but could not take any action because the Big Powers supported and appeased Israel. They ignored its violations of the United Nations resolutions. The situation in the Middle East further deteriorated and the Acting Mediator submitted another Report on October 28 to the Security Council.

He presented a grim but real picture of the Middle Eastern situation and told (3) the Security Council:

"In my view, a critical stage has now been reached where bolder and broader action is required. Such action as an indispensable condition to an eventual peaceful settlement of the political issues might well take the form of a clear and forceful declaration by the Security Council that the parties be required to negotiate either directly or through the Truce supervision organization a settlement of all outstanding problems of the truce in all sectors of Palestine, with a view to achieving a permanent condition of peace in place of the existing truce".

The Acting Mediator then proposed before the Council that an armistice was the only way out to bring peace to the trouble land. He said: (4)
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"Such negotiations would necessarily aim at a formal peace, or at the minimum, an armistice which would involve either complete withdrawal and demobilization of armed forces or their wide separation by the creation of broad demilitarized zones under the United Nations supervision."

Alexander Cadogan of the United Kingdom supported the Acting Mediator, Ralph Bunch in his plea that the Security Council should take bolder and broader actions. Cadogan in his speech said: (5)

"The best hope, pending a political settlement of the whole question is to arrive at a more comprehensive and stable state of armistice, or even peace, rather than seek to prolong and enforce the truce."

The United Kingdom and China prepared and presented a draft resolution before the Security Council on October 28, 1948. The draft resolution (S/1059) embodied the suggestions made by the Acting Mediator.

The draft resolution asked (6) both the parties to "withdraw military forces to the positions they occupied on October 14".

The Soviet Union opposed (7) the draft resolution on the ground that "the Acting Mediator has not exhausted all possible ways and means under the previous resolution". According to Malik, the USSR representative, the Acting Mediator should be given a fair chance "to use all possible means for the settlement of the questions that have arisen between the two parties".

Abba Eban of Israel also objected to the draft resolution.

---
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According to him, "It corresponds less and less to the realities of the situation in the Negeb and to the prospects of a peaceful settlement. It is likely to provoke a grave and unnecessary crisis in a matter clearly susceptible of peaceful negotiations". (8)

The United Kingdom and China tried their utmost and started lobbying to get the resolution passed but with no success. Many amendments were offered and finally the United Kingdom withdrew its draft resolution. On November 16, 1948, Canada, Belgium, France trio presented a new draft resolution (S/1079) which embodied the suggestions of the Acting Mediator and provisions of UK-China draft resolution. The draft resolution presented by Canada, Belgium and France stipulated; (9)

"The Security Council,

"Reaffirming its previous resolutions concerning the establishment and implementation of the truce in Palestine, and recalling particularly its resolution of July 15 1948 which determined that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter;

"Taking a note that the General Assembly is continuing its consideration of the future Government of Palestine in response to the request of the Security Council of April 1, 1948 (S/714);

"Without prejudice to the actions of the Acting Mediator regarding the implementation of the resolution of the Security Council of November 4, 1948,

"Decides that, in order to eliminate the threat to the peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, an armistice shall be established in all sectors of Palestine;

"Calls upon the Parties directly involved in the conflict in Palestine, as a further provisional measure under Article 40 of the Charter, to seek agreement forthwith, by negotiations con-
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ducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator on Palestine, with a view to the immediate establishment of the armistice including:

"(a) The deliniation of permanent armistice demarcation lines beyond which the armed forces of the respective parties shall not move;

"(b) Such withdrawal and reduction of their armed forces as will ensure the maintenance of the armistice during the transition to permanent peace in Palestine".

Alexander Cadogan in his comments said: (10) "By adopting the Canadian, Belgian French draft resolution the Security Council will thus be consolidating the ground already gained and...making a further definite step forward".

Eban of Israel was not very happy with the draft resolution because he believed it (11) "to be incompatible in principle and effect with the purpose of a peace settlement and with the conditions of an unprejudiced negotiations". The Arab States were a bit skeptical about the Security Council's resolution being implemented. They had not lost all hopes in the effectiveness of the United Nations but they were certainly in a self-searching mood for putting all their eggs in one basket. Fawzi Bey of Egypt was betraying Arab's dwindling hope in the United Nations when he said: (12) "We have", previous decisions of the Council, "unimplemented and seek yet another decision". Elkhouri of Syria was more outspoken and straightforward when he added: (13)
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"If the Security Council fails to execute the truce, as it decided to do in previous resolution, with what right and with what possibility can it take a step forward and decide on an armistice?"

The Canadian, Belgian, French resolution was adopted by the Security Council on November 16, 1948.

To implement the Security Council's resolution of November 16, 1948, bilateral negotiations between Israel and Arab States were held at Rhodes. The negotiations were conducted by Ralph Bunch, the Acting Mediator. Four Armistice Agreements were concluded and signed at Rhodes in 1949. Egypt-Israel Armistice Agreement was signed on February 24, 1949, with Lebanon it came on March 23, 1949. Jordan Israel Armistice Agreement came on April 3, 1949 and the last country to have signed armistice with Israel was Syria. The Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948 was written large on all armistice agreements. The preamble attached with every agreement clearly established (14) that the parties were "responding to the Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948... calling upon them to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, to negotiate an armistice".

The conclusion of armistice agreements between Arab States and Israel did not mean that there was no state of "belligerency" between two warring parties. According to the interpretation of Israel, Armistice meant end of war and it paved the way for permanent peace on the basis of accomplished fact. The Arab States thought of armistice agreements as instruments of temporary and uneasy peace. The armistice agreements, according to the Arab States, did not mean termination of "state of war". The interpretation given by the Arab

States was in conformity with the principles of international law.

According to Oppenheim (15) "Armistices or truces, in the wider sense of the term, are all agreements between belligerent forces for a temporary cessation of hostilities. They are in no wise to be called temporary peace, because the conditions of war remains between the belligerents themselves, and between the belligerents and neutrals, on all points beyond the mere cessation of hostilities".

The Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948 also stipulated that the armistice was a "provisional measure under Article 40 of the Charter" of the United Nations pending consideration by the General Assembly of the question of "the future government of Palestine".

Demilitarized Zones

The chief purpose of armistice agreements was to disengage warring parties and create as large an area as possible between the two fighting forces. The establishment of four demilitarized zones along the armistice demilitarized zone in the area of El-Auja and its vicinity. Article VIII, para 1 read: "The area comprising the village of El Auja and vicinity shall be demilitarized, and both Egyptian and Israeli armed forces shall be totally excluded therefrom". Article X para 1 said: "The execution of the provisions of this Agreement shall be supervised by a Mixed Armistice Commission composed of seven members, of whom each party to this Agreement shall designate three, and whose chairman shall be the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization or a senior officer

from the observer personnel of that organization designated by him following consultation with both parties to this Agreement”. Under the same Article para 2 it was provided (16) that "the Mixed Armistice Commission shall maintain its headquarters at El-Auja".

A demilitarized zone was also created along the Syrian border. The Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement on July 20, 1949 provided for the demilitarized zone would be created, Article V, para 1 stated:

"It is emphasized that the following arrangements for the Armistice Demarcation Line between the Israeli and Syrian armed forces and for the Demilitarized zone are not to be interpreted as having any relation whatever to ultimate territorial arrangement affecting the two parties to this Agreement".

The Demilitarized zone was defined in such a manner that the possibility of friction was reduced. Para 2 of Article V stated:

"In pursuance of the spirit of the Security Council resolution of 16 November 1948, the Armistice Demarcation Line and the Demilitarized zone have been defined with a view towards separating the armed forces of the two parties in such a manner as to minimize the possibility of friction and incident, while providing for the gradual restoration of normal civilian life in the area of the Demilitarized Zone, without prejudice to the ultimate settlement".

Under the same Article para 5(a) it was stipulated: (17)

"Where the Armistice Demarcation Line does not correspond to the international boundary between Syria and Palestine, the area between the Armistice Demarcation Line and the boundary, pending final territorial settlement between the parties shall be established as a Demilitarized zone from which the armed forces of both parties shall be totally excluded, and in which no activities by military or para-military forces shall be permitted. This provision applies to the Ein Gev and Dardara sectors which share form part of the Demilitarized zone".

---

The Syrian forces were present in areas declared as the Demilitarized zone and after signing the Armistice Agreement, the Syrian army withdrew from the areas in pursuance with the Agreement.

The Mount Scopus Demilitarized zone was created in Jordan Sector and comprised of the Hebrew University and Hadassa Hospital compound along with Augusta Victoria building. On July 7, 1948, Jordan signed an agreement with Israel and agreed to treat the area as demilitarized and it was to be placed under the protection of the United Nations. Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement had a map which showed the Demilitarized zone on the side of Jordan where Israel had no jurisdiction.

Another Demilitarized zone was Jabal-el Mukabbir area. It comprised the Old Government House, the Arab College, a Jewish Agricultural School. Apart from the Demilitarized zone there was no man's land between the Arab and Israeli part of Jerusalem. The Latrun area was also a No Man's Land.

The most important principles enshrined in all Armistice Agreements were (1) No party should try to make use of truce as instrument of gaining military or political advantage. Article IV, para 1 of the Egyptian Israeli Armistice Agreement stated: (18) "The principle that no military or political advantage should be gained under the truce ordered by the Security Council is recognized." Article II, para 1 of the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement reaffirmed the same principle.
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Jordan-Israeli and Syria-Israeli Armistice Agreements contained the same provisions too. Another significant point to keep in mind and underlined by all Armistice Agreement was that its purpose was not to draw a boundary line between Israel and Arab states. Its basic purpose was purely military rather than political. The armistice demarcation line was to delineate the line beyond which the armed forces of their respective parties would not move. The armistice line was delineated without prejudice to rights, claims and positions of either party to the armistice as regards the ultimate settlement of the Palestine question.

**Truce Supervision**

The Armistice Agreements were intended to disengage both warring parties and keep a vigil on their military activities against each other. The Security Council created Mixed Armistice Commissions for truce supervision. The Acting Mediator who was in charge of all UN peace keeping activities in Palestine was relieved of his responsibilities. On August 18, 1949 General McNaughton of Canada and Chauvel of France submitted a revised draft resolution before the Security Council. According to the Resolution (19)

"The Security Council

"Having noted with satisfaction the several Armistice Agreements concluded by means of negotiations between the parties involved in the conflict in Palestine in pursuance of its resolution of 16 November 1948;

"Decides that all functions assigned to the United Nations Mediator on Palestine having been discharged, the Acting Mediator is relieved of any further responsibility under Security Council resolutions".

The Resolution further

"Notes that the Armistice Agreements provide that the execution of these agreements shall be supervised by Mixed Armistice Commissions whose chairman in each case shall be the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization or a senior officer from the observer personnel of that organization designated by him following consultation with the parties to the Agreements."

The Resolution was adopted on August 11, 1949 by 9 votes to none with two abstentions namely Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. All members of the Security Council were unanimous in asking that the Armistice Agreement should meticulously be observed, but some of them at the same time demanded a sizeable reduction in truce supervision personnel. Eban of Israel was one of those who insisted that Truce Supervision Organization should be dissolved and all UN personnel, with the exception of certain specified personnel, should be withdrawn. Eban said: (20)

"I believe that the Security Council would meet the situation if it did call for the withdrawal of all observer personnel except those specified as being required by the text of the Armistice agreement themselves."

Mahmoud Fawzi Bey of Egypt was in agreement with Eban of Israel when he too demanded for the withdrawal of UN observers. He said: (21)

"The principle of withdrawing all supervision is a very sound one indeed. I unhesitatingly subscribe to it as a principle. No one wants outside supervision if it can be helped."

Rafik Asha of Syria supported the views of Egypt and said (22) "My delegation is in favour - in complete favour of the withdrawal of all personnel, provided that the terms of the Armistice Agreements are fully complied with."
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The Armistice Agreements had provided for the supervision of the ceasefire and Mixed Armistice Commission were created under the chairmanship of the Chief of Staff. The Powers and functions of the Mixed Armistice Commissions were clearly defined in all the General Armistice Agreements.

Article X, para 1 of the Egyptian Israeli Armistice Agreement stated that "the execution of the provisions of this Agreement shall be supervised by a Mixed Armistice Commission composed of seven members of whom each party to this Agreement shall designate them". Para 4 of the same Article provided: "Decisions of the Mixed Armistice Commission, to the extent possible, shall be based on the principle of unanimity. In the absence of unanimity, decisions shall be taken by a majority vote of the members of the Commission present and voting". Para 4 also provided for the establishment of a Special Committee which would consider appeal. The Special Committee was to be composed of the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization and one member each of the Egyptian and Israeli Delegations to the Armistice Conference at Rhodes.

The Mixed Armistice Commission would formulate its own rules of procedure and would be empowered to employ Observers in such numbers as may be considered essential to the performance of its functions. As to the interpretation of the meaning of a particular provision of the Armistice Agreement, the Commission's interpretation was to prevail subject to the right of appeal as provided in paragraph 4.

The Observers and other personnel of the Mixed Armistice Commission were free to visit any area. They would be accorded
such freedom of movement and access in the areas covered by this Agreement as the Commission may determine to be necessary.

Jordan-Israel General Armistice Agreement of April 3, 1949 created a Special Committee for the purpose of "formulating agreed plans and arrangements designed to enlarge the scope of this Agreement and to effect improvement in its application."

The Special Committee was to formulate agreed plans regarding "free movement of traffic on vital roads, including the Bethlehem and Latrun Jerusalem roads; resumption of cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus", etc.

Para 3 of Article VII stated (23) "The Special Committee shall have exclusive competence over such matters as may be referred to it. Agreed plans and arrangements formulated by it may provide for the exercise of supervisory functions by the Mixed Armistice Commission."

The Security Council was acting under Articles 39 and 40 in order to bring peace to the troubled land of Palestine. Its orders of ceasefire, truce and armistice were directed to restoring normal peaceful conditions in Palestine and pave the way for mutual negotiations between two parties at loggerhead.

All pious hopes were shattered and Israel refused to listen to all voices of reason. The Security Council resolutions were flouted with impunity and Israel followed the policy of expediency and did not care to renounce her expansionist postures.

The Security Council Resolution of November 16, 1948 was an improvement on its previous resolutions. It had provided for an
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effective Truce Supervision Organization but Israel was bent on wrecking all efforts of the United Nations to maintain peace. She concluded General Armistice Agreements with four Arab States, i.e. Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria.

Israel under the Armistice Agreements was bound to respect the "injunction of the Security Council against resort to military force in the settlement of the Palestine question". (24) She was also bound by the principle that "no military or political advantage should be gained under the truce ordered by the Security Council." (25)

Israel flouted both the obligations it voluntarily assumed under the Armistice Agreements. She invaded Arab territories and annexed them. Her policy of expanding frontiers was in violations of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions. The Security Council in its resolution No. 61 dated November 4, 1948 asked Israel to withdraw her armed forces from those areas which it occupied after October 14, 1948.

The Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948 and subsequent General Armistice Agreements of 1949 established permanent truce lines and demilitarized zones. Israel, as a party to the resolutions and Armistice Agreements, was supposed to carry out her obligations and refrain from the use of force. She chose the path of delinquency and flagrantly violated the Armistice Agreements.

The demilitarized zones, which were created to keep the armed forces at a distance, were forcefully occupied by Israel. El-Auja, a demilitarized zone near Egyptian border and the Headquarter of the Mixed

---
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Armistice Commission, was overrun by Israeli armed forces and occupied. Many times Israel was found as having committed aggression and was subsequently asked to vacate the occupied area but Israel had always refused to oblige the United Nations. It showed scant respect for the Mixed Armistice Commission or Special Committee. On March 20, 1950 Israel committed a serious violation by occupying Bir Qattar area. The Mixed Armistice Commission asked Israel to vacate the area; the Special Committee confirmed the decision of the Commission and asked Israel to leave Bir Qattar, but Israel remained adamant and its armed forces continued to occupy the area. (26)

The matter was referred to the Security Council and on November 17, 1950 a resolution was passed asking Israel to withdraw its forces from the zone.

The most serious violation of the Armistice Agreement was committed in September 1950 when Israeli armed forces occupied El-Auja demilitarized zone. On September 2, 1950 Israeli military personnel rounded up about 4,000 Bedouins living in the Negeb and around the demilitarized zone of El-Auja. The Arab Bedouins were driven out of the territory occupied Israel. According to the reports the Israelis burnt tents, crops and other possessions of Bedouins.

Israel had violated the sanctity of the demilitarized zone of El-Auja. It established a military camp under the guise of a "kibbutz". They expelled Bedouins from the area to station their armed forces at a point which was strategically very important. On September 9, 1950 the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt

wrote a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations. He charged (27) "the Israeli authorities" of undertaking a "large scale military operation, using troops, automatic weapons and armoured vehicles, in order to drive out of the El-Auja area of Palestine all the Bedouins settled in that demilitarized zone and its surrounding areas. After being driven as far as the Egyptian frontier by the Israeli forces, which were guided by an Israeli reconnaissance aeroplane, those Bedouins were compelled on September 2 to cross frontier between Egypt and Palestine to seek refuge in the Egyptian territory of Sinai". The letter pointed out that it was not the first case of expulsion of local Arabs, many more had occurred: "Between June 26, 1949 and September 4, 1950, more than a thousand Arabs men, women and children living in the areas of Haifa, Acre, Galilee, Jerusalem, Ramle and El-Majdal, and in other districts under Jewish control, were forcibly removed from their homes and constrained to take refuge in the narrow Gaza Rafah sector under Egyptian occupation in southern Palestine". The United Nations was requested to intervene "in the events reported above and, while there is yet time, stop the expulsion of the remnants of the Arab population in Palestinian territory now under Jewish control".

On September 18, 1950 General Riley, Chief of Staff after making a thorough investigation ascertained the fact and confirmed Israeli violation of the Armistice Agreement. In his Report submitted to the Security Council General Riley confirmed (28) that "Israeli military rounded up some 4,000 Bedouins and after driving the Bedouins
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across the border the Israelis burnt tents, crops and possessions, and that thirteen Bedouins were killed by Israelis during those operations". The question of the Arabs expulsion and Israel's occupation of Bir Qattar and El-Auja was brought before the Security Council by Egypt. Mahmud Fawzi Bey of Egypt told the Security Council on October 16, 1950 that Israeli violations were (29) "not a slight mistake here and there in the application of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement; nor is it an unintentional trespassing on the rights of a few Palestinian Arabs". "What we are facing now", told the Egyptian representative,"is much bigger and much more serious than all that. We are facing a continuation and an intensification of premeditated, systematic and ruthless aggression by world political zionism against the rights of the lawful Arab inhabitants of Palestine..."

Fawzi referred to Israel's policy of "relentless chasing out of the Arabs and their possessions to the motley hordes of invaders from abroad". He told the Council that the Israelis compelled Arabs to sign a document before being driven out. He quoted from the report of the Chief of Staff dated September 18, 1950 where he observed that the Arabs expelled were "required to sign a statement agreeing to go to Gaza, never return to Israel, and abandoning all property rights". (30)

Israel was declared in illegal occupation of Bir Qattar and other areas of the demilitarized zone along the Egyptian border.
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The Armistice Commission came to the conclusion that occupation of Bir Qattar was a violation of Article IV para 1 and 2, of the Egyptian Israeli General Armistice Agreement. Israel filed an appeal with the Special Committee which upheld the decision of the Mixed Armistice Commission. Israel did not comply with the verdict of the Commission confirmed by the Special Committee and refused to evacuate areas she occupied. The matter then was brought before the Security Council. On October 16, 1950 Eban of Israel denied all charges levelled against it by Egypt. He said: "I categorically state that Israeli forces have not violated either Egyptian territory or the demilitarized zone of El Auja". He further denied the charge of expelling the Bedouins from El-Auja. He declared that the bedouins expelled were not the residents of El-Auja, they were infiltrators who had crossed into Israeli territory without permission. He admitted that "the number of Azazmeh tribesmen sent back after illegally crossing the frontier and committing violence is approximately 200 families, and not 4,000 persons as alleged". He also declared with stubbornness "the immigration policies of my government are not the business or the concern of Egypt or its representative". "The immigration policy was the chief pride and achievement of Israel in the world" (31) and it was Israel's internal matter.

Mahmud Fawzi did not allow Eban score a point and refuted him and his statement presented before the Security Council. On October 20, 1950 Fawzi called Eban's bluff and refuted Israel's claim that the Bedouins expelled were infiltrators. He told the Council that such a theory if accepted "would mean that Israel

could deprive all the remainder of the lawful Arab population of Palestine of their identity papers, and throw them out across the frontier into Egypt or into any other surrounding country." He further informed the Council that "we have ample proof of the forced expulsion of Arabs from Palestine". He quoted the report of the Acting Chairman of the Egyptian Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission of September 6, 1950. The Acting Chairman confirmed: (32)

"Up to September 3, the number of expelled Bedouins totalled 4,071 people (1,791 are in Sabha and 2,281 are in Ain-Quadeisa and in Gabil-el Daghra, east of Ain-el-Qiderrat)." The chairman also confirmed that those Bedouins were living "in Beersheba area, where, during the Mandate, they had received their rations from the British."

The Security Council also heard Jordan's complaint against Israeli violations of international frontier. Haikal of Jordan informed the Security Council on October 20, 1950 about Israeli aggression and occupation of Jordanian territory. He told (33) the Council that "the Israelis committed a flagrant act of aggression upon Jordan when they occupied a part of Jordanian territory on August 28, 1950". "This aggression", declared Haikal, "gives material form to the permanent fear of the Arab States that the Israelis have embarked upon a policy of expansion at their expense". The Council at that juncture got involved in a debate of procedural importance. The issue was whether the Council was competent to hear and entertain complaint from both the parties over and above the Mixed Armistice Commissions which were directly responsible
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for looking into such complaints. General Aliley and Ralph Bunch appeared before the Security Council to record their views over the issue. The United States representative expressed (34) his Government's opinion in the Security Council regarding the jurisdiction of the Mixed Armistice Commission. "It is the opinion of my Government that all but one of the complaints should be handled in the Mixed Armistice Commissions. We do not believe that the remedies available to the parties have been exhausted. This is not to imply that this Council should slight these complaints, but in the interests of ensuring the continued effective operation of the Mixed Armistice Commissions and the various other special negotiating bodies, the Council should not intervene until it has been clearly established that complaints exist which cannot be handled by the established machinery". Austin of America presented before the Security Council a draft resolution (S/1899) jointly sponsored by France, UK and USA. (35)
The resolution stated that the Security Council "takes note of the statement of the Government of Israel that Israel armed forces will evacuate Bir Qattar". It implied an order to Israel to evacuate Bir Qattar area forcibly occupied by it in violation of the Armistice Agreement. Israel did not yield and remained adamant. Eban of Israel while commenting on the draft resolution stated: (36)

"There is absolutely no question of the evacuation of Bir Qattar. The question related to the removal of a certain military force at Bir Qattar, in accordance with the Mixed Armistice Commission's decision of 20 March 1950. The Armistice decision related to that military circumstances".
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The Resolution asking Israel to withdraw from Bir Qattar was adopted on November 17, 1950, by a vote of 9 in favour with 2 abstentions. (37)

Israel ignored all the Security Council resolutions and chose to continue acting like an unbridled horse. The forceful occupation of El-Auja by Israel was a part of its scheme to bring Jewish immigrants to settle them down in Arab land. The occupation of El-Auja was of immense significance from the military point of view. General Burns has pointed out El-Auja's importance: (38) "It lay across the second principal route for the invasion of Palestine from Egypt (or vice versa). It was from this general area that the decisive attack by the Israeli forces on the Egyptian forces had been launched in December 1948, and that another was to erupt again in October-November 1956". According to Burns El-Auja's occupation by either party was enough to have disturbed the military balance in its favour. "If, indeed, the zone had remained", wrote Burns, "demilitarized - that is to say, if it could not have been traversed or occupied by the armed forces of either side - it would have been almost impossible for either to have carried out an offensive successfully, the balance of forces as they were".

The Israelis did not want to withdraw from El-Auja and on September 28, 1953 they established in the area settlement called Ketsiot. The Israeli contention was that the settlement was for the purposes of farming and agriculture and they claimed that the demilitarized zone was part of Israeli territory. The Egyptian con-
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ention was that the settlement was a military organization and not an agricultural centre. It was proved on October 6, 1954 when one captured Israeli 'Kibbutz' member told the United Nations Military observer that 'he was a private in a certain company of a certain battalion of the Israel Army. He also said all the inhabitants of the Kibbutz were soldiers in their unit, and consisted of one Captain, four NCOs, sixty-five men soldiers, and fifteen women soldiers. 'They had the usual armament of an infantry company, rifles, sub-machine guns, light machine-guns, mortars, and anti-tank weapons". Burns further testified (39) 'The Israeli carried identification papers proving he was a member of the Army, and his story sounded truthful'.

The Mixed Armistice Commission in its meeting on October 2, 1953 was seized of the matter and decided that (40) "the existence of an Israeli Police in the new Kibbutz established in the demilitarized zone is a violation of Article IV, paragraph I, and Article VIII of the General Armistice Agreement".

General Bennike told the Security Council on November 9, 1953 that Israel regarded (41) "the demilitarized zone being an integral part of Israel" and "any Israeli activity in the demilitarized zone is an internal Israeli affair and of no concern of anybody". Israel kept up its pressure on and penetration into Arab territory. On February 28, 1955 "two platoons of Israeli paratroopers crossed the Armistice Demarcation Line east of Gaza, advanced more than
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three kilometers into the Egyptian controlled strip, and attacked a military camp near the railway station", killed fourteen Egyptian soldiers and wounded sixteen soldiers. "Another group of Israeli soldiers entered the strip six kilometres south of Gaza and laid an ambush on the main road from Rafah". (42) Egypt brought the matter to the Security Council on March 4, 1955. The Security Council meeting of March 9, 1955 was important from the point of view that all members of the Council showed deep concern at the deteriorating conditions in the Middle East and held Israel responsible for such a condition.

Wadsworth of the USA told the Council that (43) "the incident which has occurred in the Gaza district is indefensible from any standpoint". He warned Israel against latter's policy of retaliation and made it clear that his country would not stand by Israel if she pursued her policy of reprisal because he stated: "We oppose any policy of reprisal and retaliation".

Hoppenot of France recorded his country's disapproval of Israel's policy of expansion and reprisals and expressed "anxiety on the events that took place at Gaza on the night of February 28, 1955". He told the Council that (44) "we cannot remain indifferent to the fact that about sixty soldiers and civilians, most of them Egyptians, died during the attack by Israel forces". He congratulated the Egyptian Government and nation "on the calmness and self-control
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that they have preserved in the face of these lamentable events".

Sobolov of the USSR accused Israel of being 'responsible' for the "Gaza incident". He said that (45) "these acts by the Israel armed forces are a serious violation of the United Nations Charter and are increasing tension in the area".

On March 17, 1955 Egypt's complaint of "violent and premeditated aggression committed on February 28, 1955 by Israel armed forces against Egyptian armed forces inside Egyptian controlled territory near Gaza, causing many casualties, including 39 dead and 32 wounded" was submitted to the Security Council.

Eban of Israel tried to justify the Gaza incident in terms of self-defence. He told the Council: (47) "the armed clash on February 28, 1955" was the result of "a series of long standing antagonism and immediate provocations exploded into a conflict". He tried to tell the Council that Israeli aggression in Gaza was aimed at wiping out "the centre from which the violence is organized and directed". Gaza was the "Egyptian Military headquarters" from where military activities were being conducted against Israel and her people".

Hoppenot of France rejected Eban's explanation and stated (48) "The Security Council cannot allow Israel to seek satisfaction for its grievances against Egypt, even if legitimate, through a policy of reprisals and revenge. If the Gaza incident, coming on top of the

45. SCOR, 693 Mtg., March 17, 1955, p. 5.
46. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
Qibya incident, were the expression of such a policy, Israel would have to be prepared to bear alone the consequences of the censure of that policy."

France, United Kingdom and the United States jointly sponsored a draft resolution (S/3378) in the Security Council. The resolution declared Israel as having violated the Armistice Agreement and the Security Council resolutions. Peerson Dixon of the United Kingdom told the Security Council that (49) "it was established in the Mixed Armistice Commission that units of the Israel army had crossed the demarcation line, attacked an outpost in the Gaza strip manned by the Egyptian army. "This was a deliberate and planned military operation".

Lodge of USA charged Israel of being guilty of violating its United Nations Charter obligations. "The United States believes", he said, (50) "that, whatever the provocation might have been, there was no justification for the Israeli military action at Gaza. Israel's retaliatory actions are inconsistent with its Charter obligations". The draft resolution was unanimously adopted by the Security Council on March 30, 1955. The resolution condemned Israel for violating the Armistice Agreements and the resolutions of the Security Council particularly the ceasefire resolution of July 15, 1948. The Security Council Resolution also called upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent the recurrence of such military actions.

Israel disregard the Security Council resolution and on
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September 21, 1955 the Chief of Staff reported to the Security Council that Israel was not willing to abide by the resolutions of the Security Council and the Israeli army had occupied the demilitarized zone. (51)

The Israelis launched a full-fledged attack on El Auja again on November 2, 1955 when "Israeli soldiers confined the UN military observers to their rooms in the United Nations building at El Auja and then moved in force against the Egyptian position. Fifty Egyptians were killed and over forty were taken prisoners in the attack." (52)

On September 5, 1956, the Chief of Staff lodged a complaint with the Security Council: (53) "the Israeli army continue to occupy the El-Auja zone and because of her military occupation of the demilitarized zone, Israel refuses access to El Auja to the Egyptian members of the Mixed Armistice Commission". Such refusal was a flagrant violation of Article X para 2 of the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel under which El Auja was declared not only the demilitarized zone but also the Headquarters of the Mixed Armistice Commission.

Israel did not stop there, it continued expanding despite severe warning from the United Nations. The situation in the Middle East in 1956 was very explosive and Nasser's 26 July's announcement of nationalizing the Suez Canal proved a catalyst. England and France suffered the severest blow by Nasser's announcement. France, Britain
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and other European countries were dependent on Middle Eastern oil and now Egypt was in a position to cut off supply of oil to those countries. They were planning measures to face the challenge thrown in their face by Nasser. By September the situation had further deteriorated and General Burns wrote a memorandum to September 14, to the Secretary General acquainting him with his own assessment of the situation. Burns wrote to Dag Hammarskjold: (54) "I think that if hostilities between the disputants in the Suez canal question should break out, Israel might try to settle some accounts with the Egyptians. She might provoke a situation where she could attack - with self-justification, at any rate - the Egyptian forces remaining in the El-Arish. El Queseima - Rafah area". General Burns continued with his assessment and told the Secretary General: "It appears highly probable to me that the Egyptians have withdrawn two of the three Divisions they had in this area, using the troops withdrawn for defence against possible attempt to occupy key points on the Suez Canal. The Israelis, therefore, might find this a good opportunity to deal with the remainder of the El Arish concentration thus securing hostages to force a peace settlement".

The Israelis found it a good opportunity to settle its accounts with Egypt. The Sinai Peninsula was overrun by the Israeli armed forces on October 29, 1956. The Egyptian positions in this region were attacked by full military strength of Israel. The invasion of Sinai was an invasion of Egypt and it was the most flagrant violation of the Armistice Agreement and of the principles of territorial integrity and sovereignty of a state upheld by the United Nations Charter.

It was an undeclared war of aggression against Egypt which

flouted all civilized norms and established principles of international law. On October 29, 1956, the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement was unilaterally abrogated.

Ben Gurion was commenting on the question of the Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel when he stated: (55) "The Armistice with Egypt is dead, as are the armistice lines, and no wizards or magicians can resurrect these lines".

Lieutenant-Colonel Narsella asked for the withdrawal of the UN personnel of the Mixed Armistice Commission from Gaza on the ground that the Armistice no longer existed. General Burns was initially agreeable to the proposal but when he reported the matter "to the Secretary General he took very strong stand against any withdrawal, pointing out that since the duties of UNTSO under General Armistice Agreement were not suspended by the "present state of affairs", the personnel of UNTSO were required to remain at their posts". (56)

The Israeli military officers were accordingly informed that the United Nations personnel belonging to the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization would stay in Gaza.

The Security Council met on October 30, 1956 to examine the grave situation arisen as a result of Israeli aggression on Egypt. The Egyptian representative Loutfi informed the Council about the invasion of Egypt by Israel in collaboration with France and Great Britain. He called upon the Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, to face its responsibilities toward maintaining peace and security in

The draft resolution calling upon all the parties concerned immediately to cease-fire was vetoed by France and United Kingdom, two permanent members of the Security Council.

Brej of Yugoslavia commented on the draft resolution (57): "A draft resolution, the purpose of which was to stop the fighting in the Sinai Peninsula and to avoid a major conflagration, has been vetoed by two permanent members of the Security Council. This veto is a blow to the resolution of peace in the Middle East. It is a blow to the United Nations". The Yugoslav representative suggested the "possibility of calling an emergency session of the General Assembly under the terms of General Assembly resolution (377/V) entitled "Uniting For Peace", since "the Security Council, through the use of the veto, has been rendered powerless". (58)

The first emergency session of the General Assembly was held from November 1 to November 10. At the first meeting the representative of the United States of America presented before the General Assembly a draft resolution (A/3256) according to which the General Assembly would; (59)

1. Urge "as a matter of priority that all parties now involved in hostilities in the area agree to an immediate ceasefire";

2. Urge the parties to "promptly withdraw all forces behind the Armistice line" and observe "scrupulously the provisions of the Armistice Agreements";

3. All members should refrain from "introducing military goods in the area of hostilities;"
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4. "Upon the cease-fire being effective, steps should be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore, secure freedom of navigation;"

5. Request the Secretary General "to observe and promptly report on compliance with the resolution to the Security Council and to the General Assembly, for such further action as they might deem appropriate in accordance with the Charter".

The representatives of various nations showed great concern about the situation developing in the Middle East as a result of Israeli invasion of Egypt.

Rifai of Jordan asked the members of the General Assembly: (60)

"Will the international community leave the victim at the mercy of aggression? Will the elements of virtue of righteousness throughout the world retreat in the face of violence and destruction?"

He made a sincere appeal to all the members of the General Assembly "to hasten to join in a collective effort to stop this invasion of Egypt".

Sobolov of the USSR described the Middle Eastern situation as "extremely serious". He told the General Assembly that "on 29 October 1956 Israel, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement, of decisions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Charter, began aggressive military operations against Egypt". Israel's aggression was planned with the purpose of creating a pretext for the seizure of the Suez canal by British and French armed forces."

The Russian delegate urged the General Assembly "to condemn the armed attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt as an act of aggression incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations". (61)
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Eban of Israel was exhibiting his usual eloquence and making efforts to sidetrack the fact of Israel aggression against Egypt by coating it with much abused theory of self-defence. He stated: (62)

"On Monday, 29 October 1956, the Israel defence forces took security measures in the Sinai Peninsula in the exercise of Israel's inherent right of self-defence. The object of these operations is to eliminate the bases from which armed Egyptian units...invade Israel's territory for purposes of murder, sabotage and the creation of permanent insecurity to peaceful life".

Lall of India condemned the "triple invasion" on Egypt. He termed the invasion on Egypt as "brutal facts of war". He told the Assembly that Egypt's "sovereignty is being violently curtailed and territory is being occupied by the armed might of a neighbour and of two powerful countries. There has been released over Egypt a manifestation of the law of the jungle. Thus on the territory of Egypt, is mockery being made of the Charter of the United Nations, and there the organs of the United Nations are being affronted by aggression and invasion". The Indian representative was of the opinion that "the horror which is upon us can be arrested, and a major catastrophe averted, if immediate and effective action is taken by this emergency special sessions of the General Assembly." (63)

Palamas of Greece charged that (64) "Israel, the United Kingdom and France have invaded Egyptian territory. They have resorted to force, to war". "Aggression", according to Palama, "in itself is an international crime. Nothing can justify a breach of peace, as defined by the Charter. Even the best reasons lose their validity if such a breach is committed". He extended to Egypt and its people
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his country's "deepest sympathy born of a close and age-old friendship, in this hour, when Egypt is defending itself against aggression."

Ullrich of Czechoslovakia stated that tripartite aggression against Egypt was motivated by "selfish goals above the basic principles of the Charter" and it "calls for a resolute denunciation by all other Member countries. "The Czechoslovak people emphatically condemn these acts of aggression directed against Egypt". (65)

The draft resolution was adopted by a vote of 64 to 5 with 6 abstentions.

On November 3, 1956, Loutfi of Egypt informed the General Assembly that the "Egyptian Government agreed to implement the resolution adopted by the Assembly on the condition that the armed forces attacking Egypt desist from doing so". The Egyptian Government sent a communication A/3270 to the General Assembly stating that in spite of the Assembly resolution of November 2, 1956 "Anglo-French air attack continued and even increased in intensity and frequency. Furthermore, it is also reported that Anglo-French armed forces are taking part in the fight against Egyptian troops on Egyptian territory in the Sinai Peninsula". (66) The Secretary General of the United Nations confirmed the allegations made by the Government of Egypt. In pursuance of para 5 of the General Assembly resolution of November 2, 1956, the Secretary General reported to the Assembly on November 3: "the Gaza strip and the Red Sea islands of Tiran and Sinaifir had been occupied by Israeli military forces, and their air operations over Egyptian territory had continued without interruptions.
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On November 3, two draft resolutions were presented before the Assembly. India along with 18 Afro-Asian countries piloted two draft resolutions. Lall of India, before presenting the resolution, expressed "gravest disappointment" over the fact that the "resolution introduced by the leading western power, has not been complied with by the western powers concerned". That was a matter of the "gravest concern because the result of non-compliance has led to a steady worsening situation." (68) India joined hands with other 18 Afro-Asian nations and brought a draft resolution before the Assembly. The draft resolution noted "with regret that not all the parties concerned have yet agreed to comply with the provisions of its resolution of November 2, 1956, reaffirming the said resolution it "calls upon the parties immediately to comply with the provisions of the said resolution". The resolution requested "the Secretary General with the assistance of the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to obtain compliance of the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines". (69) The 19-power draft resolution (A/3275) was adopted by a vote of 59 to 5 with 12 abstentions.

The second draft resolution was presented by Canada. Pearson of Canada was explaining the purpose of his country's draft resolution (A/3276) when he stated that it had the "purpose of facilitating and making effective compliance with the resolution which we have already passed on the part of those whose compliance is absolutely essential
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It has also the purpose of providing for international supervision of that compliance through the United Nations". (70)

The Canadian draft resolution stated: (71)

"The General Assembly,

"Bearing in mind the urgent necessity of facilitating compliance with the resolution of 2 November 1956, requests, as a matter of priority, the Secretary General to submit to it within forty-eight hours, a plan for the setting up, with the consent of the nations concerned of an emergency international United Nations force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with the terms of the aforementioned resolution."

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 57 to none with 19 abstentions.

On November 4, 1956 the Secretary General told the General Assembly that he had received a reply only from Egypt which said it accepted the cease-fire resolution of November 2, 1956. He also submitted his first report on the Plan for an emergency international United Nations force. He pleaded that the General Assembly should decide to establish (72) "an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities". The delegations of Canada, Columbia and Norway presented a draft resolution which created the United Nations Emergency Force. The resolution 1000 (ES-1) was as follows: (73)

"The General Assembly

"Having requested the Secretary General in its resolution of 4 November 1956 to submit to it a plan for an emergency international United Nations Force, for the purposes stated,

"Nothing with satisfaction the first report of the Secretary General on the plan, and having in mind particularly paragraph 4 of that report,
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"1. establishes a United Nations Command for an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities..."

"2. appoints, on an emergency basis, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, Major General L. M. Burns, as Chief of the Command"...

The resolution was adopted on November 5, 1956 by a vote of 57 to none with 19 abstentions.

Israel, the United Kingdom and France did not comply with the Assembly's resolutions. On November 5, 1956 the USSR Foreign Minister requested for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to discuss non-compliance by the UK, France and Israel with the ceasefire orders of the General Assembly of 2 November resolution. Before the Council met, the Governments of France and Britain had informed the Secretary General that they welcomed the establishment of an international force to prevent the continuance of hostilities between Egypt and Israel. The Secretary General in his report to the Security Council told (74) "The Government of Egypt has accepted the resolution of the General Assembly of November 5 and may thus be considered as having accepted the establishment of an international force under the terms fixed by the United Nations. The Government of Egypt has further accepted yesterday the request of the Secretary General for a cease-fire..."

He also informed the Council of Israel's acceptance: "Today I, received from the Government of Israel, a statement to the effect that in the light of Egypt's declaration of willingness to cease-fire, Israel wishes to confirm its readiness to agree to a cease-fire".

The Soviet Union was very critical of Israel, France and Britain's invasion of Egypt. The non-compliance by these powers with the resolutions of the General Assembly was very disturbing. The Soviet Union wanted the Security Council to act under Article 42 of the Charter. Under the draft resolution prepared and presented by Sobolov of the Soviet Union "all states members of the United Nations, especially the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should give military and other assistance to Egypt, which has been the victim of aggression, by sending naval and air forces, military units". (75)

The Council rejected the item of agenda proposed by the USSR by a vote 4 to 3 with 4 abstentions.

The situation in the Middle East was not showing any sign of improvement because Israel was not prepared to withdraw its forces behind the armistice lines as demanded by the General Assembly resolutions.

The General Assembly in its resolution of November 7, 1956 sponsored by seven countries, Brazil, Canada, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Columbia and Norway established (76) "an advisory committee composed of one representative" from each of the sponsoring members "to undertake the development of those aspects of the planning for the force and its operations not already dealt with by the General Assembly".

Another resolution submitted by 19 powers (A/3309) "calls once again upon Israel immediately to withdraw all its forces behind the armistice lines established by the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel of February 24, 1949". (77)
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The Israelis did not pay any heed to the resolutions of the United Nations and persisted in its expansionist designs. The establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force was accomplished and it was stationed along the line around the Gaza strips and at Sharm El Sheikh after March 6, 1957, when the Israeli armed forces had withdrawn.

Israel, no doubt, withdrew but at what cost? On its retreat from Egyptian territory of Sinai Peninsula it demolished everything and rendered all roads non-negotiable. General Burns, Chief of the United Nations Emergency Force has given a very vivid account of Israeli acts of destruction. He wrote: (78) "As the Israelis withdrew across the Sinai they began a systematic destruction of the surfaced roads, the railway, the telephone lines". According to the General about 70 kilometers of roads" had been "thoroughly demolished" by Israel.

Israel did not grant the United Nations Emergency Force the freedom of movement on its side of the armistice demarcation line. Egypt allowed the United Nations Force to be stationed on its territory and it had the freedom of movement. The United Nations Emergency Force was also stationed at Sharm El-Sheikh and it did not prevent Israeli ships and merchandise from passing through the Straits of Tiran. Israel developed the Eilat port on Arab owned land and hence succeeded in laying pipelines linking the Red Sea with the Mediterranean. After opening of the Gulf of Aqaba in 1957 to Israel ships, Eilat became very important as an oil port. One of the objectives of Israel in invading Egypt in 1956 was to get the Strait of Tiran opened for Israeli ships. Israeli, in her claim over the Strait of Tiran was,

supported by the Maritime Law of 1958. Article 16 of the Maritime Law stipulated: (79) "There shall be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits that are used for international navigation between one part of the high sea and another part of the high seas or territorial sea of a foreign state".

Israel interpreted the clause as having conferred on it the right of using the Strait of Tiran. The western powers had always supported and upheld the claim of Israel regarding the Strait of Tiran. The Arab countries especially Egypt, had always taken the stand that the Strait had been Arab territorial waters and there was no international agreement binding Egypt to share it with any other country. The Israelis were excluded from the Gulf of Aqaba. Under the Armistice Agreement of February 24, 1949 Israel was not allowed to make use of the Gulf of Aqaba. The provisions of Annex 11(b) to the General Armistice Agreement drew the Line of demarcation "from point 402 down to the southern most tip of Palestine and Trans-Jordan Palestine frontiers". (80) Under the provision Israel was completely excluded from access to the Gulf of Aqaba.

The Israel armed forces violated this provision also and launched an attack on the southern Negeb which brought them to the Gulf. Israel occupied Umm Rashrash situated within the vicinity of the Gulf and local Arab population of the area were forcibly driven away and their property appropriated.

The Israeli policy was one of expansion. The Armistice Agreements exercised no restraining influence on its expansionist designs. On the Syrian border also violations were flagrant. Article V of the
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Israeli Syrian Armistice Agreement of July 20, 1949 provided for a demilitarized zone para 1 of the said article "emphasized that the following arrangements for the Armistice Demarcation Line between the Israeli and Syrian armed forces and for the Demilitarized zone are not to be integrated as having any relation whatsoever to ultimate territorial arrangements affecting the two parties to this Agreement". "The Armistice Demarcation Line and the Demilitarized zone" according to para 2 of Article V, "have been defined with a view toward separating the armed forces of the two parties in such manner as to minimize the possibility of faction and incident". (81)

Israel was its usual stubborn and unscrupulous self when she violated Article V of the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement. The demilitarized zone along the Syrian border was raided by the Israeli armed forces and the Arab population of the area was thrown out. The matter was referred to the Mixed Armistice Commission but Israel refused to attend the meeting of the Commission on the ground that the demilitarized zone was an Israeli territory and thus was beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Israel's refusal to attend the Commission's meeting was a flagrant violation of the provision of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949. The matter was referred to the Security Council which met on April 17, 1951. Faris al-Khoury of Syria told the Council:

"Early in February 1951, and in violation of the Israeli-Syrian General Armistice Agreement of 20 July 1949, the Israel Government began work along the western bank of the Jordan river and on Land belonging to Arab peasants in

the Mansoura sector, situated within the demilitarized zone. Notwithstanding the repeated warnings of the Chairman of the Israeli-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, Israelis not only of demilitarized zone origin crossed the bridge of Benat Yakub on 13 March 1951 and began work on a large scale in the demilitarized zone of the Eastern Bank of the Jordan River. On 15 March Israel reinforcements, armed with automatic weapons, Bren Guns and mortars were hurried to the Huleh demilitarized zone, with a view to forcing the local Arab inhabitants to cease resistance and to sell their land to the Palestine Land Development Company".

The Syrian representative further told the Council about the United Nations observers' encounter with a "six-man Israeli patrol armed with rifles and one light machine-gun in the village of Ghanama within the central sector of the demilitarized zone" on March 27, 1951. Another serious violation of the Armistice Agreement committed by Israel was on April 4 when "two Israeli mechanized patrols attacked the Arab police station established under the supervision of the United Nations Mixed Armistice Commission of the El Hamma sector in the demilitarized zone". (82) Referring to the question of jurisdiction over demilitarized zone El Khoury stated: (83) "we never agreed that the demilitarized zones along the line between the two states were taken from Syrian occupation. The Syrian army withdrew from this tract of land only in order to supply the place for the demilitarized zone. For this reason the Syrian Government has always claimed the part where the demilitarized zone now exists to be Syrian territory because this territory was under Syrian occupation up until the time the Armistice Agreement came into force".

Eban of Israel refuted the Syrian claims and insisted that
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Israel had sovereignty over the demilitarized zone. He declared the Syrian claim "unfounded" and told the Council (84) "we reject the Syrian claim. We shall sign no peace involving the cessation of these areas. There can be no Israel without the Huleh and the Ein Gev sectors, without the precious sources of the Jordan and the swamps and marshes of Lake Huleh". He threatened Syria and the United Nations when he said that "to defend its rights and claims in that area Israel will reveal a tenacity no less pronounced than that which warded off similar grave political and military threats to the southern area of Israel".

Major General Riley, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization appeared before the Council on April 25, 1951. General Riley offered his own interpretation of Article V of the Israeli Syrian Armistice Agreement. "The purpose of the demilitarized zone", according to General Riley, (85) "was to separate and to keep separated for the duration of the armistice the armed forces of the two parties, in order to eliminate as fully as possible friction and troublesome incidents between them. This was to be, in effect a sort of "buffer zone" pending final settlement of the dispute. According to General "neither party to the Armistice Agreement therefore enjoys rights of sovereignty within the zone"

General Riley in an answer to a question put by Austin of the United States said: (86) "The Armistice Agreement limits civilian

84. SCOR, 542 Meeting, April 25, 1951, p. 25.
85. Ibid., p. 29.
86. SCOR, 544 Meeting, May 2, 1951, p. 6.
control to the local villages plus the land attached to those villages. But at no time do the Israelis have the authority to assume full control over non-military activities within the zone that extends beyond those villages, unless there is an agreement between the Chairman, the Israelis and the refugee Arabs that live in that demilitarized zone.

The Security Council adopted a cease-fire resolution of May 8, 1951. The resolution was presented by the USA, Turkey, France and the United Kingdom and was adopted by 10 votes to 1 abstention. The resolution, noting with concern the fight that had broken out in the demilitarized zone along the Syrian Israeli borders.

"Calls upon the parties or persons in the area concerned to cease fighting...." (87)

Another draft resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom, Turkey, France and the United States was adopted by the Council on May 18, 1961 by a vote of 10 to one abstention.

The resolution asked (88) the Israel delegation to the Mixed Armistice Commission "to insure that the Palestine Land Development Company Limited is instructed to cease all operations in the demilitarized zone until such time as an agreement is arranged through the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission for continuing this project". The resolution took strong exception to Israel's non-compliance with the provisions of the Armistice Agreement and her refusal to attend the meeting of the Mixed Armistice Commission. Without mentioning the name of Israel the resolution said that it
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"considers it inconsistent with the objectives and intent of the Armistice Agreement to refuse to participate in meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission...." Regarding those Arabs who were expelled by Israel the resolution said that "Arab civilians who have been removed from the demilitarized zone by the Government of Israel should be permitted to return forthwith to their homes and that the Mixed Armistice Commission should supervise their return and rehabilitation in a manner to be determined by the Commission...."

Israel did not show any respect for the Security Council resolution and persistently followed her policy of aggrandizement. Israel did not vacate the demilitarized zone nor did she allow the expelled Arabs to return and settle down on their own land. Repeated requests of the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission fell on deaf ears and Israel refused to attend the meetings of the Commission.

The stubborn attitude of Israel and its refusal to abide by the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement was reported by the Chief of Staff in his reports submitted to the Security Council. In four separate reports the Chief of Staff charged Israel of refusing to implement the Council resolution of May 18, 1951 and he also informed the Council through his report that Israel was not prepared to withdraw its control over the demilitarized area. It was also stated in the report that Israeli police was interfering with the freedom of local Arab people of the area and the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission and other observers of the United Nations were not allowed to move freely. (89)
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The activities of Israel in demilitarized zone increased and on October 27, 1953 Chief of Staff General Vagan Bennike confirmed "encroachment on Arab lands", he also charged Israel of placing difficulties in the functioning of the Mixed Armistice Commission and took exceptions to "Israeli Opposition to the fulfilment by the Chairman and United Nations observers of their responsibility for ensuring the implementation of Article V of the General Armistice Agreement". (90)

The condemnation of Israel by the Chief of Staff meant nothing to a country which was bent upon pursuing a deliberate policy of non-compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations and a policy of ruthless expansion. Israel was not spared and duly condemned by the succeeding Chief of Staff General Burns who submitted a report to the Security Council on January 6, 1955 where he brought the fact to the notice of the Council that (91) "Police from the state of Israel, acting under orders from police headquarters outside the demilitarized zone, dominated the zone". He further told the Council that "The Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission was unable to implement the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement". The underlying fact behind General Burn's reference to non-implementation of the Armistice Agreement was Israel's stubbornness and refusal to comply with the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement.

The Israeli policy of deliberate provocation and planned attack was once again in full gear when in December 1955, a Syrian post on Lake Tiberias was attacked killing 56 persons. The Israeli attack on Syrian border was barbarous and was condemned even by the
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United Kingdom. Pierson Dixon of the United Kingdom called it "the shocking attack of Israel armed forces on Syrian soil and against Syrian forces and civilians on the North Eastern shores of Lake Tiberias". The representative further said: (92) "We deplore this attack by Israel forces on civilian... and commend the Government of Syria on the attitude of restraint which it had shown in this matter". Lodge of the United States of America also expressed his country's vehement protest against brutal attack on Syria by Israel. He said: (93) "We cannot stand aside and fail to condemn the action of the Government of Israel in that incident of 11 December". He registered his country's protest against Israel utter disregard for the United Nations resolutions. Referring to Israel, repeated violations he observed: "What makes these particular deliberations more serious is the fact that a Member of the United Nations, indeed a Member created by the United Nations, should now be before this Council for the fourth offence of this kind in two years".

It was the harshest criticism and outright condemnation of Israel and its attacks on Arab states by one of its staunchest allies. This change in American policy was due to new developments in the Middle East. The United States of America's reputation in the Arab world at that particular juncture was at its lowest ebb. The Soviet Union was gaining ground by supplying arms and modern weapons strengthening Arab military potential against Israel. The infiltration of the Soviet Union in the Middle East was a potential danger to the American influence because the western bloc could not afford to put all its
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eggs in one Israeli basket. The United States knew the strategic importance of the Middle East and wanted to retrieve the lost ground. Its denunciation of Israel for its brutal attack on Syrian territory was a straw in the wind.

The Israeli attack on Syria in the region of Lake Tiberias was too intense to be ignored. General Burns, the Chief of Staff in his report submitted to the Security Council said: (94) "The Israel action on the night of 11 to 12 December was a deliberate violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement, including those to the demilitarized zone which was crossed by the Israel forces which entered Syria".

The Security Council was gravely concerned with Israeli attack on Syria and a long debate followed wherein every member condemned Israel for its flagrant and repeated violations. A draft resolution sponsored by France, the USA and the United Kingdom was placed before the Council. Shukairy of Syria was not fully satisfied with the draft resolution. He appreciated (95) the resolution to an extent because "such a resolution certainly, such a verdict, would be a great deterrent". According to Syrian representative such verdict would fail because "Israel's policy was deeply embedded in aggression. Verbal measures are no cure. The only remedy is to apply effective measures to cut the evil out at the root". The resolution was not satisfactory because "it has failed to provide for effective measures to deter Israel from committing further aggression".

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously by the Security Council.

94. UN Doc. S/3516, para 29.
Council on January 19, 1956. The resolution declared that (96) "This Israeli action was a deliberate violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, including those relating to the demilitarized zone..." The Security Council "condemn the attack of December 11, 1955 as a flagrant violation of the ceasefire provisions of its resolution 54 (1948), of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, and of Israel's obligations under the Charter of the United Nations."

The Council also "expresses its grave concern at the failure of the Government of Israel to comply with its obligations".

Israel had always found it a smooth sailing in spite of condemnatory resolutions of the United Nations. She was behaving like a spoilt child of the United Nations. Her flagrant violations did not cease, her policy of planned attack on Arab Land did not suffer any setback and her policy of expansion and naked aggression was not abandoned. She attacked the demilitarized zone at El-Tawafiq. It refused to attend a meeting of the Mixed Armistice Commission called to look into the issue. General von Horn, new Chief of Staff wrote in his report "I was angry. And with reason. The Israelis had broken the Armistice Agreement, broken their word, ignored my ruling of January 20 and were now blatantly disregarding the Security Council's ruling that they should attend meeting called by the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission. (97)

General von Horn came to New York to acquaint the Security Council with the latest situation in the Middle East especially in


According to the account given by the General in his book, Comay tried to pressurise him and even threatened him. Comay's piece of advice to the General was "to forget all about that outdated United Nations idea of running a patrol boat on Lake Tiberia; the idea was still-born, and ought to be abandoned; because the Lake was essentially Israeli sovereign territory". Comay threatened General Horn: "It would be wise to listen to his advice - otherwise my life was bound to become a great deal more uncomfortable". General Horn "appreciated" Comay's "thinly veiled threats" and told him "it was really a waste of breath to attempt to intimidate the Chief of Staff of UNTSO - especially on the United Nations territory". (98) The Security Council met on March 28, 1962 to consider the complaint of Syria against Israel violation of the Armistice Agreement. Israel attacked Syrian territory on March 16-17, 1962. According to Chehlaoui of Syria (99) "Israel armed forces carried out a mortar attack on the Arab village of Nuqueib, forty Israeli armoured launches opened fire with automatic weapons on the Syrian military post of Ed-Douga. The Israel artillery at Bouria launched a violent bombardment of the city and village of Sqoufiye, Israel military aircraft bombed the Syrian position at E-Al Fiq and Zakl and they bombed the area of El-Hemma".

Israel was again condemned by the Security Council and a draft resolution S/5110 introduced by the United Kingdom and the United
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States was adopted on April 9, 1962 by a vote of 10 with one abstention. According to the resolution the Security Council (100) "reaffirms the Security Council resolution of January 19, 1956 which condemned Israel military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreement, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation; "Determines that the Israel attack of March 16-17, 1962 constitutes a flagrant violation of that resolution and calls upon Israel scrupulously to refrain from such action in the future".

Israel committed violations against the provisions of the Israeli Hashemite Jordan Kingdom Armistice Agreement of April 3, 1949. Jordan had already signed with Israel an agreement on July 7, 1948 whereby it was provided that UN check posts would be established by the UN Commander and Arab and Jewish Police would be placed on duty under the UN Commander. The General Armistice Agreement did not dispute any provision of the Agreement of 1948. A map showing the demilitarized zone on the side of Jordan was attacked with the General Armistice Agreement. The Mount Scopus was a demilitarized zone and it included places like the Hebrew University and Hadassah Hospital etc. This demilitarized zone was placed under the direct control of the Chief of Staff of the UNTSO. Israel never accepted such a situation because it would have meant a setback in her expansionist design. Israel regarded this area as "an enclave of Israel" where the United Nations or any other body did not have any control.

Article VIII para 1 of the Jordan-Israel Armistice Agreement created "a special committee, composed of two representatives of each party for the purpose of formulating agreed plans and arrange-
ments designed to enlarge the scope of this Agreement and to effect improvements in its application”.

The functions of Special Committee were also clearly defined in para 2. The Special Committee was supposed to include matters like (101)

"free movement of traffic on vital roads including the Bethlehem and Latrun Jerusalem roads, resumption of the normal functioning of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus and free access thereto etc."

Israel never respected her Agreement with Jordan and frequently violated the territorial integrity of Jordan. The area of Jerusalem - an international zone and other areas even demilitarized zone and no man's land were raided and placed under control of the Israeli armed forces. The existence of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization was meaningless as far as Israel was concerned.

General Burns has confirmed the hostility of Israel towards the Organization in following words: (102)

"Not long after I took over the duties of Chief of Staff UNTSO, I learnt that the Israeli Defence Forces and the Government looked in the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization with a jealous eye, sometimes with imperfectly concealed hostility".

General Burn further wrote about Israeli leader's attitude towards the United Nations:

"The Israelis", wrote Burns "looked on the UN as an organization to be kept in the dark, and even deceived, as an enemy may be deceived. The result was that one felt the hostility against the UNTSO always latent, and that cooperation from the Israelis only came when it suited their propaganda purposes".

E. H. Hutchison who had acted as the chairman of Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission wrote about Israel hostile attitude towards the

102. Burns, op. cit., pp. 54, 56.
United Nations. He wrote in an open letter: (103) "Be assured that the vast majority of these observers from seven different countries feel as I do and openly condemn Israel as an uncooperative, militarily aggressive country still working towards expansion".

On January 6, 1952, the Israeli armed forces raided across the demarcation line near Bethlehem at Beit Jalla. Hutchison found Israel guilty of having raided Beit Jalla and wrote that (104) "Israel was condemned for a serious breach of the General Armistice Agreement for the Beit Jalla attack". According to Hutchison Beit Jalla attack "lost its singular importance among the numerous incidents that were occurring far too frequently. Life was cheap along the border. Many Arabs were killed inside Israel while trying to retrieve items from their former homes or harvests from the lands they once had possessed".

On June 4, 1952 Israel committed another violation of the Armistice Agreement when famous "Barrel incident" took place. The Israelis, in violation of the Armistice Agreement moved soldiers into no man's land. The barrels, which Israel took to Israeli territory bypassing the United Nations check post, were seized by the United Nations Truce Supervision observers since they smelled some foul play in it. The Israelis became desperate to retrieve those barrels from the United Nations custody lest they ran the risk of being exposed. "At 1200 hours on the day scheduled", writes Hutchison, (105) "the door of MAC office burst open and three Israeli officers,  
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with pistols drawn and escorted by two enlisted men who were holding Thompson Sub-machine guns at the ready marched into the room" and took over the office of the Mixed Armistice Commission. The Israelis posted their own guards claiming that the building was on their side. They took the keys of the room barrel was locked in and the door was locked each evening by them. "No amount of pressure changed this routine until the barrel was moved from the building".

On September 17, 1962 es-Sanis incident occurred where it was reported that Jordan was being subjected to harassment and terror from Israeli side. Israel had expelled ten families of es-Sanis tribe. The United Nations observers confirmed Jordan's complaint when they found (106) "over 100 families, nearly 1,000 members of this tribe, camped temporarily just inside Jordan".

On October 14, 15, 1953, the village of Qibya became the target of Israeli aggression in which about 53 persons were killed and 15 had been wounded. Hutchison had described it as "wanton destruction" and the case was taken to the United Nations Security Council where Israel was condemned. The Security Council wanted to condemn Israel in harshest language but "Zionist pressure at the Security Council level watered down the wording of the resolution". (107)

Israel was indulging in wanton acts of destruction and mass killing because it had nothing to fear. The United States of America had its own compulsions and Israel was fully aware of it and knew that the United States would never go beyond polite limits of condemning
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its acts of violations. The Qibya incident had shown the world that Israel was bent upon expelling local Arab people from their homes in order to accommodate the Jewish immigrants. There was not one Qibya. According to Hutchison (108) "there were many small Qiybas but they were never publicized."

The Security Council Resolution of November 24, 1953 had condemned Israel and stated that the Security Council (109) finds that retaliation action at Qibya taken by the armed forces of Israel on October 14, 15, 1953 and all such actions constitute a violation of the cease-fire provisions of the Security Council resolution 54(1948) and are inconsistent with the parties obligations under the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan and the Charter of the United Nations. The Security Council also "expresses the strongest censure of that action, which can only prejudice the chances of that peaceful settlement which both parties, in accordance with the Charter, are bound to seek, and calls upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent all such actions in the future".

This Security Council resolution was nothing but a mere addition to the already piling heaps of documents condemning Israeli action of violence. What was the use of such resolutions when the United Nations could not prevent the recurrence of such devastations and loss of human life? Israel was doing what it planned to do, even the United Nations resolutions could not bridle its recklessness. The resolutions were mere "paper tigers" and had no deterrent value to prevent Israel from committing violations of its obligations.
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Israel kept its policy of retaliation and reprisal in full gear.

Israel made El Fateh a scapegoat and tried to tell the United Nations that Israeli attack on Arab Land was to destroy the stronghold of El Fateh guerrillas. In a letter to the President of the Security Council Israel Government listed a total of forty-three attacks across the frontier against civilian targets in the Israeli border areas. Of this thirty-three have been from Jordan territory. (110)

The Israeli theory of El Fateh's attack was a lame excuse to conceal its expansionist designs and to implicate Jordan in the matter. It was being done in order to fabricate a pretext to justify Israeli unprovoked aggression against Jordan. El Fateh was an organization which had nothing to do with Jordan or with any Arab Government, it was composed of people expelled by Israel from demilitarized zone rendering them homeless. These homeless people organized themselves in 1958 and started a long struggle to liberate their own home, i.e. Palestine. Israel tried to put blame on Syria also for El-Fateh activities. In a letter dated May 16, 1966 Israel told the UN: (111) "Syria is the source, training ground, principal supplier and main supporter of a vicious terrorist organization, variously known as El-Fateh...". It was a pretext for the coming attack on Syria on July 14, 1966 when Israeli jet bombers attacked Syrian areas, hit mechanized and engineering equipment destroyed bulldozers with napalm bombs wounded nine civilians and killed one woman". (112)


adopted a resolution condemning Israeli attack on Sammu. On November 13, 1966 Sammu was attacked by Israel armed forces. Jordan lodged a complaint against Israel's brutal attack on the village of Sammu in the southern Hebron area. The Security Council heard the representatives of both the countries and adopted a resolution on November 25, 1966. The Security Council resolution observed: (113) "This incident constituted a large-scale and carefully planned military action on the territory of Jordan of the armed forces of Israel". The resolution further reaffirmed "the previous resolutions of the Security Council condemning past incidents of reprisal in breach of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan and of the United Nations Charter". The resolution "censures Israel for the large scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan". It also emphasized "that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts..."

The Israelis ignored all Security Council directives and the United Nations took no action to compel stubborn Israel to comply with them. The United Nations failed in its fundamental duty of restoring and maintaining peace in the Middle East. The basic reason for the failure of the United Nations was the attitude of the permanent members of the world body. The United States of America, Great Britain, France, even the Soviet Union in the formative period, had fully supported Israel. They expressed their concern and sympathy

for Arab refugees but refused to take effective measures to compel Israel to abide by the decisions of the United Nations. Had the United Nations shown some courage and taken positive measures, 1967 war would have easily been avoided. The June war of 1967 was a reflection on the effectiveness of the United Nations and exposed its impotency in implementing its own decisions. The General Armistice Agreements were flouted with impunity by Israel and she was, many a time, condemned for her flagrant violations. The Chief of Staff and Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commissions had charged Israel of committing breach against the Armistice Agreement and condemned her for such acts. E. H. Hutchison wrote recently that (114) the "call for peace" given by Israeli leaders becomes 'ridiculous and meaningless" when one looked into "the United Nations mounting record of Israeli military action against the bordering Arab countries". According to Hutchison Israel had always refused cooperation and boycotted the commission established by the United Nations. He cited the example of Negev to establish his contention: "Israeli forces moved into and took over the Negev after the ceasefire and against direct UN orders. Israel refuses UN military observers freedom of movement along the borders, a right guaranteed by the General Armistice Agreement. "Israel refuses to allow the UN to place patrol boats on Lake Tiberias and yet the UN had, according to the G.A.A. jurisdiction over the demilitarized zones..." Writing about Mount Scopus, the highest point on the Jordan side of Jerusalem, Hutchison wrote: "since 1948 Israel has claimed sovereignty over the area and refused to allow the UN Commander to carry out an inspection."

Writing about Israeli violations he asks the world not to forget "that Israel's record of military aggression is staggering and should be listed in detail and widely exposed."

As late as October 1966, the Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Israel for its violations of no man's land's inviolability.

Israel was asked to refrain from repeating its acts of violence but Israel did not pay any heed to the request and its semi-official paper of Israel announced that Israel would challenge the decision of the Mixed Armistice Commission and declared that (115) "the vote taken by the Mixed Armistice Commission is considered an error".

On May 3, 1967 Israel disregarded once again the directives of the Mixed Armistice Commission. The Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission "condemned the Israeli authorities for crossing the armistice demarcation line into no-man's land ... and for ploughing areas situated in Jordan and in no man's land, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement". (116)

The President of the Security Council was not exaggerating when at one of its meetings in April 1968 he said: (117) "Israel continued to ignore council and Assembly decisions, continued its aggression and violation of international law; and showed the world and the United Nations by its action particularly the intention to hold a military parade in Jerusalem, that it was not thinking of leaving the Arab part of Jerusalem". The President, while condemning

Israeli military activities in Jerusalem, said: "The acts of Israel in Jerusalem were those of an aggressor who did not care to abide by the United Nations decisions or follow a policy of peace in the area."

It becomes a boring exercise if one mentions each and every act of violation by Israel, and the United Nations resolutions condemning it for such acts. Since 1949, Israel has been condemned by the organs of the United Nations for its aggression against the Arab States more than forty-four times. Thirtytwo of these condemnations were adopted by the Security Council for "flagrant violations" of the Armistice Agreements with the four neighbouring states. This is in glaring contrast to the fact that none of the Arab States has so far been condemned even once for aggression or action against Israel in breach of the Armistice Agreements.

If Germany and Japan's non-compliance with its directives was responsible for the League of Nations' failure, Israel's utter disregard and contempt can be counted as a factor responsible for the declining prestige of the United Nations.

Israel had, with deliberate plans, violated all the United Nations resolutions even the one which created the 'Jewish State'. Israel also violated the obligations it unreservedly accepted when it was admitted to the world community. Israel continued and still continues to be member of the United Nations in spite of its violations of the United Nations. It disregarded 22nd November 1967 resolution despite repeated warnings of the United Nations and still continue to control areas which it captured during 1967 war. Israel is an expansionist country and consistently pursuing a policy of naked aggression and expansion rendering numerous people homeless in their own states.