

The Six Day War

Israel Government

Yearbook

5728 (1967-68)

March 1968

Central Office of Information

Prime Minister's Office

The Six Day War

**Reproduced by the Emory Institute for the Study of Modern Israel
for strictly educational purposes**

©2008

The short, sharp encounter that has come to be known as the Six-Day War was a highly explosive but – as Israel is resolved to make it – a last installment in the agonizing serial of Arab aggression against Israel since May 1948. It had been aggression military and terrorist, political and economic, propagandist and psychological. Murderous incursions from across the borders of Syria, Lebanon and Jordan in mounting intensity, alarming concentrations of Egyptian armour in Sinai, dislodgement of the United Nations Emergency Force from the Gaza Strip and Sharm el-Sheikh, a peremptory closure of the Straits of Tiran, the signing of ‘defense’ pacts between Egypt, Jordan, Syrian and Iraq, massive aid and open encouragement from the Soviet Union – these detonated the Arab onset of 5 June 1967.

The world could not doubt that Israel was determined to fight for its life. The Minister for Foreign Affairs said so in Washington, Paris and London; in virtually every capital of the five Continents, wherever Israel enjoys diplomatic access, the same warning was sounded with identical urgency and on the highest levels; the same plea was spoken for Arab warmongering. But nothing within the will or the capacity of international media availed to halt the belligerent momentum. The concerted Arab thrust was closing in on an apparently: Egyptian tanks bore down on Israel’s southern frontier, Nasser’s artillery began to bombard Jewish villages along the Gaza Strip, Syrian guns were blasting Jewish villages below the labyrinthine entrenchments on the Galan Heights and – too quickly on Nasser’s heels – Jordan’s Arab Legion started shelling Jewish Jerusalem. Invoking Israel’s sovereignty, asserting its right under the United Nations Charter to defend itself against genocidal and political onslaught, the Israel Defense Forces swung into attack, desperately, decisively. In less than a week, Arab air and ground strength had been pulverized, and one of the most remarkable victories in recorded warfare had been won.

Public opinion everywhere was mobilized, everywhere there was understanding and sympathy for Israel. No fair-minded man but upholds the principle that there can be no reversion to conditions which so long plagued Israel and imperiled not alone its existence but also, in implication and repercussion, the tranquil being of the whole world. Discussion in June and July at meetings of the Security Council and the General Assembly faced the Arabs with a single choice – peace or war. They may hesitate to indulge in hostilities where they can employ any method of their fancy and expect Israel to comport itself as if everything were calm and ordinary. The United States is an inspiration to all those who know, and make bold to say, that the primary need is not Israel’s withdrawal from areas that it now administers but Arab withdrawal from a twenty-year-old policy of enmity, assault and blockade. Sporadically, signs may appear of Arab adjustment to reality, but, to offset that, there is unbridled talk of ‘only the first battles lost, the war still to be won’ and of ‘undoing the gains of (Israeli!) aggression’.

The declared and overriding aim of Israel is to bring about peace with its neighbors in mutual honor and to mutual benefit, in treaties that should offer an absolute guarantee of Israel’s security and, no less, of permanent regional normality in cooperative

coexistence. And the starting point must be the cease-fire map drawn by the Six-Day War.

The Foreign Minister presented the case to the General Assembly on 5 September in these words:

For nearly twenty years the United Nations has been discussing the issues arising from an obdurate refusal to acknowledge and recognize the sovereign rights of one of its members. All the bloodshed and tension which have convulsed the Middle East arises from that refusal. This is the primary cause and single origin of the conflict. Just as the conflict has a single cause, so also does it have a single solution. The mere decision to negotiate a peace settlement embodies the prospect of solving the political, territorial, humanitarian and security problems which will never be overcome across a gulf of sullen separation. The United Nations will serve the deepest international truths if it summons the nations of the Middle East to their inalienable responsibility for shaping the future of their common region.

* * *

Some progress could be recorded respecting Israel's application for a close and comprehensive link with the European Economic Community: in June of 1967, the Commission of the Community endorsed it and referred it forward with a benevolent recommendation. Of comparable significance are our constantly friendlier and expanding relations with Rumania, expressed in a set of specialized agreements; the ever greater and more diversified cooperation with developing countries, signalized, this year, by the fourth in the series of Rehovot Conferences, now on the theme of the advancement of health in the developing world; and the emphasis upon improving and enlarging relations with Asia, with our own Continent so to speak, which the Minister's tour of five States early in 1967 exemplified.

ISREAL-ARAB RELATIONS

In mid-May 1967, President Nasser shifted the focus of regional tension from Aden and Syria to Sinai. Divergence, reciprocal subversion and particularism had, for long, colored inter-Arab relations. Now Nasser contrived to wed the Arab States again to his plans. The sworn foes of yesterday came to terms: Hussein of Jordan incontinently signed a defense pact with him on 30 May, Bourguiba of Tunisia renewed his membership of the Arab League and pledged a contingent to fight against Israel, Feisal of Saudi Arabia momentarily held his hand in Yemen. Nasser's ambition of a pan-Arab hegemony, after – perhaps as a reward for – extinguishing Israel, was once more taking form after a lengthy eclipse. Evidently, the concept of Arab unity had resisted the schismatics of years more sturdily than many thought. Even the 'conservatives' were beguiled into professions of solidarity by the anti-Israel slogan and hastened to broadcast

it; the populace – not excepting Bourguiba's capital – translated it into pogroms; in Iraq, divisiveness was shelved for the time.

In that mood, intoxicated by a statistical superiority of men and munitions and by the advantages of encirclement, the Arabs passed from guerrilla and infiltration to an all-out offensive – Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq as the major champions, Algeria, Kuwait, Sudan and Saudi Arabia as vociferous camp-followers, sundry North African States at least declaring formal war.

And today? Hussein, who flung off Israel's eleventh-hour warnings, sees nearly half his citizenry and much of his farmlands under Israel administration, and eternal Jerusalem re-unified; Nasser walks the tightrope of ascendancy in Egypt and of prestige outside it, although not without bargaining skill and tactical restraints of speech and counsel. The inter-Arab balance of power is shaken. The Arab-Israel problem and, within it, the refugee question are re-dimensioned, attesting, moreover, that, for the Arab States, the Palestinian refugees were tools and not agents in the prelude to the war and in the fighting of it.

Here and there, cracks may be discerned in the Egyptian monolith: a mutinous movement of high Army officers, with the former Commander-in-Chief taking his own life in the shadow of court-martial for sedition, men who were Cabinet Ministers yesterday awaiting trial on charges of treason today. And a general restlessness, partly, one may surmise, the first awakening of the stark knowledge of an economic, political and military disaster, and partly a fatalistic trigger-happiness of spasmodic firing at Israel troops on the east bank of the Suez Canal. This could be a kind of reflex action set off by insidious leadership promises, if not of a renewal of combat, at least of ransom of the spoils of Israel's victory; the incitement is not without its consequences along the cease-fire lines at Kuneitra and at the bridges over the Jordan. And what could be more outrageous than the Egyptian firing of rockets from a carrier safely tucked away in Port Said at an Israeli destroyer on lawful patrol well outside Egypt's territorial waters last October? That sinking of one of Israel's warships was no more and no less than an unconscionable act of piracy, a cynical and callous dishonoring of Nasser's [pledged word to the United Nations to respect at least the cease-fire.

It would be absurd to ignore the reality, throughout most of the Israel-administered areas, still, of a fitful movement of not always passive resistance; it is, not doubt, partly instinctive, but there can be little doubt that it is largely incited by the press and radio of Beirut and Cairo, of Damascus and, at times, Amman, and the Arab Governments clandestinely organize, train and give passage to the hireling saboteurs, and killers who go by the collective name of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Terrorist acts have, indeed, been escalating ominously since the autumn of 1967, and they display all the marks of Syrian and Algerian direction and aid; one, particularly despicable, was the dynamiting of a settler's home in the village of Ometz: man and wife gravely injured, their little boy of three killed. The Army can claim hundreds of gangsters captured and scores killed *in flagrant delicto*, but it has also had to answer a recent manifestation of openly belligerent Jordanian gunfire on villages in the Beisan Valley, probing and raiding

as far south as Eilat, and cold-blooded shooting of Israel soldiers and Red Cross personnel engaged in the humanitarian duty of piloting across the Allenby Bridge Arab civilians seeking reunion, under Israel's continuing scheme, with kinsfolk on the West Bank.

Mining of highways, dynamiting of installations, go on. But token strikes of shopkeepers in the West Bank, symbolic absenteeism of school teachers, are past, and, on the whole, the Arabs of the administered areas, it would appear, would like to be let alone by a leadership that has failed them so often: their hesitation, their lukewarm responses to the appeals of that leadership for non-cooperation, point rather to the impact of intimidation by irredentists among them or of fears of what might happen to collaborators' if the pre-5 June status were to be restored. There is no evidence of fundamental dissatisfaction with Israel's administration or of any real feeling of oppression; and plainly the residents of the West Bank are, by and large, with holding 'aid and comfort' from infiltrators.

The Thalmann report (see below) on East Jerusalem bears this out. Arab women there are taking eagerly to lessons in Hebrew. Arab men have come forward to join the Israel Police Force. The fishing industry of Gaza is under swift rehabilitation, and the export of citrus and other cash crops of the Strip is being methodically reorganized.

* * *

But Arab 'unity' still feeds on activism against Israel – for the time being, in major part, in expendable, oratorical pyrotechnics, and the Khartoum Summit conferences of Foreign Ministers and Heads of State were mainly conceived to 'paper over' the fissures of feud and jealousy. Algeria, now openly challenging Egypt's primacy in the Arab world, and Syria, always the firebrand, if not always the great defender, of Arab nationalism, ostracized the conferences as renegeing on the oil embargo and as falling short of a renewed declaration – and performance – of war against Israel: refusal to treat with Israel for any kind of settlement, decisions to go on fighting in the arenas of diplomacy and economy, and so, by hook or by crook, reestablish the status quo of 4 June, were apparently nothing like enough for Boumedienne or el-Atassi. Indeed, the right-wing Arab States are inclined to mild saber-rattling yet on the Cairo model, and, even if history lends color to the opinion that underground processes of upheaval and subversion may yet break through, none of the belligerent regimes has been cast out so far for its defeat in battle; worsted generals and miscalculating staff officers are in plentiful supply as scapegoats. Nevertheless, the Egyptian attempt to rig a new Summit conference early in 1968 ran up against overt disinterest, if not actual recalcitrance, on the part of several constituents, and was abandoned.

At an Arab Summit in August 1967, from which Syria demonstratively absented itself, signs were faintly visible of a thawing in Egyptian frigidity towards 'conservative' Arab States, going so far as an agreement, in principle, between Nasser and Saudi Arabia to stop the Yemen fighting. It remains to be seen whether this rapprochement will be

more successful than previous but short-lived reconciliations of the same kind. What really mattered was that Kuwait and Libya undertook to pay out \$135 m., from their astronomic oil royalties, in compensation to Egypt, Jordan and Syria for their war losses, and, at the time of writing, the undertaking is being punctually kept.

The same Summit meeting did not budge from the intransigent Arab attitude of refusal to recognize Israel, acquiesce in its existence or negotiate for peace with it. 'Bad to the lines of 4 June', 'Surrender of the gains of aggression' – these were still the cry. This, taken with open patronage of terrorism against Israel, can by no stretch of the imagination be regarded as restraint, inviting or deserving concessions or waivers by Israel.

ON THE BORDERS

Since the summer of 1966, an organization styling itself –el-Fattah had assumed the ignoble function of Arab terrorist-in-chief, under the official aegis and auspices of Syria, its headquarters in Syria, its finances from Syria, its members trained by Syria's military staff. This vicious and indiscriminating apparatus for murder and sabotage in Israel was – and still is – dignified by Arab statesmen, by the Arab press and radio, with the title of a 'popular war', and the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan were at times less than enthusiastic or competent about denying these wreckers and assassins too easy a transit into Israel across their garrisoned frontiers. Jordan has occasionally given fire-cover to them as they withdrew.

The 'Palestine Liberation Movement' founded by Ahmed Shukairy, the notorious, free-lance Arab extremist, enjoying the tutelage of Egypt and blatantly marshaled in the Gaza Strip, has copied the crimes of el-Fattah independently. It must be interpolated, parenthetically, that, even with Shukairy ousted from his personal control of all this irredentism, the technique of hit-and-run dynamiting and ambush still torments the farming outposts of Israel, for all the lesions that the Six-Day War should have driven home in the most irreconcilable of Arab minds.

* * *

It was disappointing for Israel that the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization took such little count of overall political and security aspects, and preferred to carry out post-factum investigations, handing down ambivalent verdicts as to responsibility for this or that breach; after all, this was not a matter of judicial formality and court-room proofs, but concerned a manifest projection, in infiltration and mine-laying, and in unprovoked gunfire, of an advertised Arab belligerency. It was an intended foretaste of the full-scale war that was to be launched.

The Israel Defense Forces were compelled, on occasion, to carry out limited reprisals, but the deterrent impact of these, and of the unambiguous warnings given by the Government of Israel of what would be the upshot of continuing Syrian provocation, was

largely neutralized by the Soviet veto in the Security Council of any proposal to condemn Syria, and by the unending flow of Soviet arms and backing to the Arab States.

'Official' Syrian belligerency had been particularly tendentious as regards the demilitarized zone north-east of Lake Kinneret: exploiting the fewness of Israel troops in that area, Damascus unleashed a long harassment of Jewish farmsteads and traffic, making work and life almost unbearable. Routine border patrols were blown up by mines, villages in the undefended plain below were shelled again and again, there were intermittent fusillades from Syria's 'Maginot' emplacements, trespassing by Syrian shepherds or ploughmen on Jewish lands was engineered, and in Lake Kinneret, a body of water totally within the bounds of Israel, Syrians netted fish illegally or fired on Israel fishermen and patrol-vessels.

As things worsened rapidly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations proposed, and the parties agreed, that there be a special meeting of the Syria-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission, restricted to questions of disputed cultivation in the demilitarized zone. Between 26 and 29 January, the Commission met twice. There was, to start with, a mutual reaffirmation of the undertaking not to open fire and to refrain from aggression, but the Syrians soon retracted their pledge, and, in characteristic propaganda fashion, insisted on ventilating issues and claims extraneous to the agenda. The brief spell of quiet was quickly ended. The Syrians contrived to put off indefinitely a survey of the borders, suggested by the United Nations personnel, that might have demonstrated how groundless were alleged fears in Damascus of Israel troop concentrations; it will be remembered that, at a critical subsequent juncture, the Soviet Ambassador to Israel declined an invitation by our Prime Minister to see for himself how un-substantiated that apprehension was.

On 11 May, U Thant was impelled to report that el-Fattah was to blame for the local tension; his appeal to the Arab Governments which were answerable for its activity to put a stop to it was without avail.

The Jordan frontier was unusually disturbed towards the end of 1966: gravest among a lengthy sequence of el-Fattah acts were the dynamiting of a home in a Jerusalem suburb, an explosion of the permanent way near Bittir, the killing of three Israeli soldiers by a land-mine in the Hebron hills. On 13 November, the Israel Defense Forces raided the village of Samua, known to be the jumping-off point for el-Fattah in Jordan. Needless to say, no Soviet veto was exercised when, on a Jordanian complain, this counter-action was discussed in the Security Council, but the fact remains that the Hebron area was strangely calm from then on and the Government of Jordan was seen to display greater severity against commandos abusing its territory. Jordan's customary protest against the holding of a military tattoo and parade in Jerusalem on the Independence Day of 1967, a protest reinforced by strenuous political canvass internationally, was set aside by the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission, which claimed no jurisdiction in so wholly sovereign a decision of the Government of Israel.

The Lebanese frontier was also a frequent point of entry into Israel for el-Fattah. A young footballer was killed by a mine barbarously hidden beneath a playing-field in the village of Dishon, and el-Fattah mortars from within Lebanon sprayed kibbutz Manara. This called for a minor military retort by Israel.

The Six-Day War created cease-fire lines along the Suez Canal and the Jordan River, and on the Gaulan Heights. The Armistice regime had collapsed with Jordan, Syria and Lebanon (as it had done with Egypt in 1956), and Israel no longer recognized the 1949 Armistice Agreements or the demarcation lines created by them. The cease-fire agreements brought about by the Security Council Resolutions were supervised by the Secretary-General's Representative, General Odd Bull, with the help of teams of military observers along the Suez Canal and the Gaulan Heights front.

* * *

FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION

For ten years and more, since the Sinai campaign, the Straits of Tiran had been free and open to Israel's and to all, shipping, as a provision of the general settlement which led to the withdrawal of the Israel Defense Forces from the peninsula. Moreover, in April 1958, the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea adopted a Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone: there could not be a more unequivocal affirmation of Israel's right of navigation through the Straits of Tiran than the fourth paragraph of the Convention, namely:

'There shall be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits which are used for international navigation between one part of the high seas and another part of the high seas or the territorial sea of a foreign State.'

Suddenly, Nasser served notice to quit on the United Nations Emergency Force, and the Secretary-General, unmindful of the Great Power undertakings of 1957 and the predecessor, hastened to comply. His flanks now rid of restraint, Nasser, on 22 May 1967, barred the Straits to Israel navigation: he well knew what this presaged, and, within a day or two, admitted it in many words –

'Sharm el-Sheikh meant confrontation with Israel. Taking such a step requires us to be ready to enter into an all-out war with Israel.'

Reluctant, if it could at all be avoided, to exercise its prerogative of self-defense under the United Nations Charter against this open aggression, Israel endeavored to set international diplomatic processes in motion to rescind the embargo. A number of maritime States declared support for Israel's stand against the illegality. But no

intervention or action followed that could stay or sway Nasser. The blockade went on, and on 3 June the Egyptian guns shelled a Liberian ship that tried to run it.

The Six-Day War was the solvent: the Straits are open again to the world's shipping: on 11 June, and Israel flag-ship passed through.

On 6 June, Egypt blocked the Suez Canal by scuttling vessels, once more, as in 1956, seeking to turn an international waterway into an instrument of political blackmail. Israel is now a directly interested party, on the spot; pending clearance of the Canal, it adheres to the practice of free navigation for Israeli and Egyptian ships alike – or else for neither. Within the parity, Israel did not withhold assent to Egyptian measures to extract long-marooned vessels from the Great Bitter Lake and Lake Timsah southwards, but it was not prepared without prior agreement to acquiesce in Egyptian measures to clear the northern section of the Canal, which is in no way involved in the southward aggress of the vessels in question.

IN THE ADMINISTERED AREAS

(See, also, under Ministries of Health, Agriculture and the Interior, among others)

The Israel presence in the administered areas is, in the first and natural place, an instrument for maintaining law and order in the interests of their inhabitants and, hardly less, for protecting the security of the farmers and citizens of the State itself against militant desperadoes in hiding there or using the areas as a base of terrorist infiltration. But this instrumentality neither delays nor circumscribes the main objective, which is to bring about the speediest return of the areas to normal conditions.

To that end, primarily, local authorities have been kept on, the economy is being reinforced at every responsive point, and every international agency of welfare is afforded the maximum of cooperation and facilities. In the Gaza Strip, the cadre of municipal and village councils continues in office and duty: salaries are paid by the Government of Israel, which in granting advances to cover the councils' expenses in the interim until new budgets can be prepared and collections of dues and taxes be regularized. The local constabularies are functioning and postal services operating to schedule; the Gaza spur-track has been linked up to the main line of the Israel Railways; the telephone system of Israel, with its global projections, now serves the Gaza Strip and the West Bank as well.

Free movement is allowed throughout the Strip and permits for its inhabitants to visit friend and kin in the West Bank are liberally distributed. Hospitals are open, beds are numerous enough for all local needs, and health services have been restored: there is no dearth of doctors, medical supplies are amply provided by the Israel Ministry of Health. Local veterinary services have been supplemented by personnel from Israel. Courts of law are in ordinary session, and any lawyer in the Strip with an Egyptian license to practice may use it.

As in the West Bank and in East Jerusalem, local branches of banks had closed their doors: they had not the cash to meet the customers' demands and their liquidity was exceedingly low. Branches of Israel banks have come to the rescue and offer the necessary facilities for deposit and credit. Arrangements have been made for residents to get remittances from abroad as before.

Commercial contacts with foreign markets are being resumed. Already there has been a shipment of oranges to Yugoslavia and of dates and almonds, and the Government of Israel helped a delegation of Gaza merchants to go to Europe and canvass for further citrus sales.

It has also financed a first employment project, on public works and on wadi and shore revetments. The fishermen of Gaza town are netting profitably again. All schools are open and well attended. With the help of 'Care', some 70,000 needy non-refugees, including 10,000 in the el-Arish area, are getting food parcels, and the compass of this undertaking will eventually take in 120,000 recipients. The local orphanage is subsidized from Israel State funds; welfare offices are functioning in the town, and more and more of the 1948 refugees are being put to productive jobs. All public works and construction pending at the outbreak of the fighting are now in the process of completion, with the use of local manpower and equipment.

Existing artesian wells are being improved and new ones are being drilled to forward the el-Arish development scheme, planned to bring 2,500 acres of land under the plough. The Dawali Lake is being studied by Israel experts for re-stocking so as to exploit its potential as a source of fish; the salinity of underground waters and soil conservation in the Wadi Gaza are being examined; insecticides and fertilizers are being made available, crops systematically sprayed, and small operative loans granted to farmers.

By and large, farming throughout the Strip has been virtually rehabilitated by now, equipment and vehicles were put right, produce is punctually delivered – all under cooperative arrangements of supplies and sales on the Israel model.

Prices have been pegged throughout, except in cases, such as fuel, hard liquor and tobacco, where the risk of smuggling makes it necessary to equalize them with those prevailing in Israel.

But – apart from banks – no Israel firms are allowed to open branches or to do business otherwise in the administered areas, and all dealings in land or property are forbidden.

To keep the West Bank economy at its former level, which had been sustained in the main by tourism, remittances and foreign aid, ways and means will have to be discovered of finding fifty million dollars a year; in the Gaza Strip, there is a heritage of a deficit of nearly fifteen million dollars between a former import value of 24.7 m. dollars and an export value of only 9.9 m. dollars.

Tourism is being vigorously reactivated, with hotels re-opening and itineraries organized to take in Gaza, Banias and the hot springs of el-Hamma, and West Bank guides are being instructed in up-to-date methods and information.

The people of East Jerusalem may now, by permit freely issued, pay visits when they wish to anywhere in East Jordan; in this way, it is hoped, pious Moslems, both from the Old City and the administered areas, will be able to proceed on the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina.

IN THE UNITED NATIONS

On 5 June 1967, Israel advised the Security Council of the Egyptian chain of aggression antecedent to the outbreak of fighting that morning. A pro-Arab demand by the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, India and Mali for the incontinent withdrawal of the Israel forces was voted down, and, the next day, the Council, simply and unanimously, called for a cease-fire. Arab, and especially Syrian, evasion or obduracy compelled the Council to re-affirm its decision more than once, and it was not until 10 June that Damascus gave way. It is perhaps merely of academic interest that Algeria and Libya, Tunisia, Yemen and Mauretania, by declaration allies of Egypt in the war, did not accept the cease-fire.

The delegate of the Soviet Union in the Council had the effrontery to liken Israel's self-defense to Nazi barbarism; seemingly, the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939 had slipped his mind. So, apparently, had all memory of May 1948, and of his predecessor's forthright castigation, which President Kosygin was afterwards obliquely to recall, of the Arab invasion of Israel's new-born, internationally-recognized, statehood and of the Arab attack, then, upon a Jewish national liberation movement – an attack and an invasion which were to set the pattern for Arab priority and monopoly in unrelenting aggression against Israel for the next nineteen years.

It was only to be expected that the Soviet Union would propose that Israel be condemned for aggression and required to withdraw unconditionally from the administered areas. The insensate proposal to condemn Israel attracted the votes of Bulgaria, India, Mali and the Soviet Union itself; Argentina, Brazil, Britain, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Japan, Nigeria and the United States were demonstratively silent. For unconditional withdrawal, Ethiopia and Nigeria crossed the floor; again the rest stood aloof, but not before the delegate of the United States had stigmatized that part of the proposal as 'a plan for renewal of the war'. The United States, for its part, recommended that the United Nations should set about achieving permanent peace in the Middle East, in accord with the principles which President Johnson was to define on 19 June.

On 14 June, the Council called upon Israel to ensure the security and welfare of inhabitants of the Arab areas under its administration and to ease the return of fugitives; the manner in which Israel is discharging the duty is described throughout this and in other chapters of this Year Book.

Unsuccessful in the Council, the Soviet Union insisted upon an emergency session of the General Assembly, and there, from 17 June to 21 July, pressed its arraignment of Israel with all the seniority of representation and, deplorably, with all the reckless and resentful animus, that it could muster. The Assembly was split – in this camp, the Arab and Moslem States and, except for Rumania, all of Eastern Europe, clamoring for Israel's withdrawal without terms from the administered areas; in that camp, the entire New World, minus Cuba, and nearly all of Western and Northern Europe and of non-Arab Africa, plus Oceania, gainsaying any relapse into the perilous *status quo*.

The renewed proposal of the Soviet Union, going so far beyond branding Israel as aggressor, and beyond requiring its instant withdrawal, as to claim a war-indemnity for the Arab States, was solidly rejected. A less rancorously phrased but basically not dissimilar proposal by Yugoslavia and India, making much of compliance with the Armistice Agreements, also failed, for all the tinkering in between which sought to render it not quite so nakedly anti-Israel. An Albanian proposal to indict the United States, Britain and Israel wholesale was dismissed out of hand. A United States proposal – entitled 'A stable peace and coexistence in the Middle East' – was not voted on.

Twenty Latin-American States suggested an Israel withdrawal, linked, however, with abandonment of all regional belligerency and with the establishment of regional coexistence; the Security Council should act to make certain of universal freedom of navigation in the international water-ways of the Middle East. The suggestion found strong backing, but short of a two-thirds majority.

A proposal to undo the reunification of Jerusalem did gain that margin: Israel's response to it is reported further on.

Efforts to patch up a compromise between the Yugoslav-Indian and the Latin-American proposals were balked by Arab objection to anything that savored of recognizing Israel and giving up belligerency. Thereupon, the emergency session prorogued itself and referred the issue back to the Security Council. Israel's Foreign Minister characterized this culmination as one of the important hours of the United Nations: there was no failing, no recoiling from responsibility, but rather an act of statesmanship – there rebuttal of baseless charges, the rejection of evil submissions.

Impenitent still, the Soviet Union urged the Economic and Social Council, in July, to discuss a war indemnity to be paid by Israel to the Arab States, but the overwhelming sense of the Council's membership, that this was not the forum for such polemics, obliged it to shelve the idea.

On 22 November 1967, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution, drafted and presented by the United Kingdom. The central provision of the Resolution is its call for 'the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East'.

The fixing of secure and recognized boundaries and withdrawal of forces are interconnected elements in such a peace settlement, as are termination of belligerency, acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of each State, and its right to live in peace, free from threats or acts of force. Other elements of peace listed in the Resolution are freedom of navigation, solution of the refugee problem, and measures to guarantee the inviolability and independence of the States in the area.

In terms of the Resolution, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring of Sweden was appointed by the Secretary-General as his Special Representative to maintain contact with the States concerned 'to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this Resolution'.

The Government of Israel made clear its view that no peace settlement could be reached except by direct negotiations between the parties, leading to a contractual relationship between them. It indicated later that these negotiations could be initiated by Ambassador Jarring, under his auspices.

* * *

In the general debate at the 1966 autumn session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister made a plea for direct and instant negotiations between all concerned to solve the Vietnam problem, and for recognition of the dual reality of China and Formosa; Israel could not agree that the representatives of People's China should be accepted as the sole Chinese voice in the United Nations. Israel again stood for an international pact to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, subject to dependable guarantees for the concomitant security and interests of non-nuclear States; and, within that wider ambit, for a limitation of the arms race in conventional categories, whereby, Israel believes, the pressing settlement of Middle Eastern differences could be hastened.

Israel was among the first signatories of the long-awaited international conventions adopted by the Assembly on civil and political, and on economic, social and cultural, rights. It was in that connection and against that background, in the Assembly at large, and in meetings of ECOSOC and of the Commission on Human Rights and of UNESCO, that Israel, as in duty bound, spoke out forcefully on the tribulations of Russian Jewry.

Israel serves upon the Consultative Committee on the application of science and technology to development, on the International Law and the Human Rights Commissions, and on UNESCO's executive body.

PALESTINIAN REFUGEES AND WEST BANK RETURNEES

At its twenty-first session, in the winter of 1966, the General Assembly adopted a United States proposal concerning the Palestinian refugees; this, as customary, alluded to the Resolution of 11 December 1948 and its alternative of repatriation or compensation, but it did maintain that, if the Resolution was still a dead letter, the general regional situation was to blame. The recurring Arab-sponsored proposal to appoint a United Nations custodian of refugee property in Israel was not endorsed by the Special Political Committee.

Now, after the Six-Day War, Israel finds itself with the bulk of the refugees within its jurisdiction; it is, in effect, the chief 'host country'. As early as 14 June 1967, the Government signed an agreement with Unrwa, authorizing the Agency to proceed, as hitherto, with its aid to the refugees in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and assuring it of full official cooperation; the agreement is in regular and orderly functioning; health and educational services and food supply are being provided normally; the Ministries concerned are easing the Agency's currency transactions and marketing to it, at cost, fruit and vegetables from the West Bank, for distribution in the camps. On the East Bank, the Agency is operating as usual.

In July and August, Nils Gussing, personal representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, came out to look into questions affecting the civilian populations of the controlled area; he was given all the documentation that he wished and afforded absolute freedom, and maximum facilities, to see things for himself.

On 2 July, the Government announced that any person who had been permanently resident in the West Bank when Jordan attacked Israel, and who had crossed to the East Bank before 4 July, might apply for permission to return; the International Red Cross undertook to handle the formalities. Representatives of Israel and of a not especially expeditious Jordan met on 6 August and agreed upon procedures, fixing the start of return for 18 August and the final day as 31 August. The forms to be used by applicants bore the names of both States and of the Red Cross as well. By 31 August, 14,000 men, women and children – many fewer than the Government of Israel was willing, and equipped, to readmit in the time – had come back to the West Bank; the movement is allowed still in respect of any persons who were prevented by technical delays from making use of their permits punctually, and Israel will put no difficulty in the way of the reuniting of families of West Bank origin, altogether outside the limits of the mass repatriation of August. It will be remembered that a similar 'reunion of families' scheme has been administered by Israel for the last nineteen years in respect of the original Palestinian refugees.

The unhelpfulness of the Government of Jordan – and its constant invention of specious technicalities – in the process of return from the East to the West Bank, which, in effect, needlessly and tendentiously minimized the number to cross back within the agreed space of time, did not deter the Government of Israel from conditioned extension

of that period. On humanitarian grounds, it has announced that all persons who already possess, but were hindered from using, permits of return may still re-enter; applications for the reuniting of broken families will be affirmatively examined; and individual applications of special character will be reviewed. As well as that, the Government will consider with UNWRA how best Israel can further a solution of urgent problems, arising out of adverse physical conditions, in refugee camps now within the jurisdiction of Israel, particularly in Jericho: the reference is to the original Palestinian refugees.

This is not to say that there is not still a drift eastward from the West Bank and, possibly, the Gaza Strip. These are die-hards, unwilling to live with the Israel administration, be it ever so equitable, and, in matters of economy, and of social welfare, for instance, of palpable profit to them. There is the strong Arab clan-affinity, promoting a 'reunion in reverse', so to speak; there is the wish to forgo nothing of payments and remittances presumed to be non-transferable to an Israel-administered area. There may be the fear of being branded – or worse – as collaborators. The Government of Israel can only go on administering constructively and fairly, in accordance with international procedures and sanctions, and let the lesson of demonstrative time – law and order, free and equal material aids to progress – do its work in dispelling doubts and claims and reluctances; it cannot apply authoritarian restrictions to lawful civilian crossing of the Jordan. The destiny of the administered areas must depend on solemn and binding treaties of peace, framed and concluded, irrevocably, in direct dialogue between the Arab States and Israel.

Recapitulation may be permissible in this much-misunderstood context. The flight of civilians eastward was mainly – in hopes of getting continued rations and doles on the other side – from refugee camps at Jericho, within walking distance of the Allenby Bridge; it took place before any Israel troops arrived. Thereafter began, not a war-time refugee movement, but an orderly migration of Jordanians who, of their own free will, chose to stay with their own Government. Their reasons are partly familial and partly economic: posts in the Civil Service, in Government schools or with Amman firms, Government pensions, money from kinsfolk in the Arab oil-States. And psychological reason: nationalist sentiment, political uncertainty, unwillingness to be caught between contending Israel and Jordan demands. As for familial reasons, it should be recalled that, for some past years, there had been a demographic shift from the West to the East Bank, largely because the Government of Jordan concentrated its resources and efforts on developing the East Bank, its political and military base.

By stirring up the maximum of unrest and non-cooperation, by suborning returnees to join in civil disobedience, the Government of Jordan degraded a humanitarian issue into a political and security maneuver. This contrasts illuminatingly with Israel's policy and performance, including a contribution of \$334,000 to UNRWA for the betterment of its temporary camps in the East Bank itself.

Israel is now applying itself to the general question, with the aim of preliminary, experimental, integration of groups of refugees into the normal economy and productivity of the State, and, in the light of the success attending such trials, it will *pari passu* study

major plans of rehabilitation. That second phase will, of course, call for international interest and help, and it presupposes co-existential development of the region: that is to say, the imperative stipulation, if the problem is to be wholly solved, is firm and final peace between the Arab States and Israel.

Under the guidance of the Central Bureau of Statistics, ad hoc censuses of population were taken in East Jerusalem, throughout the towns in the West Bank, in the Gaza Strip, Sinai and the Gaulan Heights, with no marked hitches or abstentions. The provisional results are these:

West Bank (excluding East Jerusalem)	597,000
East Jerusalem	65,000
Gaulan Heights	6,400
Gaza Strip	364,000

JERUSALEM AND THE HOLY PLACES

Jordan's wanton attack on Israel on 5 June was mounted from the very precincts of the Holy Places in the Old City. The fighting ended with Jerusalem one and undivided again; its original unity, going back now for almost four thousand years, had been severed for less than twenty. In reverent respect for its sacred shrines, the Israel Defense Forces deployed neither armour, nor artillery, nor aircraft, and the hand-to-hand combat within the Old City's tortuous alleys cost them many young lives.

The Prime Minister at once informed all the local religious dignitaries that it was Israel's settled policy to safeguard the inviolability of the Holy Places of all faiths, and freedom of access and worship there, with no departure from established traditions of denominational custody and care. Within a few weeks, this policy was given statutory basis in the terms of the Protection of Holy Places Law. The municipal amalgamation of West and East Jerusalem, the unification of services and bounds, were by way of an amendment to the Municipalities Ordinance of Mandatory days. The Swiss diplomat, Ernest Thalmann, visited Israel in August, at the instance of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to acquaint himself with things as they are in a single Jerusalem. There follows a summary of the Secretary-General's submission to the General Assembly, in September 1967, on the basis of his report: it gives credit, where credit is due, to Israel's handling of the affairs of the Old City.

Uniforms are few and weapons fewer; military policemen go about their duties matter-of-factly; Arabs and Jews fraternize; the sound of muezzin and church bells is heard.

Arab municipal staff has been absorbed *ad eundem* in the municipality of West Jerusalem; almost all of the 370 employees are thus at work again.

All salaried officers of central and local government have had pay rises, in the light of the higher cost-of-living; eventually, Israel scales will apply, meaning a fivefold jump in the higher grades, a twenty-fourfold jump in the lower.

Pensioners are given *ex gratia* monthly payments until their substantive rights can be determined.

Far from being disturbed, the Muslim waqf, managing resources earmarked for the upkeep of religious and welfare institutions, are helped to exercise direct control and were given a loan of IL.25,000 for current disbursements.

The instructions are that all private property be returned at once; absentee property is handled by the official Custodian.

Tenants of building in a demolished slum area outside the Temple Wall were found other housing, or given key money and subventions towards payment of two year's rent; a welfare bureau has been opened; long-term loans were granted to repair houses damaged by shelling. For land, mostly Church property, under clearance to make a park around the walls, compensation would be paid.

There are no plans for buildings in East Jerusalem; in fact, all extra-mural construction, except for renewal in the Jewish Quarter, is banned.

Damaged pumping stations and conduits were put right, and the water supply resumed and amplified by linking it up with West Jerusalem's system, so that the daily consumption of 9,000 cubic meters has been trebled, yet the cost more than halved; the resulting annual deficit of IL.500,000 will be met by West Jerusalem.

The Sanitation Department has spent over IL. 1 m. on street-sweeping machines, garbage-collecting vans and refuse-bins; malaria sources are being eliminated; use of unpurified sewage effluent for irrigation is checked; the municipal abattoir has been renovated.

Public parks are under betterment, highways and street lighting likewise; the vote for these and similar works is IL.4 m.

With access free from Israel to East Jerusalem, the shopkeepers are unusually active, taking as much as IL. 2 m. a day. Service establishments are busier. Workshops, after a brief dislocation, have reverted to routine and normality and are adjusting themselves to new marketing conditions.

There has, necessarily, been an economic shock to start with, but the standard of living ought to begin rising soon

Everything is done to prevent East Jerusalem being cut off from its sources of – especially agricultural – supply in the West Bank; while an overflow of farm produce that might affect local prices and markets must be avoided, some sales from East Jerusalem to Israel are proceeding.

Farm produce from the West Ban was untaxed on entry into East Jerusalem, and, though check-points have now been set up on the outskirts, no Customs duty is levied. On the other hand, Israel excise duty is payable in East Jerusalem and in all administered areas on hard liquor, spirits, petrol and cement.

Citizens of East Jerusalem pay Israel income tax, but no municipal taxes, except for abattoir and market dues at the previous Jordanian rates.

All the banks in East Jerusalem were branches of head offices in Amman, where their reserves were kept; own cash was only enough to cover 6 percent of deposits, amounting to 5.7 million dinars. Their inevitable closure immobilized more than half of the public's monetary assets and denied businessmen credit with which to start again; the economic integration of East and West Jerusalem led to price-rises in East Jerusalem, further diminishing liquid assets.

On the other hand, borrowers are temporarily spared repayment of bank loans, aggregating 3.0m. dinars, and purchases by Israelis in East Jerusalem are tending to swell its liquid assets once more.

Five Israel banks have opened branches there and are actively engaged in rehabilitative advances. The Government of Israel, through the International Monetary Fund, is negotiating the re-transfer of assets of the closed banks from Amman, as the first step to their re-activation.

At first, the rate of exchange of the dinar had been fixed at IL. 7.50, the value of Israel currency on the free Swiss market, but, speedily, to sustain purchasing power, it was raised to IL. 8.44.

Thirty out of the thirty-four East Jerusalem's recommended hotels are catering normally to tourists; most of the tourists agencies are already operating under temporary licenses, as are many of the almost two hundred guides; some forty to fifty taxis have been re-licensed.

There is a branch of the Histadrut in East Jerusalem and registration of Arab workers is not insignificant; Histadrut policy is gradually, to pay Arab hands in Israel undertakings precisely what Israeli fellow-workers get; in Arab undertakings, wages would be graduated to economic solvency; over two thousand workers from East Jerusalem are now employed in the Jewish sector the Histadrut plans, further, to establish welfare and health institutions, for example, a loan fund, a community center for girls and women that will offer vocational

training, a youth movement, and a sports club, printing presses and a daily newspaper.

A municipal court, under an Israel stipendiary, deals with infringements of by-laws; for the rest, Muslim civil and religious courts are handing down judgments as heretofore.

The educational laws and rules governing Arab children in Israel, the curriculum and textbooks applicable to those children, are effective for East Jerusalem also, with Arabic the basic language of instruction, and Hebrew introduced by degrees in higher grades as a second language. Kindergartens, hitherto non-existent, are to be formed. Grade 9, in Israel part of the secondary, fee-paying, system, is still part of the tuition-free intermediate establishment in East Jerusalem; grades 10 to 12 are to be incorporated in the Israel graded-tuition system, where the contribution of parents to the fee varies from nil to IL.1000, according to means. Where, as in so many cases, families are large, the Israel Government and the municipality will defray the fees.

Plainly, the envoy was struck by the especial character of Jerusalem's unity, without parallel anywhere else in the world and with but one brief and unworthy break in four thousand years, by the conduct of relaxed life in the city on the virtual morrow of combat, by the 'invisibility' of Israel's military image – this, even after he had been allowed to talk freely, and unescorted, with Arabs known to be irreconcilables, members of the Palestine Liberation Organization and so forth.

The policy and promise of Israel, respecting its reunified capital, were set out in the Foreign Minister's letter to the envoy on his arrival:

A salient fact of Jerusalem's life today is the intrinsic necessity of ensuring equal rights and opportunities to all the city's residents by extending to them the same public services and facilities. No international or other interest would be served by the institution of divisions and barriers which would only sharpen tension and generate discrimination. This does not foreclose the final settlement of certain important aspects of the Jerusalem situation which lie at the origin of the international interest in the city. I refer to the need to secure appropriate expression of the special interest of the three great religions in Jerusalem. It is our urgent desire to promote this objective in cooperation with the universal interests concerned. I am confident that, in an atmosphere of international tranquility, substantial progress could be made towards this aim, which has hitherto had no concrete fulfillment.

The particular issue of the Holy Places has been under discussion between Israel and ecumenical circles. After a conversation with the Israel Ambassador to Italy, the Pope sent his envoy, Monsignor Felici, to Israel for further inquiry and talks, to do, in

part, with the precedents of the Italo-Vatican Lateran Agreement on the legal status of the Vatican's churches in Rome. A joint communiqué, issued after the Monsignor's interview with the Prime Minister, and the talks had been conducted in a friendly atmosphere and with mutual understanding, that possible formulae for an acceptable solution of the problem connected with the Holy Places had been reviewed and that contacts would be continued. It is significant that, in his Note of 18 August to the Coptic Patriarch in Egypt, the pope expressed himself thus:

‘The Holy Places must benefit from the guarantees which modern international law furnish for the efficient protection of the rights of all.’

The non-Catholic world has not been slow, in the light of all this, to approach the Government of Israel for the protection of its respective rights. The Government is very ready to clarify such matters with all the Churches of Christendom, and, it goes without saying, with the world of Islam no less.

ECONOMIC WARFARE AGAINST ISRAEL

The Arab boycott network was extended by the opening of branches in Japan and India: everywhere, these offices kept threatening right, left and center, and formidable statistics were advertised of blacklisted firms, although it may be doubted whether effectual boycott was always enforced. In November 1966, the organization decided to boycott Coca-Cola, RCA and Ford. It was a damp squib – these concerns of global renown and ramification scouted the decision. In the issue, the boycott organization looked less prestigious and minor victims could take heart of grace; anyhow, divergent modes of practice seemed to be dividing the Arab States. Lebanon, Kuwait and Jordan, in particular, were critical of policy and of implementation: not seldom the complaint was heard that State A, obedient to a headquarters ukase, found State B doing business with an outlawed enterprise.

Already in October 1965, the United States Congress amended the Export Control Act, thereby obliging every company to report to the Secretary of Commerce any approach from the boycott organization; recent data published by the Department point to a rising measure of salutary compliance with that procedure. The organization appears to be resigned by now to extracting admissions of non-association with Israel from concerns that, in any event, do not traffic with us.

The Foreign Trade Risks Insurance Company of France has rescinded its rule against coverage of risks arising out of the boycott in its policies; such risks are, in fact, now covered.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

THE NEW WORLD

The Government of the United States was out-spoken in its dissent from the way in which the United Nations Emergency Force was stampeded out of its frontier assignment in Sinai, and in denouncing Egypt's closure of the Straits of Tiran; it was prominent, thereafter in attempting – however abortively – to spur international maritime action that might restore freedom of navigation; and, at all times, throughout the crisis, it has shown a traditional readiness, starting at the Presidential level, to keep in contact and discussion with the spokesmen of Israel. In the United Nations, its standpoint always was that not just the results of the Six-Day War, too often assessed and exploited unconscionably by the pro-Arab bloc, but also the background and reasons of it should be brought under survey. On 19 June, President Johnson defined American policy as respect for the total right of every State in the Middle East to a life of independence and peace; a fair and proper solution of the refugee question; an honoring of the right of navigation through international waterways, for interference there 'was more responsible than any other act of folly for the breakdown of peace'; a curb on the arms race; and heed for the independence and territorial integrity of all States in the region. That principle of integrity and independence, the President emphasized, was likely to be effective only on the basis of peace between the parties and if the truce lines that had been broken and violated during twenty years were replaced by recognized borders and arrangements that would give every State security against terror, destruction and war.

The clear purport was to end the 'limited' war which the Arab States wage against Israel, not without the passive acquiescence of a great part of the international community; as Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on 2 August: 'The Arab States and Israel must themselves find an acceptable settlement, since the USSR and the USA will not force a ready-made solution upon them.'

This far-sighted and fundamental precept for the lasting good and tranquility of the Middle East was unflinching affirmed by the United States throughout the sequel.

Thus, on the official plane, the friendship between the United States and Israel splendidly weathered a testing time. The American public displayed its sympathy and goodwill in its own stimulating way. American Jewry outdid itself in an unprecedented outpouring of material and moral support. In August, together with representatives of other Jewries, leading American Jews consulted in Jerusalem with the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues: it was more than an occasion to proclaim identification and solidarity with Israel, it was a businesslike preliminary to long-term plans for larger overseas investment in local industry, for stepping up the quality and price-competitiveness of our products, and for more intense and wider partnership in the spheres of education and culture.

In the past year, Israel was recipient of US food surpluses to a value of \$2.6 m. and of a loan of \$10 m. from the Export-Import Bank.

Among notable guests of Israel were Senators Pastore, Gore, Symington, Edward Kennedy, Clark, Hartke and Brewster; a group of Negro leaders came to study community development; the American Ballet and the Cincinnati Orchestra performed here with much success. Reciprocally, there were the visits to the United States of Israel's grand old man of letters, Shai Agnon, winner of the Nobel Prize in literature, and, once more, of the ever-popular Israel Philharmonic Orchestra.

* * *

Steadfast in their advocacy of Israel's righteous causes, the States of Latin America would have nothing of any proposal in the United Nations that did not speak for the abandonment of Arab belligerency *pari passu* with any disengagement of Israel forces and for the imperativeness, following that 'wind of change', of a directly-negotiated and permanent peace in the region; it was a collective stand that did much to circumvent the partisan maneuvers of the pro-Arab bloc.

Apart from the friendly links thus forged, or reinforced, at the United Nations, there is warm and frequent contact between personalities of Latin America and Israel through exchanges of hospitality, and through a constant extension of Israel's technical cooperation in the agrarian and general development of the sub-continent. Cultural and scientific rapports were strengthened, trade is expanding. Parliamentary delegations, with the respective Speakers leading them, came from El Salvador, Brazil, Chile, Panama, Peru and Venezuela for the dedication of the new home of the Knesset in Jerusalem. The Vice-President of Peru, the Dominican Foreign Minister, the Colombian Ministers of Defense and Agriculture, the Mexican Minister of Commerce, the Chilean Chief of Staff and representatives of the Chilean Atomic Energy Commission were also our guest during the year. Very pleasant occasions were a call at Haifa of the Chilean frigate 'Esmeralda', in which naval cadets get their training, and the visit of a group of students of Brazil's military academy, with their instructors: the parading of these welcome visitors in the thoroughfares of Haifa and Jerusalem evoked a spontaneous demonstration of public enthusiasm and affection.

Mexico's Deputy Minister of Education came to discuss a cultural agreement and took part in the inauguration of the 'Mexico' building at the University at Tel Aviv. At meetings in Buenos Aires and Jerusalem, the mixed commission under Israel's cultural agreement with Argentina set the lines for wider cooperation; 'Argentine House' in Jerusalem, a cultural and social center for visitors and pilgrims from that State, is now open. Professor Otilia Arosemina deTejeira of Panama, a member of the Executive Committee of Unesco, held conversations here with the trustees of cultural institutions.

Agreements of considerable bearing on the continuance and extension of Israel's technical aid were signed with the Organization of American States; a delegation from the Organization, led by its President Dr. J. Mora, and with the chairman of the 'Alliance for Progress', Dr. C.S. Santamaria, among its members, had come to Israel first for exploratory talks.

Agreements on cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy were concluded with Mexico and Uruguay.

EUROPE

The basic friendship of the Western European States towards Israel was given marked expression in the ambit of the events of June 1967, in both the spoken and the printed word. Manpower and money were offered by Denmark and Holland, Greek intellectuals appealed vigorously for peaceful Middle Eastern coexistence. Save for France and Spain, this widespread reaction, which the Government of Italy, for once, espoused in a formal declaration, was reflected in the voting in the Security Council and in the emergency session of the General Assembly.

The Government of the Netherlands, in and out of Parliament, underlined its support of Israel's right to sovereign existence and to self-defense against aggressors, and urged unmediated negotiations for peace; it had, characteristically, come out strongly for freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran. Also typical of this cordiality were the tax-exemption of gifts to Israel during the crisis, and a tempestuous reception of the Israel contingent in the annual Nijmegen march.

The coalition Government in Bonn, formed early in 1967, has made for a stronger practical accent in our relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. Israel's Foreign Minister represented his Government at the funeral of Dr. Konrad Adenauer, and had an opportunity then of constructive discussions with the German Foreign Minister and other members of the Bonn Cabinet on issues of common concern.

Bonn, it should be noted, has shown understanding and sympathy in respect of Israel's wish standing and sympathy in respect of Israel's wish to join the Common Market, and the loans made by West Germany last year to finance projects of development are being followed up by further economic aid.

Organized and officially-sponsored groups of young Germans, on visits of re-educational character, are familiar sight in the villages of Israel; in the opposite direction, a Histadrut delegation has visited West Germany, for the first time, at the invitation of the West German trade unions.

The long-standing and crisis-proof amity between Scandinavia and Israel was projected in high-level visits of reciprocity: the Foreign Minister of Norway and his Deputy were here in April, the Prime Minister of Finland was with us in May, the Israel Minister of Agriculture toured Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. Scandinavia-Israel relations of trade and culture improve and multiply year by year; an agreement for the avoidance of double taxation was signed with Denmark.

Until the moment of crisis in May-June 1967, our relations and our exchanges with France were marked by the sentiments and attitudes of helpful friendship and community of interests which have for so long given joy to Israel: the foreign Minister of Israel conversed on matters of basic significance with his counterpart in Paris in the most amiable fashion; a French parliamentary delegation, including the Deputy Speaker, visited Israel; the working of a diversity of agreements was furthered by reciprocating missions. Yet, at the psychological instant, General de Gaulle was not willing to admit Israel's compulsion to defend itself, and seemed to go so far as to charge it with attacking first; an embargo on arms consignments to Israel and a vote by France for the Yugoslav-Indian proposal in the General Assembly lent the President's sudden deflection a disturbing connotation. Many, and not only in Israel, found this difficult to interpret or justify, in the light of all that France, under General de Gaulle, had done in the past, with such consistent goodwill, to sustain and strengthen the scientific and military apparatus of Israel, and its economic and political welfare.

There is not a single person in Israel without implicit faith that these dark hours will swiftly pass. It is a faith founded, justifiably, in multitudinous displays of public support throughout France – professions of sympathy by politicians of all affiliations a favoring press and radio, overt demonstrations of solidarity, an expanding flow of French tourists, ad a 'Gallup' poll which yielded a clear majority on Israel's side. It is proper to add that Franco-Israel 'contacts of cooperation' in the spheres of economy, culture and science have been honored all along without the slightest hitch.

* * *

As pointed out in previous Year Books, the trade agreement which the European Economic Community signed with Israel in 1964 fell short of answering our minimal needs. The mixed Israel-Common Market committee provided for by it met in April 1965 and in June 1966, but did little to enlarge its scope, although evidently the member-States of the Community were themselves becoming convinced of its inadequacy as an instrument for progressively wider and mutually advantageous exchanges. In June 1966, therefore, Israel asked that, being due to expire on 1 July 1967, it be replaced by an 'associative' agreement that would have the effect of doing away with quantitative import restrictions and of harmonizing economic policies of the Common Market and of Israel in industry and agriculture. Stress was laid, in particular, on Israel's wish to develop new industrial exports and thus to redress a trade balance which depends so much on free entry into a larger market. In ensuing talks with the Foreign Ministers of member-States, the Foreign Minister of Israel pressed the point.

Thereafter, by decision of the Council of Ministers of the Community, issues were clarified and argumentation was crystallized at a meeting of representatives of Israel and the Community in January 1967: the outcome was that a report was submitted early in

June to the Council of Ministers, recommending that the Community do enter into an 'associative' agreement with Israel, under paragraph 238 of the Treaty of Rome; the Council's working party on foreign affairs has begun its study of the report for final consideration. Meanwhile, the agreement of 1964 was extended for a year.

Of particular impact, in this context, was the appearance of the Foreign Minister at the Council of Europe towards the end of September: he spoke of the political standpoint of Israel and outlined its ideas for regional peace. At the same time, he emphasized how essential it was that Israel should be drawn into the complex of development of the European Economic Community. It was, also, an opportunity for the Minister, whose words were warmly received, to establish further contacts with the organs of the Council.

* * *

The situation with Eastern Europe was normal, and, indeed, not without promise of betterment, until the events of June 1967, when all but one of the regional States broke off diplomatic relations with Israel. Till then, there had been signs of some readiness to respond affirmatively, at least in the cultural and economic spheres, to Israel's hopeful approaches. In the political area, there was a continuing dialogue between the Governments of the Soviet Union and Israel, in Jerusalem, in Moscow and at the United Nations: in this, Israel made known how important to it would be a clear stand by the Soviet Union on the rights of every State in the Middle East to peace and security; plainly, the two Governments are at one in their opinions on many international questions, but, unhappily, the gap between Soviet principles as enunciated in theory and Soviet policy as followed in practice is still wide. How wide, has been documented in the early part of this chapter; if further proof were needed, it was furnished by the Soviet Union's diplomatic break with Israel on 10 June, a discriminatory affront with no parallel in past Russian reactions to States in similar circumstances.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia followed suit. Save for Czechoslovakia, the previous record of steadily improving relations stood in violent, and inexplicable, contrast to that toeing of the Soviet line, and the astonishment was certainly shared to a considerable extent by the respective publics. There was bold criticism of the official anti-Israel trend, especially among intellectuals and young people, and, it would appear, in military circles also.

Having effectively displayed his partisanship against Israel by his severance of diplomatic relations, President Tito of Yugoslavia was ubiquitous and persistent in his endeavors to work out a formula that would win general support of the pro-Arab demand for Israel's withdrawal from the administered areas with no condition beyond empty gestures. With the same strange unconcern for Israel's claims, at least to be consulted, of

which many self-appointed peace-makers are guilty, Tito traded his proposals to all and sundry, the Arab States included, but ignored Israel.

Rumania was the admirable exception. It came out robustly in support of Israel's basic, elementary, right to live and be secure, it stood for a policy of parallel friendship for Israel and for the Arab States, and so it voted in the United Nations.

I March 1967, a Rumanian economic survey mission was in Israel, led by the Deputy Minister of Commerce; in April an Israel mission, led by the Minister of Finance, returned the visit, and rewarding agreements were subsequently signed, (see, below, 'Economic Affairs'). Israel experts in farming have been advising in Rumania, Rumanian farmers training and studying in Israel. Professors St. S. Nicolao, a foremost scientist, who is Deputy Speaker of the Rumanian Parliament, was guest of the Israel Academy of Science, Rumanian artistes and actors, as well as ensembles, performed in Israel; Israel musicians were invited to Rumania.

In December 1967, the Rumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs led a delegation to Israel for meetings with the Minister of Commerce and Industry and his advisers. The highly gratifying outcome was an additional trade agreement to be effective from 1968 to 1970, and an air agreement. The total of trade each way in 1968 will be \$14 m., which doubles the previous figure, and then succeeding increments of 10 and 15 percent, respectively. Israel will sell, in the main, electronic tele-communication and agricultural equipment, cotton, phosphates and tires, Rumania will sell tractors, wood, road-surfacing material and electrical equipment. What is especially important is that the two countries will work together to find new markets for their products.

* * *

Great Britain and Canada, Australia and New Zealand, had deplored the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from Sinai; and, as interested maritime Powers, they sought – albeit with no success – to end Egypt's blockade of the Straits of Tiran. Disapproval of territorial gains through war did not prevent Great Britain, or any Commonwealth State, from insisting that any withdrawal of Israel troops from Arab territory must be simultaneous with guarantees of peace and security for Israel henceforth, with an end to belligerency and with freedom of passage through the Straits and the Suez Canal; Canada, itself author of the United Nations Emergency Force, urged international supervision to ensure that freedom. Australia and New Zealand, in the General Assembly, reproached the Soviet Union as responsible for the crisis by supply arms to the Arab States and by vetoing in the Security Council whatever proposal might vouchsafe Israel a modicum of the Council's aid and aegis. It will be recalled that New Zealand voted against a proposal in the Council in November 1966 to condemn Israel for a military reprisal against the Jordanian village of Samua.

The British Foreign Secretary, in the Assembly, criticized Israel's re-unification of Jerusalem; Canada's Foreign Minister, however, implied that his Government did not reject the idea, so long as supervision over the Holy Places was arranged to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Personal contacts between political figures in Britain and Israel were frequent and cordial. Among visitors to Israel were the Speaker of the House, Dr. Horace King, Jo Grimond and Jeremy Thorpe of the Liberal Party, Sir Alexander Douglas Hume, Selwyn Lloyd, Duncan Sandys, Lord Boothby, and many MPs and trade union leaders.

President Shazar went on a State visit to Canada for the centenary celebrations of the Canadian Federation and the ceremonial opening of 'Israel Day' at 'Expo 1957' in Montreal.

An extradition agreement, and an agreement to avoid double taxation on income from shipping and civil aviation, were concluded with the Government of Canada.

The Foreign Minister of Israel was an official guest of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand in March 1967, and could discuss with their Cabinet Ministers, freely and fully, matters of common interest: an echo of those encounters of understanding and explanation was to be heard in the United Nations a few months afterwards. Sir Alistair MacMullin, President of the Australian Senate, attended the inaugural ceremony of the new Knesset building; other visitors from Australia included the leader of its labor movement, members of the Federal and State legislatures, and scientists of eminence.

AFRICA

The majority of the African States with which Israel enjoys diplomatic normality declared themselves, in the United Nations and generally, for an end to Arab belligerency and for recognition of all Israel's sovereign prerogatives; in this demeanor and in this expression, the French-speaking States were conspicuous, and the English-speaking ones, among them the two most recent 'independences', Botswana and Lesotho, were hardly less helpful. Israel has appointed non-resident Ambassadors in both those States, and also in Malawi.

Guinea, perhaps, went furthest in espousing the Arab case, and even broke off diplomatic relations with us, but African opinion on the whole, and Muslim opinion within it, even in States which sided with the Arabs at the United Nations, were far from unsympathetic to Israel. In the Organization for African Unity, too, a majority was disinclined to be dragooned by the Arab members into impugning us: this fair-minded group was, besides, successful in a concerted effort to see to it that Israel Ambassadors should be invited regularly to attend the public occasions of the Organization.

There is a constant flow of interested and responsive visitors of influential status from Africa. No fewer than fifteen African Parliaments were represented at the Knesset

inauguration; the Deputy President of the Malagasy Republic came to the 1967 Independence Day parades; and we welcomed, also, the Prime Minister of Gambia, the Foreign Minister of Upper Volta and Gabon, the Finance Minister of Upper Volta, the Dahomeyan Minister of the Interior, Major General Albert Kwesi Ocran, member of the Liberation Council of Ghana for Communications and Housing, and Kiakha Dieng, General Secretary of the joint organization for French-speaking Africa and Malagasy.

Israel, as always, identified itself with the African States in every realm of human freedom and rights, and, in every international forum, endorses African thinking and effort for the final uprooting of all vestiges of colonialism, for ending racialism, and in respect of the problem of Southern Rhodesia and the destiny of South-West Africa. Our economic relations with the present regime in Southern Rhodesia are suspended.

ASIA

It may be claimed that the Foreign Minister's tour of friendly Asian States in March 1967, his talks with personages of central decision on matters of international, bilateral and Middle Eastern relevance, did a good deal towards enlarging the map of Israel's political nexus with the Continent. Prospects were brightened, too, of wider cooperation in new projects and training programs, and of joint consultation and activity in the area of development.

Japan's Deputy Foreign Minister, in a striking precedent, gave public expression to his country's friendship for Israel; a joint communiqué in Manila underlined a similar mutuality; the Cambodian Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, spoke again of his interest in Israel, as precept and example for Asia in so many ways. In January, 1967, an Israel Embassy was established in Phnom-Penh, capital of Cambodia.

Thailand once more gave utterance to its full understanding of Israel and its satisfaction with development projects proceeding under Israeli guidance; in Burma, a long-standing affinity was reaffirmed.

The absence, as yet, of official links with certain Asian States is no bar to the offer of developmental and technical aid by Israel, mainly in farming, so as to step up crop yields and food supply, but in a variety of economic, social and cultural disciplines as well. In the Economic Committee for Asia and the Far East, Israel's principal contribution is to the Mekong River reclamation and re-settlement project, a United Nations regional development plan.

In mid-1967, forty Israel advisers were on mission in Asia, some hundred Asian students were training in Israel.

An Asia-Israel Friendship League has been formed in Jerusalem, to advance and extend social and cultural contracts with the Asian peoples and afford the public of Israel a better knowledge of Asia; in one or two Asian States 'friendship societies' are already actively in existence.

Israel's victory in the Six-Day War was, as an exploit of arms, admired throughout Asia, politics apart. And in the General Assembly, no Asian State in diplomatic relations with us, except for Cambodia, voted for the Soviet or the Albanian anti-Israel proposal; Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Japan and Nepal voted for the Yugoslav-Indian proposal, the Philippines voted against it, Laos and Thailand abstained. It may be surmised that the States of South-East Asia, caught up in the conflict between China and the United States, tend to regard the Soviet Union as a 'golden mean', and their voting suggested this.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Britain is still an important customer for Israel, our exports in 1966 rising by over a fifth to \$62 m. In April 1967, the Minister of Commerce and Industry was invited by his British counterpart for discussions which proved very useful, and commercial and economic relations in general ought consequently to develop to mutual profit; there was also accord on scientific and technological cooperation, and British experts are to come out to Israel to itemize the areas of it.

Until June, trade with Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, within the compass of commercial and clearing agreements, showed a rising graph: our exports to Yugoslavia and Poland went up substantially, and the balance was in our favor. In April, agreements for economic, scientific and technical cooperation, as well as for trade, were signed with Rumania; the trade agreement sets the turnover at \$36 m. Cooperation with Rumania in husbandry, irrigation, establishment of factories, tourism, civil aviation and science has been successfully planned.

The United States is our main buyer and vendor: in 1966, we bought \$221 m. of goods from the States and sold it \$77 m. worth.

Trading with Latin America is still in the subcontinent's favor: in 1966, we exported a value of \$6 m. and imported a value of \$32 m., the bulk of it in beef. Economic cooperation was signalized in that year by the success of the Israel contractors, Tahal-Vered, in bidding for the construction of highways and waterways in Argentine, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela, to be carried out over a period of three years in the sum of several million dollars.

In June 1966, Argentina, Mexico and Peru exhibited at the Near East Fair in Tel Aviv.

Everything possible is done to expand business and economic cooperation with Africa. To that end, the Government affords monetary and technical aid to firms that seek to enter into partnership with African firms in establishing new industry.

There were Israel pavilions, during the year, at international fairs in the Gold Coast, Kenya and Zambia.

An agreement was made with Kenya for an Israel company to install a water supply in Mombasa; Israel's earlier grant of a million sterling to Kenya will pay in part for this.

Israel is an observer on the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

The balance of trade with Asia in 1966 was satisfactory: exports went up by 16% over 1965 to \$66 m.; imports were \$32 m. The Foreign Minister's Asian tour was a factor of improvement, and cooperation in industry and in public works may well result.

A Thai delegation was in Israel to initial a civil aviation agreement.

* * *

As regards GATT and the 'Kenned Round', negotiations ended gratifyingly in May 1967. Israel, which took part in them as a developing country, is now entitled to lower tariffs on its chief exports: diamonds, citrus and its by-products, plywood and textiles in particular, valued at \$150 m., which is 30% of our total shipments. Israel, in return, has already allowed reciprocal reductions or has agreed to do so in due course.