



CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                 | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Agenda item 25:<br>The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> ) ..... | 1611 |

**President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM**  
(United Republic of Tanzania)

**AGENDA ITEM 25**

**The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)**

1. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is discussing the question of the Middle East, which started with the question of Palestine, the direct result of the catastrophe that befell the Palestinian people in 1947 through the division of their homeland, thus uprooting them from their territory, dispersing them and turning them into either refugees or people oppressed by and under the control of the occupiers. These two items on the agenda—the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East—are not the only matters emanating from the tragedy of the Palestinian people that are discussed by the General Assembly at each session. There is not one of the Main Committees of the General Assembly that does not discuss one or several aspects of this tragedy. And I must once more admit in this forum that I may not add anything new to what has been said on the question of the Middle East from the inception of the United Nations to the present day.

2. In the last few years the representatives of the Zionist entity have been complaining and asking why the General Assembly, its Main Committees and its commissions, and the Security Council dedicate so much time and effort to examining Israeli practices and dealing with the effects of its aggression, expansionism and racism. Those questions from them impel us to ask why the United Nations does not fully discharge the responsibility it bears as a result of the major part it played in creating the Palestinian tragedy, which has become the core and principal content of the Middle East question, and thus end that tragedy, in accordance with the provisions of the hundreds of resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

3. The tragic injustices that have befallen the Palestinian people at the hands of the Zionist invaders were the direct and sole reason for the Arab-Israeli struggle, or for what today is called the question of the Middle East. That conflict began at almost the same time as Palestine was divided and the racist "Jewish State" was implanted in it.

4. Before 1947 there was no Arab-Israeli struggle, but rather a Palestinian-Zionist struggle. Before 1947 there

was no crisis in the Middle East, because Israel had not yet been implanted, with injustice and aggression, in the heart of the Middle East. Great Britain's proclamation of its determination to terminate its Mandate over Palestine, and its request to the United Nations to find a solution to the problem, led to the beginning of the involvement of the Organization in the question of the Middle East, an involvement that has not yet come to an end and that appears unlikely to come to an end in the near future.

5. Britain, throughout its Mandate over Palestine—i.e. for a period of 27 years—tried to make the Zionist organization in Palestine a State within a State, and facilitated immigration to the greatest possible extent in order to turn the Jewish minority in Palestine into the future majority. It is obvious that, in pursuing that policy, Britain was trying to ignore the natural rights of the Palestinian people and deliberately to make it a minority in its own land. The Palestinian people, of course, did not willingly accept that British colonialist policy and rose up in revolts and disturbances that we all know about. During their attempts to secure national independence, they were subjected to oppressive action by the mandatory authorities and even worse and more terrible action by the Zionist terrorist organizations, one of which was led by the current Prime Minister of the Zionist entity. Those terrorist organizations became the backbone of what is now known as the Israeli defence army.

6. At all events, the United Nations concluded what was started by British colonialism in Palestine. It divided Palestine into two States. One of them had the opportunity to be born, grow stronger and become another source of conflict and concern in the world—that, of course, is Israel—whereas the other, the Palestinian Arab State, has not yet been able to emerge. Our world Organization has so far been unable to ensure that Palestine's real owners regain their rights, and to correct the injustice that it had itself imposed on the Palestinian and Arab peoples. Some interpretations of the structure of the international Organization during its first years try to explain its sympathy with the Zionist entity as the result of the pressure of the colonialist invasion. But what is the justification for the Organization's hesitations in assuming its full responsibility now that the star of colonialism has waned and will not rise again, now that the peoples throughout the world have liberated themselves and dozens of independent States have emerged and taken their natural place in this Organization? What is the justification for the fact that the two racist régimes—in South Africa and in occupied Palestine—are contravening and rebelling against international law and the international will? Does colonialism dream of turning back the wheel of history through those two entities? The newly independent States which now belong to our international Organization give it a new perspective on international problems, and particularly on the question of the Middle East and Palestine. This new viewpoint leads it to press for recognition of the inalienable rights of the

Palestinian people and of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] as the sole representative of that people.

7. The liberation of peoples from the yoke of colonialism and their membership in the United Nations, in which they see their salvation, based on the noble objectives and principles of the Charter, cause us to expect from the Organization a greater effort, commensurate with its responsibility for creating this tragedy, and the exercise of pressure on the aggressive Zionist entity called State of Israel, to which it had granted membership under definite conditions.

8. It is, in fact, ironical to see precisely that entity contravening the conditions that it previously accepted and attacking the main principles of the United Nations, namely, the preservation of international peace and security. Israel has persistently refused—and continues to refuse—to implement any of the United Nations resolutions, including even the resolutions whereby it was created and became a Member State. The Zionist entity ignores the international will, continues its aggressive expansionist policy and carries out repressive acts against the Palestinian Arabs, hounding and expelling all those whose patience is exhausted and who speak the truth. The world, including Israel's allies, has condemned and rejected the creation of settlements in the occupied Arab territories, but nevertheless there are statements and information about the establishment of new settlements on the West Bank and Golan Heights and the demographic and cultural changes in the Arab territories.

9. In this context, the destruction of Quneitra, the capital of Golan, is evidence of the racism of Israel and of its hatred of the Arabs. When Israel was obliged to withdraw from Quneitra, it destroyed it completely and deliberately, and that destruction remains as flagrant evidence of the brutality of the new colonialists.

10. The American journalist Bernard Weinraub, writing in *The New York Times* of 12 October 1979, in his comment on the statement by the American presidential candidate, Mr. Connally, who called upon Israel to withdraw completely from the Arab territories occupied in 1967, said that this clashed sharply with the policy of Israel, whose Prime Minister had said that "Israel would keep most of the Golan Heights in any peace treaty with Syria".<sup>1</sup>

11. The Zionists have always made a point of distorting the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of misinterpreting their provisions in a flagrant attempt to get out of the commitments thereby imposed on Israel. The resolutions of the United Nations, as a whole, call upon the parties to take certain clearly defined steps in order to ensure the establishment of a lasting and just peace in the Middle East and to resolve the Palestine question.

12. But Israel will not accept these requirements for peace, except when it suits it to do so and, even when it accepts them, it does so within a framework designed to ensure that it retains the Arab territories it has usurped by means of aggression and force. While creating every possible obstacle to peace, Israel spares no effort to consolidate its settlement of the occupied Arab terri-

tories, and takes feverish steps to establish such settlements in the heart of those territories and to fill them with Zionist settlers, despite the objections of the United Nations and even of its allies, to this adventurist policy.

13. The three revealed religions which have emanated from this tortured part of the world call for a much desired peace. Peace is the highest objective of mankind, and without peace other objectives cannot be achieved; they are incomplete. It is obvious that Israel fears peace because it knows that peace cannot be achieved except through justice. It fears justice because it knows that, if justice prevails, that will be the end of its racist and expansionist policies, which involve the seizure of Arab territories and the total elimination of the Palestinian Arab people.

14. Since this is the case, I can only express the concern and anxiety of my country at the impotence of the international Organization in the face of the Nazi character of this colonialism, and condemn the United States Government for the irresponsible role which it has played and continues to play in this field. The United States is a permanent member of the Security Council and therefore has a special responsibility as regards the continuance and the effectiveness of the United Nations. It has done everything in its power to paralyse the United Nations and to disregard its resolutions. We consider that the United States, in common with other major Powers, has a definite interest in building up an international system in which all peoples will play a part and that will civilize and guide international relations and solve conflicts by peaceful means on the basis of principles of law and justice and equality among all States, large and small.

15. We, the developing countries, as well as all the Member States of the United Nations, have a definite interest in building up such an international system and preserving it. That is why we consider that the attitude of the United States regarding the future of the United Nations, and its place and influence in the world, is an irresponsible one. For us, the Arabs, this is an unjust attitude because it ignores truth and right so as not to face the tragedy of an entire people, and because it makes allowances for and encourages the continued Israeli aggression against our countries and peoples. Even in the very few cases in which it takes an official attitude that is at variance with the Israeli attitude—such as its non-recognition of the annexation of Jerusalem and its statement that it considers the establishment of Israeli settlements in occupied territories illegal—the United States is satisfied with registering its attitude, ignoring the fact that people are not as stupid as it thinks and forgetting that, if it had not provided economic and military support to Israel, that country would not have been able to continue its aggression and to ignore this international Organization, despite all the resolutions adopted by it during its short history.

16. Any serious and responsible formula for the practical resolution of the Palestine question and the question of the Middle East can emerge, in our opinion, only from recognition of the source of the ill. We must know the main reason for the Israeli aggressions and for the resistance resulting therefrom. We must find the reason for which the victims of aggression, the victims of nazism, have become neo-Nazis, thus poisoning our area and making it a pocket of conflict and tension in the

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

world, and continuing to deprive Palestine, the land of peace, of any prospect of peace within the near future. The main reason for this situation is zionism, the belief that is built on the principle of the superiority of one people over others, and that has turned those who accept it as a State doctrine into living vehicles of hatred and bitterness.

17. We consider that one of the outstanding contributions of our international Organization was to equate zionism with racism and racial chauvinism. I believe that this international Organization, when it took its historic decision in 1975 equating zionism with racism and racial discrimination [*resolution 3379 (XXX)*], was not punishing the Israelis but calling in all sincerity on Israel and its supporters to review the Zionist doctrine, because without a deep and sincere review of this doctrine we cannot achieve the peace to which we aspire in the Middle East. While that Zionist doctrine remains the doctrine of the State of Israel, peace will remain as far from our area as it is at present. We cannot imagine a peace that is based on the superiority of any one people over other peoples, while crimes against humanity are being committed under the cloak of religious concepts. In our opinion, the way to peace begins with ridding Israel of its Zionist doctrine.

18. In the face of the sufferings that have been the fate of the Palestinian peoples and the hopes that the Palestinian people have pinned on the United Nations and the international community, what is the just solution that has been presented to us?

19. My delegation in discussing the Palestine question [*81st meeting*], announced that it was to be regretted that the efforts of the United Nations in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, have not taken our area one step further towards a just peace. In fact, certain actions which have been taken outside the framework of the United Nations have ignored this Organization and contributed to the complexity of the current situation and continue to do so. This has increased tension and lessened the possibility of finding a just and lasting settlement to the Palestine question and that of the Middle East.

20. The Camp David agreements<sup>2</sup> are the most notable link in the chain of actions which have been taken outside the framework of the United Nations and have had tragic consequences for the fate of the Palestinian people and the future of our area as a whole. Those agreements, which we condemn and strongly reject, have given Israel a free hand to expand the area of its settlements in the Palestinian and the occupied Arab territories, to defy the resolutions of the Security Council in a shameful manner, and to justify new aggression against an Arab country which had been beyond its reach during the major part of the conflict, namely, Lebanon. Thus, Israel has created what has been called the "State of Saad Haddad" in order to maintain its occupation of southern Lebanon and to impede the efforts of the United Nations.

21. The non-aligned countries regard the Camp David agreements as a flagrant violation of the rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab countries, as well as of the Charter of the United Nations, the charter of the

<sup>2</sup> A Framework for Peace in the Middle East, Agreed at Camp David, and Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, signed at Washington on 17 September 1978.

Organization of African Unity and the relevant international resolution<sup>3</sup>.

22. The peace to which we aspire must be based on justice and justice is one and indivisible. A just and comprehensive solution must, in our opinion, be based on the following considerations.

23. First, the Palestinian question is at the core of the Middle East crisis and the main reason for the Arab-Israeli conflict.

24. Secondly, the Palestine question and the question of the Middle East are one and indivisible. Therefore, there is no place for a partial solution or a solution that concerns only certain parties to the conflict. Nor can there be a separate peace; peace must be comprehensive and just and its must include all the parties to the conflict and eliminate all the reasons for it.

25. Thirdly, the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East is not possible unless it is based on the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and occupied Arab territories and the restoration to the Palestinian peoples of all their inalienable national rights, including the right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to establish an independent Palestinian State.

26. Fourthly, the city of Jerusalem should be considered an integral part of occupied Palestinian territory and should be evacuated and returned unconditionally to Arab sovereignty.

27. Fifthly, the PLO should be considered the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. No solution could be comprehensive, just or acceptable unless the PLO participates in it as a sovereign party and on an equal basis with the other parties.

28. Sixthly, all Israeli actions in occupied Arab territories, aiming at changing their demographic, urban, political, religious and cultural character, should be considered null and void.

29. Seventhly, all settlements violate international custom and agreements, and therefore an end should be put to the establishment of new settlements and the present ones, which were built in opposition to world public opinion and the relevant United Nations resolutions, should be dismantled.

30. In our opinion, this is the only framework for any just and comprehensive solution, if we want to fulfil our duty to put an end to a tragedy which leaves no one indifferent.

31. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The problem of the Middle East is the most serious of the problems faced by the United Nations. That region, in which are gathered more conventional—and perhaps unconventional—weapons than in any other area of conflict and which is the scene of violent confrontations as a result of increasing Israeli provocations, finds itself in a situation that does not permit any hope of a negotiated settlement comprising all parties on a basis of justice and law. That region, among all the regions of the world, is characterized by the presence of the largest number of United Nations

emergency forces or observer forces, a fact that indicates that it is one of the areas with the largest number of conflicts. Furthermore, it is without hope of an acceptable or final solution that would achieve the objectives for which those forces were created, such as the return of the refugees, a cease-fire, the withdrawal of the occupation forces, the ending of armed intervention—in other words, the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations.

32. These observations allow us to understand the problems of the Middle East in general and also to understand that the interventions of the United Nations have not enabled us either to solve the problem of the core of the conflict or to create stability. Furthermore, the stockpiles of destructive weapons imported from abroad are increasing every year—thus aggravating the state of imbalance and causing an escalation of violence—on the pretext that Israel's military supremacy is a condition *sine qua non* for any peaceful solution in the area. Moreover, the importance of the Middle East in the economic field makes it a target for the ambitions of the advanced countries, because of the natural wealth of the area, which is of extreme importance for the continued prosperity of those advanced countries.

33. At its current session various documents have been submitted to the General Assembly, and we would particularly mention three reports which concern the core of the problem in the area: first of all, the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Middle East [A/34/584-S/13578]; secondly, the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [A/34/35 and Corr. 1]; and, thirdly, the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/34/631].

34. These reports refer to events and facts and assign responsibility; they bring proof that the General Assembly was right and just in the resolutions it adopted on the situation in the Middle East. They also prove that the time has now come for the countries which for one reason or another have not accepted these resolutions to change their attitude, rectify their errors, join the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world that have recognized the facts and put other considerations aside.

35. My delegation would like to refer to an essential point which emerges from the reports I have referred to. The continued intransigence of Israel can in no way logically lead to any peaceful solution.

36. We can reach a settlement on a peaceful solution only if all the parties concerned are convinced that this settlement has a chance of success. In view of the multiplication of Israeli acts of aggression and of the flagrant violations referred to in the reports I have just mentioned, is there any evidence whatsoever that Israel is really following the path of peace? Furthermore, the military and economic alliance between Israel and South Africa is something that we all know about. Although Israel is not alone in this alliance, we cannot help recognizing that the two countries are twins acting on the basis of the principles of racial supremacy—a supremacy which has no basis in history or fact—which our area, in spite of its repeated efforts, has not been able to deter or even to limit. We also

cannot help recognizing that both régimes reject the most elementary principles of civilization now accepted by all mankind.

37. In the Middle East, Israel is now imposing the law of the jungle and attempting to impose its own interpretation of the agreements concerning the West Bank. As regards the other neighbouring countries, Israel does not offer anything but the *fait accompli* and, in Lebanon, it is fanning the flames of a war the end of which is not yet in sight.

38. In the occupied territories Israel is imposing on the Palestinian people, in its own land, a racist régime under which the Palestinian is a victim because of the privileges which the Israelis have granted themselves.

39. Logic demands that peace in the Middle East be based on the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly those that have been accepted by all countries of the area. Acceptance of such a solution would be proof that Israel is determined to live in peace with all the peoples of the Middle East and particularly the Palestinian people.

40. But this continued refusal to implement the resolutions of the United Nations is definite proof that Israel is determined to maintain the *status quo*, both territorially and militarily, and to keep up this political freeze indefinitely, which inevitably leads us to conclude that Israel deliberately rejects the policy of good-neighbourliness, coexistence and understanding—in other words, that it rejects peace.

41. Israel was able to impose its political freeze—which has been strongly condemned by our Assembly and by the countries of the area—only because of its military supremacy which is based on the unlimited support and equipment received from distant sources. This has increased national awareness in the Middle East and led to revolutions whose echoes continue to shake the world. As a result of these factors, the development of the situation has taken place very decisively and very fast, and it has radically changed international relations in the area.

42. It is obvious that the maintenance of the present situation in the Middle East is an artificial factor which draws its strength from a strategic supremacy foreign to the area, just as it is obvious that the nature of the Israeli régime impels Israel to carry out military or other adventures; it would never have been able to follow this course if it did not receive continuous and growing external support. That is the reason we can say that the external factors dominate the essential conditions for peace, its component parts and its time-table.

43. Another basic point to which we wish to refer is the responsibility of the United Nations. Our Assembly has expressed its views on the conditions for the establishment of peace in the Middle East and the basic requirements for that peace in resolutions that have been adopted by virtual unanimity as clear expressions of international will and determination. A few—and they are the same in practically all cases—have tried to stay aloof from this unanimity but they are taking on a terrible responsibility by perpetuating an explosive situation in an area whose peoples do not wish for anything save peaceful coexistence and understanding.

44. For all these reasons, there are two aspects to the situation in the Middle East: first, the contravention of the law and, secondly, the resort to violence, because the injustice imposed by force on the peoples of the region has sown the seeds of violence. This is only a reaction of legitimate self-defence by a people that has been humiliated and deprived of its most basic human rights.

45. The continuation of the current situation in the Middle East can only lead to further anarchy. The responsibility of imposing peace and deterring aggression devolves upon the Security Council, which has the right to impose the authority of international law. Likewise, the countries of the region must continue their attempts to reach a peaceful solution based on respect for all the rights and for the dignity of all the parties concerned. The Ninth Arab Summit Conference held at Baghdad,<sup>3</sup> and the Tenth Arab Summit Conference, held at Tunis,<sup>4</sup> have affirmed the determination of countries bordering on Israel to respect international law as defined by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

46. The establishment of a comprehensive, just and final peace in the Middle East requires giving up narrow concepts and spurious designs and relies on the will of peoples to exercise self-determination.

47. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): The situation in the Middle East has not improved since the last session of this Assembly; the problem is, in fact, becoming more grave. Conflict in that troubled region is escalating, both vertically and horizontally. This escalation does not augur well for the peace and security of the region, or for international peace and security. It is dreadful to note that this problem has been with us for over three decades, with no solution in sight. As we approach the 1980s, it may be time to ponder and reflect on what new strategies and tactics should be adopted to resolve the problem.

48. Although the Middle East problem is multifaceted, one element stands out, and that is that the position of the Palestinian people is at the core of the Middle East conflict. It is a tragedy of a dispossessed people and of how these people can recover their inalienable right to their homeland, Palestine. The second logical aspect is how the people of Palestine can be allowed to exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence within their homeland, which should rightfully be accorded the status of a State.

49. The situation at present is that the majority of the Palestinians are homeless because they have been forced out of their homeland. Those who remained behind are being subjected to ruthless pressure to emigrate. It is the tacit policy of Israel to depopulate the occupied Arab territories and thereby create space for Jewish migrants. Jews, in turn, are being enticed, from wherever they are living as citizens of other countries, to abandon their places of residence to become Israeli settlers on Arab lands. What could be more racist than such a policy?

50. If Israelis do not wish to have their doctrine of

<sup>3</sup> Ninth Arab Summit Conference, held at Baghdad from 2 to 5 November 1978.

<sup>4</sup> Tenth Arab Summit Conference, held at Tunis from 20 to 22 November 1979.

zionism equated with racism, then they should desist from engaging in racist practices such as those I have just outlined. The Israelis are better placed to recall the catastrophic consequences of seeking racial purity for a State.

51. All evidence shows that Israel occupied Arab lands in wartime in order to enable it to create more room for Jewish settlers at the expense of the indigenous people. Further land has also been seized by force, and legal tricks have been employed in concerted attempts to dispossess the Palestinians to an even greater degree. For example, a person who is expelled from the occupied West Bank is classified as an absentee landowner whose land can be expropriated without compensation. In this regard, I wish to refer those who would like to have recent information on Israeli practices in the occupied territories to the report of the Security Council's Commission on the Middle East, dated 12 July 1979.<sup>5</sup>

52. Zambia was privileged to have participated as a member of that Commission, and that mission has brought us even closer to the gruesome realities of the plight of the Palestinian people in the context of the Middle East problem. Facts show, therefore, that Israel has instituted a policy of colonizing Arab territories, after conquest by force of arms, to satisfy its expansionist designs.

53. The Palestinians are denied any basic rights as Israel continues to plunder their resources, including vital water supplies. The so-called Israeli settlements in occupied territories are a euphemism for colonies. That is how colonialism has always been manifested throughout history. The United Nations must prevail on Israel to dismantle settlements in the occupied territories and to withdraw from them completely and unconditionally. The acquisition of territory by force is totally inadmissible in international law.

54. The Palestinians have responded with extreme restraint and resilience in the light of this naked provocation. Israel has responded to their peace overtures with brute force. It is evident that they have resorted to armed struggle only after all other avenues have been blocked by Israel.

55. If the problem of the Middle East is therefore to be resolved, the Palestinian people have to be involved directly in the peace process through the PLO as the only organization that is the embodiment of their interests. As we know, the Palestinian people are in turn represented by the PLO, which is itself an outgrowth of the Palestinian refugee camps in neighbouring Arab countries.

56. It should be self-evident, from what I have just said, that there can be no peace in the Middle East unless and until the case of the Palestinians is considered in full. Any attempt to resolve the problem that seeks to bypass the Palestinians is doomed to failure.

57. We appeal to all countries that are interested in

<sup>5</sup> Commission established by Security Council resolution 446 (1979) to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. For the report, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1979*, documents S/13450 and Add.1.



fostering peace in the Middle East to avoid dictating the terms of the peace process. Zambia further appeals to all States to set aside their parochial interests in searching for peace in that region.

58. The solution to the Middle East conflict lies in a comprehensive peace. It has to address itself to the main elements of the problem. We shall render our support to meaningful efforts. Such efforts should be predicated on recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and on the cause of peace and security in the world. We call upon Israel to respect these principles and to desist from pursuing ostrich-like policies in seeking to hoodwink world public opinion. The United Nations must remain firm in its determination to bring peace with honour to the Middle East.

59. As a member of the Security Council, Zambia will continue to pursue all avenues for resolving the Middle East crisis. The last few years of relative calm in the region provide an excellent opportunity for additional initiatives for peace in the area. Inaction at this time could lead to a catastrophe that may engulf the entire world. Members of this Organization should be well-disposed to assist in the interests of peace.

60. The PRESIDENT: We have concluded our debate on the question of the situation in the Middle East. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply. In doing so, I would remind them of the General Assembly's decision concerning the time-limit of 10 minutes [4th meeting, para. 350].

61. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It has been alleged again, in the course of this debate, that before the establishment of Israel the condition of Jews in Arab lands was idyllic. It has also been alleged that, were it not for the creation of the State of Israel, Jews and Arabs would to this day be living in amity and equality throughout the Arab world. There have even been those who have invited the "Arab Jews" to return to their former homes.

62. The idyll of Arab-Jewish coexistence in Arab lands is a canard, if ever there was one. For centuries, Jews were barely tolerated as second-class citizens in Arab society.

63. But why should the Assembly take my word for it? Let me quote from a work by the well-known French author, Albert Memmi. I choose Albert Memmi advisedly because he was born in Tunis in 1920. I quote from the second chapter of his book *Juifs et Arabes*, published in Paris in 1974. That chapter is entitled, "Who is an Arab Jew?". I quote:

"The much vaunted idyllic life of the Jews in Arab lands is a myth. The truth . . . is that from the outset we were a minority in a hostile environment; as such, we underwent all the fears, the agonies, and the constant sense of frailty of the underdog. As far back as my childhood memories go—in the tales of my father, my grandparents, my aunts and my uncles—coexistence with the Arabs was not just uncomfortable; it was marked by threats periodically carried out.

"The Jewish communities lived in the shadow of history, under arbitrary rule and the fear of all-powerful monarchs whose decisions could not be rescinded or even questioned . . . But the Jews were

at the mercy not only of the monarch, but also of the man in the street. My grandfather still wore the obligatory and discriminatory Jewish garb, and in his time every Jew might expect to be hit on the head by any Moslem whom he happened to pass.

"I have lived through the alarms of the ghetto: the rapidly barred doors and windows, my father running home after hastily shutting his shop because of rumours of an impending pogrom. My parents stocked food in expectation of a siege, which did not always materialize; but this gives the measure of our anguish, our permanent insecurity."

64. The rest of Memmi's description is extraordinarily painful. It explodes the myth that Jews and Arabs lived together happily before the establishment of Israel. In fact, Jews have been persecuted and discriminated against by the Arabs for many centuries. The medieval degradations suffered by the Jews in Arab lands continued unabated, with varying degrees of intensity, down to our own times.

65. The Jews, like the Christians, were a "tolerated people"—*ahl dhimmi* in Arabic—in the Arab domain, but this does not mean tolerance in the modern sense of the word. It means bare acceptance and the right to practise their religion as monotheists as against other idolators and non-believers.

66. Thus, in the early part of this century, Vambéry, one of the many renowned travellers who recorded this situation of the Jews in Arab lands, was moved to reflect: "I do not know any more miserable, hapless and pitiful individual on God's earth than the Ya'udi in those countries". "Yahudi" is, of course, the Arabic term for "Jew".

67. When the Arabs talk glibly of Jews and Arabs living in blissful harmony throughout the centuries, the meaning is clear: the abasement and harassment of Jews in previous centuries was indeed idyllic in comparison with the savage treatment meted out to Jews in Arab lands in the past 50 years. In the wake of political developments in the twentieth century, the persecution of Jews was intensified. Jews in Arab States were deprived of their most elementary human rights, their property was confiscated, their citizenship revoked and pogroms were organized against them with the tacit, or not so tacit, consent of the authorities.

68. Rabble-rousers could always be found to incite mobs for religious or any other reason, and the frenzied populace would fall upon the Jewish citizens and butcher them.

69. Since achieving independence in 1932, Iraq, for example, has subjected Jews to an incessant régime of terror. Official State policy towards the Jews has meant secret trials, torture and public executions.

70. I need hardly elaborate on what would have befallen the ancient Jewish community in Iraq during the Second World War, had the attempt of Rashid Ali el Khaylani to install a pro-Nazi régime there succeeded. While the coup of the pro-Nazi officers was short-lived, several of them managed to reach Berlin, where they remained until the end of the war. A number of them were eventually arrested, tried and sentenced to death. Today, the officers connected with the

pro-Nazi coup are hailed as national heroes in Iraq. Only a month after the attempted Nazi *putsch* in Iraq, a savage, but typical, pogrom took place in Baghdad. On the Jewish festival of *Shavuot*, Jews were murdered on their way to synagogue; many were dragged off buses and slaughtered, and their corpses overrun by passing cars. Soldiers, policemen and members of youth groups massacred, raped, wounded and robbed, and burnt down houses and shops. After three days of this anti-Semitic orgy, 180 Jews were dead, hundreds more were maimed and wounded and over £1 million worth of property had been looted.

71. This scene repeated itself on a scale previously unknown even in Iraq when the Arab States, in their frustration, sought to take revenge at the thwarting of their attempt to destroy the fledgling Jewish State of Israel. As a result of ever-increasing persecution, almost the entire Jewish community of Iraq fled in total destitution between 1948 and 1951.

72. The small remnant left behind live on in squalid conditions and constant fear for their lives. The Iraqi Government and, particularly, the secret police threaten them even with murder. The authorities cut telephone lines to Jewish homes. Many have been arrested and released only after paying a high ransom for their lives. Jewish students have been expelled from universities and schools. Jews have been dismissed from their jobs. During 1968, chanting mobs in the streets of Baghdad acclaimed the stringing up in public of the bodies of nine Jews falsely accused of espionage.

73. In Libya, too, the Arabs seethed with vengeance when yet another attempt to destroy Israel was thwarted in 1967. Mobs ransacked and set fire to all Jewish shops in Tripoli and then began seeking out Jewish apartments to burn. The panic-stricken Jews barricaded themselves in their homes while the attacks continued. After the riots, refugees from Libya related how they were subsequently expelled from the country with only the clothes on their backs.

74. The simple and unadorned facts speak more eloquently of the long history of Jewish suffering and persecution in Arab lands than all the idyllic romances and fictional histories that we have heard in the speeches of some Arab representatives in this debate and in the one that preceded it.

75. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): I do not know whether the representative of Israel was referring to the debate on this item or to statements made during the debate on the earlier item, the question of Palestine. Be that as it may, he returned to the question of Jews in Arab lands and it was my delegation that had quoted certain material showing what the truth was.

76. Now, he refers in particular to the situation in Iraq and mentions specifically the position of Jews in Iraq since that country achieved its independence. I should like to quote from a confidential dispatch to the British Foreign Office, dated December 1934, from the then British Ambassador in Baghdad, Sir F. Humphries:

“Before the war, they [the Jewish community in Iraq] probably enjoyed a more favoured position than any other minority in the country. Since 1920, however, Zionism has sown dissension between Jews and

Arabs and a bitterness has grown up between the two peoples which did not previously exist. The wiser and more experienced Jews, while probably sympathizing with the general aims of the Zionist movement, openly deplore the unfortunate repercussions which it has had on their position in Iraq.”

This appeared in the official documents of the British Foreign Office, No. E7701/6395/93.

77. As to those Jews who left Iraq as a result of so-called “persecution” by the Iraqis—and, as I pointed out in my previous statement [83rd meeting, para. 21], it was in fact Zionist agents who came and threw bombs into the Jewish synagogues in Baghdad and thus caused the flight—let me quote one of those Jews speaking of their condition in Iraq before they left:

“We brought out something more important than money: our skills and education. One third of all those who emigrated in 1950 had at least 11 years of education, a higher percentage than even those newcomers from Europe and America. In that year, 110 Iraq Jews graduated from Iraqi and foreign universities, more, I am sorry to say, than the Iraqi Jews who are graduating from Israeli universities today. Over 80 per cent of the emigrant householders were artisans, shopkeepers, officials, administrators, doctors, lawyers and teachers.”

This may be found in the article “From Babylon in exile to Ramat Gan” in the *Israeli Digest* of 30 August 1974. Another Iraqi Jew who emigrated to the glorious heaven of Israel has this to say:

“A community that had controlled most of the resources of Iraq, one of the most developed States of the area, was turned into a subject group, discriminated against and oppressed in every way . . .”

—that is, after they went to this heavenly Israel—

“A community with its own high ethical values was caught in the spokes of Ashkenazi culture, which is totally foreign to it. A united and cultured community began to produce delinquents of every kind in Israel. Its fine, well-formed children were now all handicapped.”

This appeared in the article “How the Iraqi Jews came to Israel”, in the *Middle East International* of January 1973.

78. The representative of Israel again saw fit to raise the question of executions in Iraq. Iraq is not the first, nor will it be the last, country to mete out capital punishment to those convicted of treason or found to be criminals. Jews have been executed, sent to the electric chair, here in the United States: Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. What does that prove?

79. Furthermore, of all the executions carried out at the order of a court each year throughout the world, half occur in just one country: South Africa. The world knows that; everybody knows it. And further, it is done on a purely racist basis. But Israel finds nothing to criticize in South Africa. The Israeli representative referred to the pro-Nazi régime set up in Iraq in 1941; that is history and nobody can deny it. At that time, we considered the British to be our enemies, and the en-

emies of our enemies are our friends. But what of the Nazis in South Africa? The Germanic population of South Africa is proud of the war record of Mr. Vorster, who was jailed for his activities on behalf of the pro-Fascist Ossewabrandwag which worked on Germany's behalf against Britain in the Second World War. Mr. Vorster has said openly of his fight for Hitler: "If I had to live my life again, I would do exactly the same: I am quite satisfied that what I did was right". Does Israel find any objection that? Not at all; they are the bosom friends of the South Africans. They have nothing to criticize.

80. This shows the hypocrisy of the representative seated here. The Zionists have become world famous for their mendacity.

81. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the PLO, who wishes to make a statement.

82. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): One of the basic principles of Zionism is that anti-Judaism is innate in human beings and that therefore Jews and non-Jews cannot coexist in the same society. That was one of the arguments that was put forward by the early Zionists. In order to legitimize that kind of logic, fantasies and distortions have been created by people like Albert Memmi and the Zionist representative of Israel here today.

83. What he cited suggests one of two things: either there is something inherently bad in the Arabs as a people, as a culture and as a civilization—and, if that is what he meant, his is one of the most racist statements I have ever heard, for he has categorized a whole people as racist—or he may be covering up for the crimes that the Zionist movement and his Government commit against the Palestinian people.

84. I have before me an article that appeared in *The New York Times* on Thursday, 29 November 1979—the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. It is about six thugs, settlers from a settlement near the Jalazoun refugee camp. It is written by David K. Shipler, a reporter of that newspaper at Jerusalem. He is writing about three of the six:

"The three hurled rocks at close range through the windows of the classrooms"—they were attacking the girls' high school at Jalazoun refugee camp—  
". . . injuring two girls, and fired at least 10 rounds into the air and into crowded classrooms . . .

"The three assailants who chased the youths into a neighbouring settlement began throwing stones at women and children who were outside, according to residents. One woman who would identify herself only by her first name, Subayyeh, said she was holding her 6-month-old infant in her arms when the men came running, hurling stones at her.

"She dived into her house, she said, but the attackers pursued, smashing windows with stones and firing into the water tanks on the roof. Three houses showed signs of damage today, one with a window smashed near a baby's crib, and tanks on two roofs were punctured by bullet holes. At a fourth house, rocks were thrown at solar heating panels on the roof this morning, breaking them.

"They have no conscience," said an elderly woman named Amneh. "They want to rule us by terrorizing our children." She had been pelted with stones, she said, as she was carrying a big jar of water on her head. When she ran away the water spilled . . .

"When the three who were chasing the youths had finished with the houses, witnesses said, they joined their comrades at the school. Small children were screaming, running and crying, hiding together with older ones, trying to stay away from the flying stones and bullets.

"The assailants broke into the office of the principal, Samira Klebo, and the results could be seen today. Windows were broken, the glass front of a set of bookshelves was shattered, the contents of the shelves, trophies and books, were knocked over and the desk was on its side."

85. If the remarks of the representative of Israel today were intended to cover up those crimes, which have no match except for those crimes committed by the vigilantes in Germany against the Jews, I think he will not succeed.

86. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Everything we have heard in this debate and the preceding one demonstrates again that the crux of the Arab-Israel conflict is no more and no less than the inability of the rejectionist Arab States to come to terms with the rights of the Jewish people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in its homeland, the Land of Israel. They thus begrudge the existence of the sovereign Jewish State on any part, no matter how small, of the original area of Mandated Palestine.

87. Rhetoric, platitudes and blandishments aside, this harsh and stark fact was given full expression last week by Mr. Klibi, who presented himself here two or three days later as the Secretary-General of the new League of Arab States [84th meeting] of what is now, for all practical purposes, the organization of the Arab rejectionist States. Speaking in an interview on Radio Monte Carlo on 26 November 1979, Klibi said:

"The Arab leaders, despite the differences in their approaches, are united in their opinion that the confrontation with Zionism will not end with the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in a few years' time. On the contrary, the confrontation will continue with the marshalling of the military, economic and political resources of the Arab States in order to defeat Zionism."

88. In simple terms, that candid statement proves what Israel has been saying all along. The aim of establishing a PLO-controlled State in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district is not to satisfy Palestinian rights. Those rights of the Palestinian Arabs have been fully realized in the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan, which was established on 80 per cent of the territory of Mandated Palestine and gained its independence in 1946. The aim of creating a second Palestinian Arab State on the territory of Mandated Palestine is no more and no less than to establish a forward base from which the rejectionist Arab States and their instrument, the terrorist PLO, might be able to realize their dream: a war of annihilation against Israel.



89. That is the only lesson that can be drawn from a close reading of statements that have been made in this debate and the one preceding it, as well as from the way those statements are being translated into terrorist acts and military facts such as the military alliance on Israel's eastern borders.

90. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has said and repeated, and we are ready to repeat it again whenever necessary, that we are really astounded to hear the things said by the products of the ghettos, particularly the Warsaw Ghetto, against those whose land they have occupied in order to set up their so-called State and thus to be able to speak in this international forum where they have found their sole refuge.

91. These facts show that military power shortens the memory, diminishes the sight and reduces the intelligence of the colonizers, whose most modern aspect is zionism.

92. The representative of the Zionists wants to escape reality whenever he has his back to the wall, and I wonder if he thinks that God Almighty, who promised that land to them, also promised to make the others stupid enough to give it to them. No matter what lies they concocted, the Zionists remain colonizing and racist intruders. They must admit reality and return to the Arab owners the land they have seized by force.

93. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): In fact, we believe that we shall continue our confrontation with zionism for the very basic reason that, in the same way that *apartheid* constitutes the negation of the black people of Africa, we believe that zionism, as a racist ideology and in practice, is the negation of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Therefore zionism constitutes a negation of the Palestinian people, and the Palestinian people constitute a negation of zionism.

94. As far as the question of terrorism is concerned, I think it is now clear to everyone that it was the Zionists who introduced terrorism into our part of the world. Our part of the world had never heard of terrorism until people like Menachem Begin and others who are now at the head of the Government of the State of Israel came to our part of the world.

95. Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It seems to me that the imagination of the Israeli representative is very adept at falsifying facts. In fact, he alleges that the Arab countries have the strongest military force in the world and that they have even more weaponry than that owned by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, by the countries members of the Warsaw Pact, and several times more weaponry than Communist China. If, indeed, the Arab countries have all this, I am surprised, and would simply ask the Israeli representative how the representatives of the major Powers can sleep soundly while the Arab countries have such a large offensive force and such a vast arsenal of weapons. It is very clear that he is falsifying the facts. He was again carried away by his fertile imagination and has pictured the Arab-Israeli conflict as simply due to the refusal of the Arab people to let the Jewish people live in Palestine, as though the problem were as simple as that.

96. After listening to all the statements of representatives here, let me affirm that the fundamental problem—and I want the Israeli representative to understand this—is that of the rights of the Palestinian people. Let me stress that the problem at the root of the Middle East crisis is the denial by Israel of the rights of the Palestinian people. And the second problem concerns Israel's withdrawal from the territories it has occupied since 1967. These are the two problems of the Middle East which the General Assembly is meeting to discuss: the rights of the Palestinian people and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories.

97. As for the coexistence of Jews and Arabs, it is a fact of life since ancient times. Arabs and Jews have coexisted for a long time. But the Arabs and the Zionists cannot coexist as long as the Zionist mentality remains unchanged.

98. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): It is significant that the representatives of Israel now speak openly of their claim not only to all of the West Bank—which they insist on calling Judaea and Samaria—but also to Transjordan, which they established by force of arms but of which they would not speak openly before.

99. In 1919, Nahum Sokolow, Zionist leader and historian, wrote:

“It has been said, and is still being obstinately repeated by anti-Zionists again and again, that Zionism aims at the creation of an independent ‘Jewish State’. But this is wholly fallacious. The ‘Jewish State’ was never a part of the Zionist programme.”

That can be found in Sokolow's *History of Zionism*, vol. I, published by Longmans, Green and Company, in London, in 1919.

100. Furthermore, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who later became the first President of Israel, told Arab leaders in 1918 at Jerusalem: “Let his hearers beware of treacherous insinuations that Zionists were seeking political power . . .”. That is quoted in Ronald Storrs' *Orientalisms*, published by Nicholson and Watson, in London, in 1945. Ronald Storrs was himself actively engaged in the Paris Peace Conference, in 1919.

101. It is significant that, under the cover of the Camp David agreements and the Peace Treaty with Egypt,<sup>6</sup> the Zionists can now openly claim the whole of Palestine and also Transjordan.

102. Speaking now of the so-called rights of the Jewish people, I shall try to show the Zionist representatives why these are rejected by the Arabs.

103. Moshe Dayan, in a lecture he gave to the Technical Institute at Haifa, was very frank. As reported in *Ha'aretz* of 4 April 1969, he said:

“We came to this country, which was already populated by Arabs, and we are establishing a Hebrew”—that is, Jewish—“State here . . . Jewish villages were built in the place of Arab villages. You

<sup>6</sup> Treaty of Peace between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

do not even know the names of these Arab villages, and I don't blame you, because these geography books no longer exist. Not only do the books not exist, the Arab villages are not there either. Nahalal arose in the place of Mahlul, Gvat in the place of Jibta, Sarid in the place of Haneifes, and Kfar Yehoshua in the place of Tel-Shamen. There is not one single place built in this country that did not have a former Arab population."

104. When one claims rights for one people at the expense of another, those are not rights but a serious injustice, rightly rejected by the people who are the victims of those claims made at the expense of their basic inalienable rights.

105. Mr. BAAYO (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Jews in Libya enjoyed every privilege and right. Between them and the Libyans there were relations of amity and friendship and

there was intermarriage. The situation of the Jews in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was much better than their present situation because, after the deception of Zionism, they now suffer from racial discrimination among the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim. The Zionist organization has tried to create division among the Jews in Libya in order to entice them to enter the Zionist entity. In Libya they enjoy peace and security. Islam, our religion, does not know racism.

106. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that consultations are still going on concerning the formulation of a draft resolution on the present item, "The situation in the Middle East". As soon as the draft resolution is submitted, it will be circulated to representatives and voting will be scheduled for an appropriate time.

*The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.*