

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NOV 13 1986

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

2199th MEETING: 22 FEBRUARY 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2199)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
(a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);	
(b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2199th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 22 February 1980, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Peter FLORIN
(German Democratic Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2199)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
 - (a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);
 - (b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802)

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

- (a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);
- (b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) took a place at the Security Council table and Mr. Roa-Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Filali (Morocco), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should also like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People dated 21 February, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that, in connection with the consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in the occupied Arab territories', I be invited to address the Council in my capacity as Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, in accordance with the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure."

3. On previous occasions, the Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kane (Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I have also received a letter dated 20 February [S/13813 and Corr.1] from the representative of Tunisia, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in the occupied Arab territories', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

5. The proposal of the representative of Tunisia is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the pro-

visional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those of a Member State when invited to participate pursuant to rule 37. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

6. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): Once again, the delegation of the United States wishes to make clear that it has no objection to participation by the Palestine Liberation Organization in the debate in the Council on the situation in the occupied Arab territories. However, we believe that the participation of the PLO can be sustained only under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure and that, notwithstanding the recent past practice of the Council, there is no basis for extending an invitation to the PLO as if it were entitled to the rights of a Member State participating in the work of the Council in accordance with rule 37.

7. For this reason, the United States requests that the proposed invitation be put to a vote.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of Tunisia.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, China, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Philippines, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

9. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Since this is the first time that the Philippines has participated in a vote on the issue before the Council, namely, whether or not the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization should be allowed to participate in the debate on a matter which we believe is relevant to the situation in the Middle East, my delegation has decided to explain its vote.

10. The affirmative vote we have just cast is consistent with the position taken by the Philippines in support of General Assembly resolutions 3210 (XXIX), 3236 (XXIX), 3375 (XXX) and 33/28 A. In paragraph 3 of resolution 33/28 A, the Assembly, *inter alia*, invited the PLO

“to participate . . . in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East which are held

under the auspices of the United Nations, on an equal footing with other parties”.

The Philippines has since supported the participation of the PLO in international conferences concerning the Middle East held under the auspices of the United Nations. We believe that the PLO, as the representative of the Palestinian people, should be allowed to participate in the current deliberations in accordance with previous decisions of the Council on this issue.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 22 February [S/13819] from the representative of Tunisia which reads as follows:

“I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Clovis Maksoud, permanent observer of the League of Arab States, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled ‘The situation in the occupied Arab territories’, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure”.

12. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to that request.

It was so decided.

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like also to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 20 February [S/13814] from the representative of Tunisia which reads as follows:

“I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Fahd Qawaswa, Mayor of Al-Khalil (Hebron), to participate in the consideration of the item entitled ‘The situation in the occupied Arab territories’, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.”

14. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to that request.

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The Council is meeting today in response to the request made by the representative of Jordan in his letter [S/13801] dated 15 February to the President of the Council and the request made on behalf of the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in the letter [S/13802] dated 15 February from the representative of Morocco in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group.

16. The members of the Council also have before them the report of the Security Council Commission

established under resolution 446 (1979). That report is contained in document S/13679. I should also like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: document S/13811, which contains the text of a letter dated 20 February from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to the President of the Council; and document S/13815, which contains the text of a letter dated 22 February from the representative of Morocco to the President of the Council.

17. The first speaker is the representative of Portugal, in his capacity as Chairman of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979).

18. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): As Chairman of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), I have the honour to present to the Council the Commission's second report [S/13679], prepared pursuant to paragraph 4 of resolution 452 (1979).

19. As the Commission stresses in its letter of transmittal, it is our hope that we have fulfilled our mandate to the satisfaction of the Council, and we wish to express our appreciation for the confidence shown by the Council in designating our respective delegations to be members of the Commission.

20. For its part, the Portuguese delegation agreed to participate in the Commission because it desired—and still does—to contribute to any efforts it might be asked to make in the search for peaceful solutions to conflicts, as our Organization conceives of and carries out that search.

21. We wish to express again today our gratitude to the delegations of Bolivia and Zambia for their exemplary co-operation with us in the fulfilment of our task. The experience and knowledge of the members of those delegations were very valuable to us. I should also thank the members of the Secretariat for their work. They once again demonstrated their devotion and their competence.

22. The second report which the Commission is submitting to the Council for its consideration was drawn up, for the most part, along the same lines as the first report [S/13450 and Add.1 of 12 July 1979]. That is to say that we have striven to present, with the greatest possible objectivity and exactness, elements of information and judgement that could enable the Council to take the appropriate decisions on the questions raised by our mandate. Thus, the Commission once again endeavoured to establish contact with all the interested parties, its major concern being to collect information reflecting all the points of view as fully as possible. And so we obtained the information required for the drafting of our report from several sources. But we were again confronted by Israel's refusal to co-operate with us in any way.

23. Although that did not prevent the Commission from carrying out its task, it did make efforts—which it had hoped would not be fruitless—to obtain this co-operation and thereby put an end to Israel's self-inflicted isolation from the Commission's work and, which is even more serious, from the Council's decisions. We made those efforts because it was our duty to do so, despite the initial, and negative attitude immediately adopted by Israel when the Commission was established and throughout the initial stages of its activities.

24. Convinced as we are of the benefits and the value of dialogue and of working together and of the need to try to reconcile differing points of view, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, on which our work was based, we should have liked to reproduce in the report the views, clarifications and comments provided by the Government of Israel, which would have enabled us to place them in the context of the other information in our hands.

25. Israel's failure to co-operate with the Commission and what that failure represents for the Council and, more broadly speaking, for the general evolution of the situation that we had to consider indicates how gloomy are the prospects for a rapid and peaceful solution of the problem posed by the Israeli presence in the occupied territories. We shall revert to that later, but should now like to stress the degree of Israel's responsibility in the matter, responsibility that we deeply deplore.

26. The restraint, sense of balance and constructive spirit shown by the Commission and reflected in resolution 452 (1979), which was adopted in an encouraging manner by 14 of the 15 members of the Council, once again prevailed. But, once again, they met with no positive response on Israel's part. That fact should not be considered in isolation. It was not a mere formal position which had been adopted; it was not just a determination not to co-operate with the Commission and the Council, no matter how worthy of condemnation that might be. In the course of our work we noted that, with regard to the substance of the problem, the appeal that we made to the Government of Israel to cease establishing, building and planning settlements in the territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, had been ignored—as was our concern regarding the disastrous consequences of a continuation of that policy on any attempt to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

27. We have therefore been able to confirm in this second report the information that we had already placed before the Council and to stress the gravity of this stubborn declared policy of establishing settlements, expanding those which already exist and planning further settlements over the long term. That policy and the measures to carry it out which the Israeli Government constantly takes and which are mentioned in our report, its influence on the local Arab and

Palestinian population, and the changes of all kinds that it produces in the territories, including those affecting natural resources, have all contributed to a dangerous deterioration of a situation already charged with tension and are, in the opinion of the Commission, incompatible with a search for peace in the area.

28. As we describe this situation once again, we cannot fail to recall, in addition to the eloquent facts and figures given in our reports, a whole pattern of hardship and despair which we encountered during our mission in the Middle East, especially in the midst of the populations—victims of exodus and forced exile. But we also recall other images: the determination and will not to accept as permanent conditions that were felt to be profoundly unjust. Time will not solve the problem. The ever-present source of conflicts has brought with it the hardships and grief that were to be expected. That situation requires of the men and peoples in the Middle East a courageous political vision and a keen awareness of the urgent need to bring about a just and peaceful solution of the great challenges which are before them.

29. That is why, notwithstanding the difficulties and obstacles which the Commission encountered in carrying out its mandate and Israel's failure to respond to the appeals already made, we believe it is still not too late to revert to the question in the same spirit; and so, in this report, we make the same recommendations, by and large, as those we made last year. We wish to continue to believe that it is possible for reason and common sense to prevail. That, in the ultimate analysis, is the message which we bring to the Council.

30. The report contains in an annex communications received by the Commission relating specifically to the spiritual and cultural aspects of Jerusalem, a centre for propagation of the faith of the three great monotheistic world religions. Bearing in mind the need to safeguard the pluralistic and religious nature of the Holy City, the Commission tried to obtain the views of the dignitaries of those religions. Freedom of access to the Holy Places, to our way of thinking, goes hand in hand with guarantees permitting the communities of the faithful who live there fully to carry out their spiritual and cultural activities. We have already expressed the hope that the Holy City may have a status that will guarantee fraternal dialogue among men, peoples and religions. Once again we would reiterate that hope.

31. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Morocco, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group at the United Nations. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

32. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my delegation, I wish first of all to extend to you, Mr. President, and the other mem-

bers of the Security Council our sincere thanks for the opportunity that has been given me to speak before this body in my capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group.

33. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February and to wish you every success in carrying out your important task. I am particularly gratified that the presidency of the Council is now occupied by a country with which Morocco has friendly relations.

34. I should also like to express our appreciation for the speed with which you acted on the letter that I addressed to you on 15 February, in my capacity as Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, requesting that a meeting of the Council be convened.

35. We have just heard the representative of Portugal introduce the second report of the Commission established under Security Council resolution 446 (1979) to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

36. We should like to pay a tribute to the Chairman and the other members of that Commission, the representatives of Portugal, Bolivia and Zambia, for the exemplary manner in which they have discharged the mandate that was entrusted to them by the Council. Its sense of responsibility and its sincere desire to assist in enlightening the Council objectively about the situation prompted the Commission to get in touch with anyone who could help it in its mission. Unfortunately, once again, we have seen this determination encounter a negative attitude on the part of Israel, which has refused any kind of co-operation with the Commission. This attitude does not surprise the international community, since it is that taken by Israel in connection with any international commission entrusted with inquiring into Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories. Nevertheless, it is an open challenge to the Security Council and its essential task of preserving international peace and security.

37. Section C of chapter I of the report shows clearly that, since the presentation of the first report of the Commission in July 1979, no change has been discerned in Israel's policy regarding the building and the planning of settlements in the occupied Arab territories. Quite to the contrary, the Israeli occupation authorities have pursued that policy obstinately and relentlessly in utter contempt of all the decisions and resolutions of the Security Council, particularly its resolution 446 (1979), in paragraph 3, of which the Security Council

"Calls once more upon Israel, as the occupying Power, to abide scrupulously by the Geneva Convention, relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons

in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,¹ to rescind its previous measures and to desist from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status and geographical nature and materially affecting the demographic composition of the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and, in particular, not to transfer parts of its own civilian population into the occupied Arab territories''.

38. Further Arab private lands totalling 40,000 dunums have been confiscated in recent months in order to allow for the expansion of the settlements in the West Bank. In September and October 1979 decisions were adopted by the Israeli Cabinet allowing Israelis to acquire lands in the occupied areas of the West Bank and Gaza and encouraging the expansion of seven settlements situated on the West Bank. The implementation of the plan established by the World Zionist Organization, which is designed to establish 46 new settlements between 1979 and 1983, is under way. The occupation authorities are proceeding to divert four fifths of the total annual volume of water available to the West Bank for the use of the Israeli population and the settlements.

39. Those facts which have been reported by the Commission and which are based on information from Israeli sources or which have been broadly disseminated by the media confirm our conviction that the policy of colonization, far from being that of small groups of fanatics, is definitely official policy for which the Israeli Government is responsible.

40. The policy of settlements is but one of the pillars on which Israeli strategy is based, that strategy whose objective is the annexation of a large part of the occupied Arab territories, particularly the West Bank of the Jordan. That policy is accompanied by other ill treatment meted out to the Arab and Palestinian population in those territories. Arrests, expulsions, deportations, displacements and transfers of that population have unfortunately become almost daily practice. The Israeli authorities have resorted to any means to force that population to leave the area and to modify the juridical status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the territories they occupy.

41. That policy of altering the nature of the occupied Arab territories does not end with the destruction of property; with the force of hatred, it also strikes at the very roots of the identity of the Palestinian and Arab population.

42. The world will never forget the acts of desecration which are being visited upon the Holy Places of Islam in these territories. It will never forget the major fire in 1969 in the Al-Aqsa Holy Mosque in Al-Quds (Jerusalem), just as it will never forget the acts of desecration which since the beginning of this month have occurred in that Moslem Holy Place, the

Great Mosque of Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi in Al-Khalil (Hebron).

43. My country, which had the honour to play host to the First Islamic Summit Conference in 1969 and to the Tenth Conference in 1979, is profoundly against the Israeli policy of Judaization of the Holy Places of Islam in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. It strongly denounces the continual Israeli measures of annexation and Judaization undertaken in the city of Al-Quds (Jerusalem), as well as the repeated violations against the Holy Mosques of Al-Aqsa and Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi and the other Holy Places in Palestine. It should be recalled that the Islamic Conference, speaking on behalf of the hundreds of millions of Moslem believers, at its sixth session held in Fez condemned these criminal acts and proclaimed the year 1400 of the Hegira, which corresponds to 1980, as the Year of Al-Quds (Jerusalem).

44. Furthermore, the entire international community has continually expressed its indignation at these violations of international rules. Both this universal Organization—the United Nations—and regional inter-governmental organizations have condemned Israeli practices in occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. They have frequently reaffirmed that all the steps taken by Israel to alter the physical nature, demographic composition, institutional organization or status of the occupied Arab territories or any part thereof, including Jerusalem, are null and void.

45. Scarcely a week ago the Commission on Human Rights, at present in session in Geneva, adopted a resolution² whereby it stated that the flagrant violations by Israel of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949¹ were war crimes and an insult to mankind.

46. The policy obstinately pursued by Israel despite all the appeals and decisions of the Council can only lead to a further deterioration of the situation in the Arab and Palestinian territories. That policy is a dangerous provocation of the Islamic community as a whole.

47. The members of the Council will fully appreciate the indignation which is daily felt by hundreds of millions of Moslems at the attacks against their Holy Places and the continued Israeli occupation. That is why the Moslem world is appealing to the Council speedily to put an end to this grave situation and to take effective steps to prevent Israel from continuing to violate the rules of international law and wounding the dignity and the most noble sentiments of Moslems throughout the world. The Islamic world remains convinced that this policy is an obstacle to any serious search for a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Middle East and, more particularly, to the Palestinian problem. The Moslem world reaffirms once again its unshakable solidarity with the Palestinian people in its heroic struggle under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Libera-

tion Organization. It remains convinced that the solution to these problems is to be found in the withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories and the recovery by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights, including the right to establish its own national and sovereign State.

48. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

49. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Mr. President, as this is the first time I have had occasion to address the Council this month, I have the distinct pleasure of extending to you, Mr. Peter Florin, and to your esteemed country, the German Democratic Republic, my most sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February and of wishing you every success in your high office. I am confident that your seasoned and highly skilled diplomacy give every assurance of such success.

50. I should also wish to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation to your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Jacques Leprette of France, for his exemplary presidency of the Council during the month of January, which was fraught with crucial and delicate issues, which he handled with his usual prudence and wisdom.

51. It has been almost a year since my Government, appalled by the colossal magnitude of Israeli colonization of the West Bank, including Jerusalem and other Palestinian and Arab territories, presented an urgent complaint to the Council. Profoundly alarmed by the disastrous and well-nigh irretrievable consequences of the Israeli occupiers' heedless, relentless and audaciously illegal policy of ongoing mutilation of the occupied territories and their people for the very survival of the Palestinian people in their homeland and hence for the prospects of a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, Jordan requested that decisive and prompt measures be taken to stop the haemorrhage. The Council adopted resolution 446 (1979), establishing a Commission on 22 March 1979, whose mandate was "to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem".

52. In accordance with paragraph 5 of resolution 446 (1979), the Commission submitted its first report on 12 July 1979, after an intensive study of the situation in the area. The culpable party against which the complaint had been made and whose criminal aggression against the Palestinian and Arab peoples posed a present, continuing and grave danger, not only to international law and elementary justice but, in equal measure, to international peace and security, refused even to accord the Commission permission to enter the occupied territories, let alone to concede to the Council any jurisdiction in the matter, while

expressing an *a priori* rejection of its findings. That should hardly be surprising to anyone, as it comes from an aggressor fearful of being caught red-handed in his self-declared policy of devouring the occupied lands, of obliterating the remnants of the Palestinian people and of rebuffing any intercessor, whether individual or collective, friend or adversary.

53. Israel's Ambassador-designate to Egypt and a top confidant of Menachem Begin, a mere week ago on 15 February, echoing his master's voice, publicly denounced the United States Government for its appeals to Israel to curb Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. "I deny any right to any foreign Power to intervene in our policy of settlement", declared Ben Elissar at a news conference. That henchman of Begin called the right of settlement "a basic inherent right that is denied only by those who want to see us back to the lines of 1967".

54. That notorious expansionist has evidently never heard of Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which mandate Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and categorically reject the acquisition of territory by force. As to what are in his opinion irrelevancies such as international law, the elementary dictates of justice and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the equally unequivocal prohibition of the transfer of the civilian population of the occupier to the occupied territories, the Israelis regard them as applicable to all the other nations of the world but not to themselves—for, God forbid that their rapacious appetite for expansion should be subject to international review and rebuke by the international community's laws, human or divine. But then, one wonders why should they perjure themselves by acceding to those conventions, decisions and norms in the first place, only to renege on and defy them?

55. Pursuant to paragraph 4 of resolution 452 (1979), the Commission submitted its second report to the Council [S/13679]. The Council had requested the Commission, in view of the magnitude of the problem of settlements, to keep under close survey the implementation of the previous resolution and to report back its findings on Israel's compliance therewith. Not only did Israel persist in refusing to extend any co-operation to the Commission; far more ominously, the Israeli occupiers responded by an unprecedented and staggering acceleration of their colonization of the occupied lands. There is not an area, location, region, town or city that has been spared. It is in fulfilment of the Begin Government's atrocious decision that all the lands of the occupied West Bank, including Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights are up for grabs by the Israeli aggressors. It is an assertion on the ground of Begin's interpretation of the categorically rejected and farcical self-rule plan that, anathema as it is, it applies only to the existing and substantially shrunken remnants of the inhabitants of the occupied territories and does not recognize to those Palestinians any rights of possession in those

lands which the Israelis regard as their own and which they are determined to keep as such. As for the existing inhabitants whom they regard as stateless residents, they can, subject to the whim and will of the occupiers, live out the rest of their lives until the natural process of mortal attrition runs its course.

56. I wish to rebut, in passing, the Israeli claim that they will henceforth confiscate and colonize what they call State domains, even though this claim has been more conspicuous in its breach than in its observance. To begin with, it is estimated that 90 per cent of the lands already seized are privately owned. Secondly, as I have stated on previous occasions, the term "State domain" is a misnomer. The authentic name is "public domain", the land being the communal possession of the inhabitants in each particular area and was meticulously recognized and delineated as such during the British Mandate. Furthermore, Israel deliberately falsified the difference in legal status between the "miri lands" and the "public domain" lands.

57. The *miri* lands have over the centuries been individually owned by village and town dwellers, but were treated differently in terms of tax rates. These constitute 1.03 million dunums out of the total area of the tiny West Bank, a mere 5,500,000 dunums, the equivalent of roughly 3,400 square miles. These are usurped by the Israelis and begrudged to the close to 4 million Palestinian people as a homeland—less than 1 per cent of the area of Alaska, 40 per cent of which—I believe 40 million acres—has recently been declared an environmental recreational reserve, off bounds to habitation. But assuming that the *miri* lands are not *miri* lands and the public domains are State domains because the land survey department has not completed the apportionment of these communal lands, under what private or international law does the Israeli occupation claim any entitlement to them, other than by conquest and the acquisition of territory by force, which are both illegal, null, void and invalid?

58. It had been established by the Council that by the spring of last year the Israeli occupation had confiscated 27.1 per cent of the occupied West Bank, including Jerusalem. In the intervening year the flood-gates have burst under pressure of a devastating and uncontrollable avalanche of colonization. Subsequent to resolutions 446 (1979) and 452 (1979), during the period from April to October 1979 alone, Israel confiscated an additional 230,000 dunums of Arab lands, thus increasing the total area seized to 1,730,000 dunums—a dunum is 1,000 square metres—which accounts for about 31.4 per cent of the total area of the West Bank. Thus, in a period of only six months, the total area seized increased by 15 per cent.

59. Although no exact data exist for the total number of Israeli colonizers, in Israel's ever-accelerating expansion and usurpation the total number of settlers has significantly increased beyond the 91,000 figure

reported for April 1979. The colonizers are housed in 87 illegal settlements, of which 18 are in or around Jerusalem, 22 in the Jordan Valley, and the rest entrenched in every corner and location throughout the length and breadth of the occupied West Bank, including cities, towns and villages.

60. Only a month ago the people of Jerusalem were watching Israeli bulldozers opening 30-metre-wide roads for a town that is being built at the last relatively open entrance to Jerusalem from the east, adjacent to and on considerable lands confiscated from the villagers of El-Azariyeh overlooking Bethany and a few kilometres from the centre of Arab Jerusalem. The construction of this town, Ma'ale Adomin, completes the closing of the ring around Arab Jerusalem, already cut off from the rest of the world by massive Israeli colonization in the north up to Ramallah, from the south up to the town of Bethlehem, and to the west by Israel's usurpation of the Palestinian two thirds of West Jerusalem in 1947 and 1948, cutting it off from the Mediterranean Sea, and a long stretch of Israeli colonization along the western mountain ranges all the way from Bethlehem to Ramallah.

61. The construction of the new township is of course hardly fresh news. Under the headline "The land that money cannot buy", on 17 September 1979 *The Christian Science Monitor* published a report on what was happening elsewhere in the vicinity of the approaches to East Jerusalem, the village of Anata. Abdul Salam Salameh, the head man of the village, stumbles over an Israeli military fence on what was his land: "They could give me a million dollars," he snaps, "and I would throw it back in their faces. I want my land back."

62. I might here read to the Council a dispatch from the correspondent of *The Washington Post* foreign service of 13 August. He writes as follows:

"Jerusalem, going ochre in the sunlight, lies just over the next hill, on the other side of Bethany, a short drive away.

"Down the slope of this rocky mound in the opposite direction is an Israeli army camp, part of the military forces that have occupied the West Bank since Israel conquered it in the 1967 Middle East war.

"Here at the top are the first signs of construction if a settlement"—actually it is a town—"dedicated recently by Israeli Housing Minister David Levy. It will be another link in a chain of Jewish settlements designed to surround Jerusalem and bind it for ever to the State of Israel.

"Ma'ale Adomin looks barren, dry and worthless to a visitor. But it has a special significance in that chain—it will provide a strong Jewish presence on

the last major approach to Jerusalem that still retains a primarily Arab character, the road east to Jericho and on toward Jordan.

"Perhaps for these reasons, the Israeli Government invited the public to attend the little ceremony in which Levy laid the corner-stone. About 1,000 persons attended and heard him proclaim: 'There will no longer be a line between what we had before the Six-Day-War of 1967 and what we have in these days of redemption.'

"Another Israeli Government official explained further, 'We are putting the settlements all around Jerusalem so there will never be any question of whether it is part of Israel.'

"To the north of Jerusalem, just south west of Ramallah, the Givon settlement has been built and plans have been drawn up for three nearby settlements in the same Givon bloc commanding the road to Ramallah. Just north of Ramallah lie the four settlements of the Beit El bloc commanding the road north from Ramallah toward Nablus.

"To the south of Jerusalem, just south west of Bethlehem at points commanding the road to Hebron, the Israelis have built half a dozen settlements and have started preliminary work on another at Efrat. The communities are part of the Etzion settlement bloc scheduled to expand on both sides of the road within five years.

"To the West is Israeli territory within the pre-1967 boundaries. And now, with Ma'ale Adomin to the east, the encirclement is complete, putting an Israeli imprint on land all around the Holy City."

63. Numerous other farmers and city dwellers face the same ordeal on an almost daily basis. At the expense of maintaining a chronological sequence of colonization and just to give random examples, I shall quote two reports of an Israeli colonization running beserk. The first, which the Mission received in the latest pouch, dated 11 February 1980, a mere 10 days ago, reads:

"The Israeli occupation authorities have confiscated 2,500 dunums of land belonging to the two Arab villages of Al-Khader and Beit Umar, to the east of the Bethlehem road near Wadi Al-Bayyar. Two days earlier, the occupation authorities celebrated the laying down of the corner-stone for a new town to be named Efrat on the lands of the two villages. The new town, located between occupied Jerusalem and the Kfar Etzion complex, will consist of 5,000 housing units. New Jewish citizens from New York and South Africa will be settled in this town.

"To the north of the West Bank, the corner-stone will be laid for the construction of Qarney-Shomron

No. 2, in the mountain city of Nablus. Mr. Sakhr Abu Ayyash, speaking for the dispossessed villagers of Beit Umar, declared: 'At the time when we have been demanding the removal of the earlier settlement, Migdal Oz on our land, we find ourselves faced with the construction of yet another one.' "

64. On 14 February of this year the occupation authorities confiscated an additional 1,000 dunums of land belonging to the village of Abboud, to the north east of Ramallah, in order to build a new settlement to be named Levota. This is equidistant from the north and the south to ensure that the inimical and ubiquitous colonization is fairly equally shared.

65. What I have mentioned is the typical achievement of a week or two. I apologize for having given random examples that have occurred during the past two weeks, but I have done so because this is our daily bread, these reports on colonization which arrive regularly and they take time to tabulate in a total picture, even though we have such tabulations from March 1979 up to January 1980.

66. The total picture we have is gruesome indeed, the more so as it is part and parcel of an over-all and inexorable process that is spelled out not only in our reports but in a notorious official Israeli document which has the approval of Begin and his racist régime. Furthermore it is being systematically implemented on the ground literally as laid down on paper. It is known as the "Master plan for the development of settlement in Judaea and Samaria" [see S/13582 of 22 October 1979] and was written by Matityahu Drobles; it covers the period from 1979 to 1983. That colonization plan was issued by the Department for Rural Settlements of the World Zionist Organization in a triangular arrangement that also includes the Israeli entity and the Jewish Agency and over the life span of the plan determines the establishment of 46 new settlements to be inhabited by 16,000 families. The cost of the plan is 32 billion Israeli pounds—that is, in excess of \$2.5 billion. Furthermore, the plan includes the thickening of 38 existing settlements as well as those under construction, at a cost of another 22 billion Israeli pounds. Altogether, the plan calls for an additional 27,000 families by the end of 1983, at a cost of 54 billion Israeli pounds. The average cost of settling a family is 2 million Israeli pounds. These expenditures and settlements are designed as an initial step in a much more massive colonization of the densely populated highlands of the West Bank. They are not part of the other 20-year plan that is at present under implementation for the period from 1975 to 1995 in the Jordan Valley. Even though the Israeli occupation authorities have already seized 80 to 90 per cent of the Jordan Valley, they have intensified a colonization plan to encircle the remnant still in Palestinian hands, and particularly around the historic city of Jericho, by six new colonies. They will be named Ni'mah A; Ni'mah B, Ni'mah C—those racists seem

to be running out of names—and also Al-Mog B, Beit Ha'reh and Matzbeh Yerihu B—Arihah is Jericho's Arabic name. It is established that in January 1979 the Israeli aggressors had built a colony named Ni'mah to the north of Jericho and the big Palestinian village of Uoja.

67. This is the pattern of and motivation behind the encirclement of every city, town and village complex throughout the whole of the West Bank, as well as their vivisection by the establishment of settlements between them, as we shall see from a brief analysis of the Drobles master plan. It is regrettable that the Commission did not include in its second report a verbatim reproduction of the Drobles report and the attached list and map of new settlements to be established or already established, for the plan is the official plan of the Israeli Government, almost its bible, and it would be highly enlightening to the Council to know what is happening or what is in the offing in Israel's cannibalization of the remnants of the Palestinian people in the remnants of their Palestinian homeland. The Jordanian Mission has therefore found it necessary to include copies of the master plan in the files that we have placed at the disposal of the members of the Council and, in view of its extreme importance and gravity, I respectfully request that it be circulated as an official document of the Council. Its publication would also spare the Council the piecemeal surprises that are sprung upon us by the enterprising dispatches from occupied Arab Jerusalem and often published in the press. We are not competing with the media, but it feels good to know what we would eventually come to learn from our own sources and guidelines.

68. It is pertinent to highlight a number of significant components in the Israeli entity's official policy of colonization as spelt out in the master plan.

69. First, the plan is regarded by the Israelis themselves as just one further step towards taking over the whole of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, which has suffered most by the total encirclement and massive colonization. Evidently, and as the plan clearly states, after the initial master plan and at the centre of its examination stands a comprehensive and systematic land survey that is still going on. "When the survey is completed, the plan adds, it is probable that we will be able to plan the disposition of settlements additional to those proposed" in the master plan.

70. Secondly, settlement throughout the land of Israel—and this, according to the Zionist aggressors, includes the occupied territories—is for security and by right. "A strip of settlements at strategic sites enhances", the plan says, "both internal and external security alike, as well as making concrete and realizing our right to Eretz Ysrael." One would have thought that the stockpile and arsenal of the several dozen nuclear bombs would have given the Israelis adequate

security rather than the seizure of the lands of hapless farmers, lands which provide their sole means of livelihood.

71. Thirdly, the disposition of the proposed settlements would take the form of interrelated and integrated blocs or community settlements and in the course of time they would be turned into urban centres.

72. Fourthly—and I wish to underline this point—the plan states that the settlements must be established not only around what it describes as the settlements of the minorities—meaning the Palestinians—but also in between them, this in accordance with the settlement policy adopted in Galilee. This has prompted an outside observer's comment that if this is the way Israel looks at those who, according to law, are its citizens, can anyone wonder at the manner in which the military government is treating the population in the occupied territories?

73. I should mention here that the Israeli usurpers have confiscated since 1948 at least 90 per cent of the lands of the Palestinians whom they regard as citizens of Israel, and even that monumental feat has fallen far short of the expectations of Koenig, the district commissioner, who suggested even greater confiscations in order to impel the Palestinians to leave. It has also evoked a United States correspondent's comment that even now, when the Palestinian Arabs are still the overwhelming majority in the West Bank, the Israeli plan describes them as the minority.

74. In paragraph 50 of the Commission's second report there is a reference to a decision unanimously adopted by the Israeli Cabinet on 16 September allowing Israeli citizens to purchase land in the occupied West Bank and Gaza, thus rescinding a previous decision to the contrary. Quite apart from that decision's being in violation of international law and conventions, the inhabitants are inexorably opposed to any alienation of their lands, even if all the gold of the world were offered for them.

75. With regard to the close to 30,000 dunums appropriated by the military authorities from El-Azariyeh village in 1975, and upon which the Israeli occupiers are at present going ahead at full speed with the building of the town of Ma'ale Adomin in order to complete encirclement of Arab Jerusalem, Mr. Rashid Hijazi, who had bought parts of that land in 1963 before the occupation, told the *Washington Post* reporter:

"I will not sell the land. I have been trying to get a permit to build on it, but they told us all building permits for that area were closed off."

He only learnt of the expropriation when he saw bulldozers scraping out the access a few months ago.

76. It is unnecessary to reiterate that, in addition to their massive expropriation of lands, the Israelis have seized five sixths of the water resources of the West Bank for exploitation both in the Israeli settlements and in the illegally expanded Israel of 1947-1948. As the Commission reports, Israel is pumping away some 500 million cubic metres by means of artesian wells. The file distributed to the members of the Commission includes a study made by a qualified hydrologist which describes the magnitude of Israel's plundering of the water resources of the West Bank, so as to choke the inhabitants and to reduce their treasured lands to waste. The farmers are currently resorting to water-saving techniques to remain afloat, if that is possible.

77. The difference between Israeli extremists and moderates is that the former are bent on total annexation, while the latter prefer that sections of what would remain of the West Bank, with its heavily concentrated Arab populations, be excluded from Israel's final borders—not out of charity, but in order to avoid serious internal problems for the racist Jewish State. They prefer to keep that population essentially stateless, as a source of underpaid labour, under Jordanian or local civil administration and Israeli military control.

78. That is the crux of the Israeli vision of self-rule. "How much longer is the world willing to endure such wanton cruelty?", asked a thinker known throughout the world.

79. The members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference held an emergency meeting a week ago to discuss the ominous situation which had arisen in the city of Al-Khalil (Hebron) on 31 January last. We have just heard the Chairman of the Islamic Group telling the Council of the ominous situation there. An urgent meeting of the Council was requested to deliberate on the dangerous situation which had arisen in consequence of the brutal punitive measures which the Israeli forces of occupation, in close collaboration with the racist, fanatical and illegal Israeli colonizers in the vicinity of that city, and particularly the armed colonizers of Kiryat Arba, infamous for their blind hatred and crimes, had perpetrated for years and continue to perpetrate against the unarmed and hard-working 50,000 inhabitants of that Palestinian city. Their despicable behaviour has been in flagrant violation of the most fundamental human rights and the universally recognized principles of decent behaviour.

80. The facts of the situation are that on 31 January, an Israeli soldier was shot by an unknown assailant and died of his wounds. That assailant was acting on his own, in reaction to the unending and mounting provocations and assaults by the Israeli colonizers of Kiryat Arba, just overlooking the city. Such incidents are daily occurrences in most countries of the world. In such cases police forces investigate the incident with a view to ascertaining the identity of the individual assailant in accordance with the normal

processes of law. However, the Israeli occupiers imposed a 23-hour curfew, for 11 days and nights on end, on the inhabitants of a whole city—men, women and children—subjecting them to grave hardships. The Israelis went on a rampage. Large contingents of Israeli troops subjected the inhabitants to ruthless, systematic and abusive searches, including indiscriminate break-ins into the homes of hapless civilians, physical assaults and the destruction of furniture and other belongings. The city of Al-Khalil was sealed off and barriers were erected on roads leading into and out of the city, thus disrupting all communications and isolating Hebron from the rest of the world, so that, with the population forbidden to visit the East Bank, their perishable fruits and vegetables were left to rot.

81. The Moslem inhabitants were prohibited from performing their Friday prayers in the Holy Sanctuary of the Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi mosque, one of the holiest and oldest Islamic places of worship in occupied Palestine. This is where I should mention that not since the Middle Ages has a place of worship belonging to one religious affiliation been converted into a place of worship for another. For the Ibrahimi holy sanctuary, and especially the spacious main hall of the mosque, has to all intents and purposes been converted into a synagogue, in violation of its centuries-old status. The mosque was built by the Palestinian Arabs a thousand years ago.

82. Aggravating this provocative behaviour, the Israelis encouraged the colonizers—notwithstanding the curfew, because curfews apply only to the Palestinian inhabitants—to pray illegally at that Islamic sanctuary. Those colonists engaged in widespread stone-throwing at the homes of the confined inhabitants. One of the attackers fired a machine gun at the population. Such collective punishment, though not the first or the last, is reminiscent of the atrocious practices associated with the Fascist occupiers of Europe during the Second World War, of which the Jews themselves were among the foremost victims. The despicable behaviour of the Israeli occupation is but a continuum of that dark era of racist, exclusivist orientation. Even more ominous, as I have said, is the taking over of the Ibrahimi holy sanctuary, which the Moslems had built well over a thousand years ago, leaving to the Moslems small crannies and cramped spaces in which to perform their worship. The Israelis have already named it a synagogue.

83. As usual, the Israelis utilized the occasion to stretch further and step up their policy of colonization. The Israeli Council of Ministers decided on 10 February to allow the Jews to settle in Al-Khalil (Hebron) as well as, in their words, in other parts of the land of Israel. The Israeli Minister of Education, Mr. Hamir, urged that in addition to settling Jews in the heart of the city, the construction of 1,000 additional housing units be undertaken at Kiryat Arba, on lands recently confiscated from Tel El-Jaabra and other lands adjacent

to Kiryat Arba. Other Ministers demanded the resignation of Mayor Fahd Qawasma and immediate settlement in 16 houses which had belonged to the Jews in the past. The Mayor retorted that he did not object to—indeed he welcomed—the 16 Jewish families living in Hebron, provided the over 2 million Palestinian owners of Jaffa, Haifa, Lydda, Ramleh and Askalan and the inhabitants of other towns and villages were allowed to go back to their homes in accordance with natural justice, international law and General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

84. The Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* quoted one of the attendants of the Ibrahimi Sanctuary as having submitted a protest to the Military Governor in which he narrated how unknown Israeli persons had desecrated the Ibrahimi Mosque by pouring sand and water on the Holy Koran and trampling on it. It was preserved in the room of the Sheikh of the Ibrahimi Mosque, Aatif Al-Hamawi. The complaint also narrated how the attackers cut the electric wires to immobilize the loudspeakers used by the muezzin in calling the worshippers to prayer. They completed their feat by stealing the loudspeaker apparatus itself.

85. Such misdeeds and the resort to collective punishment are in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention, and of article 50 of the Hague Convention.³ Desecration of religious places is prohibited under articles 49, 53 and 56 of the fourth Geneva Convention.

86. Most regrettably and sadly, a number of police officers have been killed in New York during the past week. Have the law-enforcement forces in New York imposed a curfew upon any street or block—let alone the whole city? If they have, none of us have known about it or suffered from its hardships. The security forces in the occupied territories might have some novel advice to give to the law-enforcement departments in this city, in an intercultural exchange programme, to see how law-abiding citizens respond to such across-the-board "collective punishment".

87. I have just made an absurd analogy, but it reminds me of a discourse entitled "A Stranger to the World" by a well-known Palestinian poet in exile. I should like to read out the following excerpts:

"Thus it is that the world understands me; thus it wants me to be. Our struggle has come to an end so long as I have left Palestine and there is no longer a guardian for the fire. The equation of the world's peace is perfected, and international security has become conditional on my being absent from Palestine and from humanity.

"I have bidden farewell to no one, to nothing. A rifle butt sent me rolling down from Carmel to the harbour, while I clung to God's waist, screaming until I lost voice and consciousness. Yet the world has promised me some charity in return for signing a truce with myself, for a truce with a murderer comes

about only after a truce with oneself. The world has bestowed charity upon me; it has given me flour and clothes and many tents for me and my unborn children, in return for my giving it my homeland and security. And when I used to feel cold in exile, the newspapers of world opinion would protect me from cold and shivering. And when I used to feel hungry a paragraph of three lines in the speech of the President of a civilized State would satisfy my appetite. And when I used to feel homesickness, foreign songs pouring forth from the neighbours' radio would make a departure for me into a beautiful experience.

"And thus the world goes to its bedroom and forgets me. Do not wake the victim lest he scream.

"Who has wakened him; who is responsible? Answer: A wind suddenly blows and resuscitates the dead.

"From where does it blow? Answer: From all directions—from the homeland.

"And who taught them this obsolete term? Answer: Poets singing to a fiddle.

"Kill them! Answer: We have killed them so they have invented another term: freedom.

"Who taught them this seditious term? Answer: Fanatic rebels.

"Kill them. Answer: We have killed them, so they learned another word: justice.

"Who taught them this term? Answer: Injustice. Shall we kill injustice? Answer: If you do away with injustice, you do away with yourselves.

"We shall kill memory. Thus sleeps the world, thus it wakes. It is armed to the teeth and I am shackled to the teeth. The strong are civilized; the weak, savage. They came armed to the teeth with weapons and the Torah. They uprooted me from my mountains and valleys and sent me rolling down from civilization to the bottomless pit.

"Was Israel established by any method other than murder and terrorism? Thus always it is with the world: rapturous about mass murder, censorious about individual murder. States are entitled to kill their own and other peoples, but an individual or a people has no right to fight for its freedom. If our behaviour is subject to the demands of 'world public opinion' as expressed by manipulated information systems, then the time has come for us to declare that we are tired of our servitude and our state of loss and that we are searching for means of survival.

"When we abstain from suicide, they say we are cowards; and when we commit suicide, they say we are savages. When we preach peace they say we

are hypocritical liars, and when we preach struggle they say we are barbarians. And are we murderers? Who killed whom? Have they asked this question?"

88. I have read the poet's discourse because in it the centrality of the Palestinian dilemma is pinpointed by one of its 1947-1948 victims. His exodus was then brought about by the Israeli rifle butts. Israeli strategy of today is to achieve an identical objective and an identical crime against humanity, using as its primary tool the bulldozer instead of the tank, even though the tank and other lethal weapons of coercion are the back-up of the bulldozer. The population of Jerusalem and the West Bank has dwindled by 32 per cent since 1967. Over the past 13 years of occupation, it is a stagnant 600,000 to 700,000. If there had been no prolonged occupation, the return of the displaced, those working abroad but whose home is in the West Bank, and their off-spring, and the natural increase and economic and social development, would have raised the population to at least 1.5 million. And yet the ratio of the displaced, the exiles, the so-called absentees is increasing alarmingly as days, months and years go by.

89. I have two reports in Arabic which detail the Israeli settlement activities. The first covers the period between 1 April and 30 October 1979. The second covers the period from March 1979, when the Commission was established by the Council, to January 1980. The reports are included in the dossiers which we have placed at the disposal of the members of the Council. I would be taking too much of the Security Council's precious time were I to enumerate those widespread activities in detail, and I respectfully request that the reports be circulated as official documents of the Council.

90. The second report indicates that 11 new settlements have been established. The first is Sal'it, on lands confiscated from the village of Kufr Sur, to the north of Qalqilya. The second is the Elon-Moreh settlement, five kilometers from Nablus. As a result of a court ruling, a substitute settlement on one of the adjacent hills belonging to the village of Dair Al-Hattab is being constructed. This represents a shift of a new kilometres. The third is Qarney-Shomron, on the main road between Nablus and Tulkarm, three kilometres from the earlier-established settlement, Qarney-Shomron A. These are in the third belt, which we referred to at previous Council meetings as advancing from the Armistice Line of 1967 from the west to the east. The fourth is Neveh-Zuf, located between the two Arab villages of Dair Ballout and Aaboud, to the north of Ramallah, in the centre of the West Bank. The fifth is Qarney-Shomron D, to the south of the earlier Qarney-Shomron A. The sixth is Dotan, to the south of the City of Jenin, near the town of Ya'bud. The seventh is Reihan, near the Armistice Line in the Jenin district. The eighth is Qarney-Shomron C, eight kilometres from Qarney-Shomron A. The ninth is Elazar settlement in the Kfar Etzion complex, on the main road between

Bethlehem and Hebron. The tenth is the Efrat settlement or town, on confiscated lands belonging to the village of Al-Khader (St. George), to the west of Bethlehem. And the eleventh is Jiffa Hadasha, on confiscated lands belonging to the village of Al-Jeeb, in the Ramallah district.

91. Five settlements have been augmented, namely: first, Ariel Haris in Kufr-Haris-Salfit in the Nablus area; secondly, Jiboan on the village lands of Al-Jeeb, in the Ramallah district; thirdly, Al-Kharja, in the area of Abu Qarnein village; fourthly, Beit Huron, on lands of Al-Petra village, in the Ramallah district; and, fifthly, the settlement of Afra on lands confiscated from Hawd Al-Marja, to the north of Ramallah.

92. During the past six months, the Israeli occupation authorities have confiscated 196,767 dunums. They are located in the Khan El-Ahmar-Dead Sea area, Jenin, Nablus, Hebron, Tulkarm, Bethlehem and Ramallah. I might add the confiscations in and around Jerusalem, as well as the confiscation over the years of upwards of 80,000 dunums belonging to the village of Taubass between Nablus and the Jordan Valley in the north.

93. I should not confuse the wood and the trees by narrating compilations any further. I shall therefore conclude my remarks by expressing the Jordan Government's deep appreciation to Mr. Leonardo Mathias of Portugal—whose country has always supported our just cause—as Chairman of the Commission, and to the other members of the Commission, the representatives of Bolivia and Zambia. They are to be highly commended for their painstaking efforts, dedication and concern.

94. I should like to draw this Council's attention to the recommendations of the Commission which warn of the disastrous consequences that the settlement policy is bound to have on any attempt to reach a peaceful solution in the Middle East. I should also reiterate the Commission's recommendation that the Council adopt effective measures, as a matter of urgency, to prevail upon Israel to cease the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories and to dismantle the existing ones.

95. It is my delegation's conviction that, unless and until the Council in its wisdom decides to apply the punitive measures which it is authorized to apply under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Israelis will no doubt persist in their aggressive and defiant attitude, which poses the greatest threat not only to the very survival of the Palestinian people in their homeland and in exile but also to the peace and stability of the entire region, and hence to world peace.

96. The situation in the occupied territories is indeed a unique one in every sense. It is not simply a 13-year-old occupation, for occupations come and go, although they leave a deep sore. The Israeli occupation and

colonization are endemic and the occupiers are engaged in altering the geographic, demographic and historical legacy of a whole people. The struggle of the Palestinian people for their inalienable rights, with the support of the Arab world, the Islamic world, the non-aligned world and all peoples that believe in humanity and justice, will continue unabated.

97. As I said last year, the situation is like that of a sinking ship signalling an SOS before it descends to the darkness of a fathomless sea. A conflict of decades will inevitably turn into a struggle of generations, with consequences too gruesome to foretell. It is our earnest hope that the Council will reverse this most dangerous drift and shoulder its responsibilities in the interests of justice and peace.

98. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

99. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset, let me present my compliments to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I should also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Mr. Leprette of France on his able conduct of the Council's delicate work last month.

100. These are momentous days in the quest for peace between Israel and its neighbours. Three weeks ago Israel and Egypt established diplomatic relations, and this week embassies were opened in our two countries. Early next week the ambassadors will present their credentials. Within the coming days and weeks the process of normalizing the relations between our two countries will be carried forward. The signing of various accords and agreements is envisaged in the spheres of trade, communications, travel, tourism and culture. Simultaneously, the talks aimed at achieving full autonomy for the Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District are proceeding and making deliberate progress.

101. And what is happening in the Security Council? As on many previous occasions, it is being mobilized again by the opponents of peace in the Middle East. The evidence is overwhelming, because in the last year a certain pattern has emerged. It shows that whenever there is tangible progress in the ongoing peace process or whenever the negotiations reach a significant stage, Jordan and its allies rush to the Council in an attempt to extract from it support for their own diversionary and belligerent purposes.

102. That is precisely what happened a year ago, as we have been reminded by Ambassador Nuseibeh before. The President of the United States went to Cairo and Jerusalem last March to negotiate personally the last delicate stages of the Israel-Egypt peace treaty. Jordan reacted by staging a debate here. That is precisely what happened last summer with the

opening of the autonomy talks. At that time too, the Council was mobilized in an attempt to frustrate the peace process. And that is precisely what is happening now.

103. When one looks around the world and sees the real crises threatening international peace and security which the Council is, for one reason or another, unable to tackle, let alone resolve, the absurdity and total lack of proportion in the present exercise is patently and painfully obvious. A fortnight ago the Government of Israel re-enunciated its position of principle that Jews have the right to live in any part of the land of Israel and that Jews are not foreigners in any part of the land of Israel. That mere reiteration of a position of principle has been turned into a flimsy and dubious excuse for calling for an urgent meeting of the Council based on an exclusivist—I dare say racist—proposition. That proposition asserts that, since the ancient Jewish community of Hebron was liquidated through the brutal massacre of 1929, the city is to be kept forever *Judenrein*. For the benefit of those who may not be familiar with the term, let me explain that it means "cleared or emptied of Jews", in accordance with the racist tenets of an ignoble era in the first half of this century. All of us know that the struggle against those racist tenets was one of the main objectives of the nations which brought our Organization into being. And now, 35 years later, the Council is being called upon to sanction and perpetuate a racist crime. This racist approach is carried to preposterous extremes and to a point where attempts are being made to erase even the name of the city of Hebron by which it has been known over the millennia simply because the name "Hebron" attests to the historical association of the Jewish people with that city. It is not by accident that, of the four cities in the land of Israel held holy by the Jewish people, the first, chronologically, was Hebron, the City of the Hebrew Patriarchs.

104. In the light of recent events in the Middle East, there is a distinct convergence of interests between the initiators of the present debate and those who would try to divert attention away from Afghanistan, where the real threat to international peace and security in the region has surfaced unmistakably in recent months. We all recall that the Soviet aggression against that country was condemned by over two thirds of the membership of the United Nations meeting in an emergency special session only last month.

105. It was no coincidence that, on 27 January this year, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union rushed to Damascus and that his visit was followed in short order by Syrian moves calculated further to destabilize the situation in Lebanon. As long as Soviet expansionism and subversion persist, we must expect attempts, however lacking in subtlety, to distract attention from Afghanistan and elsewhere by one subterfuge or another. The great defect . . .

106. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

107. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I do not want to continue listening to the idiocies that I have just heard. We are discussing a specific issue. What the representative of Israel is repeating to us is simply fiction. He can do that at some other meeting outside the Council. There is a specific issue before us: "The situation in the occupied Arab territories".

108. I shall reply to the representative of Israel in due course. I do not intend to do so now, but I would request him to observe the rules and discuss the question now before the Council.

109. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Israel.

110. Mr. BLUM (Israel): We all know who is trying to divert attention away from the real threats to international peace and security. We have just had evidence to that effect again.

111. The great defect of all the Council's debates on the Arab-Israel conflict in recent years is that they have been detached—consciously detached—from the over-all geopolitical and strategic developments in the Middle East. Deliberate attempts have been made to fragment the Arab-Israel conflict and to focus exclusively on one or other of its secondary aspects, out of its general context, and certainly in a total disregard of broader considerations—security considerations and others—which from Israel's point of view are crucial.

112. Thus in its recent deliberations the Council has persistently ignored the consolidation of the war-mongering of the so-called rejectionist Arab States over the last 18 months and the establishment of a so-called "eastern front" combining the armed forces of Syria to the north of Israel, Iraq and Jordan to the east and Saudi Arabia to the south, not to mention military inputs from other Arab groups and quarters. Similarly, the Council has ignored the fact that several of the Arab States and groups in question are being supplied and assisted by the Soviet Union—both directly and through the latter's proxies—to the point where the combined military strength of the Arab rejectionist States now exceeds that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And against whom, one may ask, is all that military might being aimed?

113. Beyond that, the Council has chosen to ignore the fact that the Arab States concerned and their allies regard Judaea and Samaria—and, for that matter, the Gaza District—as extensions of the "eastern front", as a bridgehead, a forward base for acts of hostility, terror, sabotage and subversion against Israel and its civilian population. The peace treaty with Egypt

has not freed Israel from the threats to its security and existence from other quarters. The heightened belligerency of other Arab States, the increasing incitement and terrorism by their agents—all make security considerations assume greater importance than before.

114. If certain members of the Council are capable of ignoring these harsh facts, the Government of Israel is not. Nor could any other responsible, independent and self-respecting Government do so in similar circumstances.

115. The Council is again confronted with its perennial dilemma. As the organ of the United Nations entrusted with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, will it choose to be supportive of the only practical peace process which has emerged after three decades of the Arab-Israel conflict, or will it opt once again for a blinkered, partial approach which will only play into the hands of and give encouragement to the enemies of peace?

116. As usually happens on occasions such as this, there will be States, both in the Council and beyond it, which, while recognizing full well the diversionary nature of the present debate, will nonetheless find it difficult to resist the temptation to try to gain some political advantage or to prove their credentials by participating in this debate. Such tactics are no doubt part of the game of politics, but they can scarcely be regarded as helpful or contributing to the quest for peace which, as we all know, is being conducted in more serious negotiations elsewhere.

117. Since this debate is patently calculated to be diversionary, the quest for peace would, to our minds, be best served by non-participation in these proceedings by all those States which genuinely have the cause of peace at heart.

118. However, as this is perhaps too much to expect, we reserve our right to speak again in the course of this debate. We shall then have the opportunity to expose and refute the many falsehoods that have already been altered and the deliberate distortions that have been made in this debate and that will no doubt be supplemented by those speakers who have been mobilized because of their well-known expertise in fabrication and fantasy. In particular, we shall then address ourselves to the statement of Mr. Nuseibeh, whose low, very low, credibility rating is common knowledge and has already been established on many previous occasions.

119. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, on whom I now call.

120. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Between the people of Palestine and the people of the

German Democratic Republic there is an affinity. We both have suffered the ravages of war; we both have high stakes in peace; we both endeavour to provide a bright future for our children. In your country, Mr. President, your people has already achieved a great deal and plans to achieve a lot more in order to accomplish its aims. The Palestinian people still struggles to guarantee its mere survival. We still struggle by all means to regain our paradise, our homeland, our Palestine, to regain our inalienable rights, rights that are universally recognized. But like your people, Sir, and other peace-loving peoples, we shall not abandon our struggle for peace. Under your prudent guidance we are certain that the current debate will produce constructive and positive results.

121. I should like to thank the representatives who cast their affirmative vote and joined in inviting the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in this debate on an equal footing.

122. We have studied the reports submitted by the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979). We cannot but praise the diligence and the objectivity of the members of the Commission. In our opinion, the concern and keen interest in the fate and future of the Palestinian and Arab peoples and territories under Israeli occupation also reflect the concern and keen interest of the friendly Governments and peoples of Bolivia, Portugal and Zambia.

123. On a previous occasion, on 9 March 1979 [2123rd meeting], I had the honour to appear before the Council and to participate in the debate on the item entitled, "The situation in the occupied Arab territories". It will be recalled that a map was produced and we showed the water resources which had been expropriated by the forces of illegal occupation. We drew the attention of the Council to the "process of strangulation"—of eliminating the Palestinians by thirst. We indicated how the Zionists resorted to sophisticated and advanced methods to dig deep wells, deeper than the indigenous Palestinian Arabs could reach. This advanced method resulted in the drying up of Palestinian Arab wells and their salinization.

124. That was in March 1979. The Commission established by the Council recommended in its report of 4 December 1979, which is now under discussion, the following:

"In view of the vital importance of water resources for the prosperity of the occupied Arab territories, and of the reported serious depletion of those resources as a result of intensive exploitation by the Israeli authorities, mainly for the benefit of the Israeli settlements, the Security Council might wish to consider measures aiming at investigating the matter further, with a view to ensuring the protection of those important natural resources of the territories under occupation." [S/13679, para. 55.]

125. In the opinion of the Commission, the concern was about the vital importance of water resources for the prosperity—and I underline the word "prosperity"—of the occupied territories. In our opinion, the concern is about the survival of the people and the animal and plant life in that area. How do the annexationist Zionists view the vital importance of the water resources in the occupied Palestinian territories? In its issue of 6-12 May 1979, *The Jerusalem Post* carried a full-page article under the title, "The Water Threat". It states:

"One third of the water reaching Israeli kitchens and farms originates in the West Bank. But once the autonomous Arab administration takes over, there may not be anyone to guarantee this flow."

The reporter's name is Mr. Joshua Brilliant. I shall quote only a few excerpts from that article:

"The Arabs could play havoc with the Israeli economy if they drilled a few dozen wells into Samaria's western slopes."

Here one wonders if this is not an attempt to create a justification for a pre-emptive move or strike by the Zionists—and they have been known as masters of creating conditions for aggression under the cover of pre-emption. The Brilliant writer cites the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tahal Water Planning Corporation, who says: "Whatever the Arabs take would mean that much less for Israel... every additional dunum they irrigate means a dunum less for us"—that is, for Israel. This would make it clear that Israel must prevent, by all possible means, any advancement by the Palestinian Arabs in the field of agriculture.

126. Potable sweet water in Palestine—at the moment completely under foreign military occupation—comes from a reservoir that does not recognize any partition lines, not even the 1949 armistice lines. This reservoir reaches down some 700 metres below sea level and contains about 20 billion cubic metres of water. The reservoir is replenished mainly by rainfall that is absorbed by the western slopes of the Nablus and Hebron region, all of which lie in the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

127. According to Israel's Water Commissioner, Meir Ben Meir, one third of the water reaching Israeli kitchens and farms originates in the West Bank. The writer Joshua Brilliant then arrives at his first conclusion:

"That is why Israel opposes transferring control of West Bank water sources to the proposed Arab autonomous administration to be set up according to the Camp David agreements."

Do we really need further evidence and proof that Zionist leaders are determined to deny the Palestinian

people its inalienable right to self-determination and national independence?

128. If they are opposed to a shady, undefined so-called autonomy, then we can understand how much more opposed they are to self-determination and national independence. The writer proceeds to say:

"... but it would be difficult to defend action against the Arab self-governing authority trying to tap more water for local use. Public opinion would not tolerate it. ... The military Government protected Israel's interests by restricting drilling on the western slopes of the hills—but once the autonomous Arab administration takes over, there may not be anyone to protect Israel's interests and guarantee this flow. The new administration will have to provide food and drink for thousands of Palestinian refugees expected to return to the West Bank."

129. One can here immediately deduce that consequently the Palestinians should not be permitted to return. And that is a denial of the inalienable right to return. According to writer Brilliant, the return of only 100,000 Palestinians—what he describes as those who fled during the Six-Day War—will pose a serious threat, Council resolution 237 (1967) notwithstanding. Or are we expected to pay the high price of return and learn how to survive without water and without food?

130. In the same article it is further stated that the water-supply problem cannot be solved on the scientific level and a solution will have to be sought on the political level. Apparently some Israelis suggested a joint authority to control water. But Water Commissioner Meir Ben Meir thinks that Israel must retain sole control over water resources. And this Meir is supported in the Knesset by a number of members from all parties. They maintain that joint control would be worthless if West Bankers—that is our new name; I think that we Palestinians are classified as West Bankers—still needed water for drinking and growing food.

131. I am certain that the members of the Commission have very good reasons for concern, which in fact prompted their recommendation aimed at the protection of important natural resources, and my delegation hopes that the Council will heed it. We trust that the Commission will also be requested to consider measures aimed at investigating the matter of water resources with a view to ensuring the protection of those important natural resources of the territories under occupation. We believe that the most effective protection, if not the only effective protection, is the withdrawal of the forces of occupation and the termination of the illegal occupation, which is a prerequisite for the free exercise of the inalienable rights of the liberated Palestinian people and a prerequisite for peace.

132. The report of the Commission takes special care to deal with the question of Jerusalem. On 1 February

The Jerusalem Post published an article Judging by the three-columns-wide title the gravity and seriousness of the situation be really alarmed. The title of the article cites recent wave of vandalism. Clergy and national backing for Christian rights in Christians from all over Palestine, from the Mediterranean Sea to the River Jordan, since the events prompted the issuance of an appeal to Christians in Palestine say they are motivated by

"an exclusivist view of the character of Jerusalem and it is therefore opportune that the Christian community, in all its presence in Jerusalem as of right, a footing with the other two great mono-

"The impression is persistent and persistent in the Christian community that they have so far failed to exhaust all means open to them to curb such manifestations is not infrequently felt and said with the community that the perpetrators of such acts are given a relative impunity".

133. As was to be expected, the Zionist group of zealots. We cannot but recognize the exercise of religious rights has already been on with the ratification of Israeli Law which penalizes those endeavouring to convert to their religion. We Christians consider it a violation of our religion and our religious rights to endeavour to convert to Christianity. The concept of Christianity, as preached by modern political racist Zionism, Theologians provide the answer. Herzl referred to the Messiah, our Redeemer, as the boy from Nazareth who sowed hatred in the world. We really have to believe it when we see vandalism against Christian shrines is the work of a group of zealots? The Israeli police say they will continue to do their best to suppress vandalism but "find it extremely difficult to find those specifically responsible".

134. The particular concern of the report related in paragraph 9 of its report is the West Bank. The annex is of particular significance in the consensus among the Christian churches that

"the question of Jerusalem is not only a question of protection of the Holy Places; it is linked with living faiths and communities in the Holy City".

Holiness is not only in the shrines but it is in the worshippers.

135. The fate of the Islamic shrines is a matter of fact, it is much worse

last the Mission of Jordan addressed to the Secretary-General a letter [S/13732] expressing the deep concern of the Government of Jordan over

"the Israeli continuous measures to demolish historical Islamic places and evacuate Arab inhabitants, owing to extensive excavations inside the walls of the Old City of Jerusalem".

I wish to add that, as a result of the collapse of buildings adjacent to Al-Haram Al-Sharif, Al-Aqsa Mosque, 3,000 Palestinian Arabs living in that area of Jerusalem will be forced out of their homes. You see, the construction in the Old City of Jerusalem has a domino pattern; one house depends on the next house as a buttress, so, if one house is demolished, it stands to reason that the other houses will follow suit. And that is why we believe that the collapse of the Al-Mu'aqit building cannot be considered in isolation.

136. The Zionist plan to eliminate Moslem shrines that is being talked about is, we know, the implementation of the sick and twisted desire of the founder of Zionism, Herzl. In his memoirs, Herzl writes:

"If we were to own Jerusalem, one day, before my death, and if I am able to do anything, then I shall remove from it everything which is not sacred to the Jews, and shall burn antiquities which have been there for centuries."

That is the premise on which Zionism stands.

137. Herzl died without seeing his dream and desire realized, but his followers have not failed him. This is exactly what they are doing, and here I wish to call on those who of late have expressed their deep concern about the future of Islam and the Moslems to be conscious of this reality: Zionism is the enemy of all religions, including Judaism. This is one aspect of the Zionist philosophy, here, in particular with regard to Christianity and Islam; and the Zionists have been implementing their anti-Christian and anti-Moslem plans in a very concrete way.

138. Let us have a look at what they have done in Jerusalem. Since 11 June 1967—that is, immediately after the occupation of Jerusalem—the Zionists started to demolish the Maghrabi Quarter adjacent to Al-Haram Al-Sharif—that is, on the south west side of it—and the Maghrabi Quarter was the property of the Moslem pilgrims who came from north-west Africa. We usually refer to it as the Jewish Quarter, but property-wise it belonged to those good Moslem pilgrims who came from north-west Africa and needed a refuge near Al-Haram Al-Sharif. By April 1968, almost 5,000 Moslems had been evicted from their homes and the Moslem *Waqf* property was confiscated, exactly 595 buildings.

139. There is sufficient evidence to prove that the Zionist plan to force the evacuation of the Palestinian

Arabs, both Moslems and Christians, from Jerusalem and to demolish the historic buildings in the Old City is under way. Excavations started in 1968 alongside the western wall of Al-Haram Al-Sharif constitute a real threat to the sacred shrine, a threat whose first symptoms appear in the fate of the Al-Mu'aqit building. The Security Council and the General Assembly have on several occasions condemned Israeli violations and destruction of heritage, but Israel still pursues its contempt and implements its designs in more than one way, thanks to the financial and moral support it gets from the Government of the United States.

140. The report also refers to settlements. It is clear that even the United States Administration, press and public opinion could no longer maintain a black-out on events in the occupied Palestinian territories, and that the truth had to be divulged, albeit in part. According to *The New York Times* of 13 February, Hodding Carter, the State Department spokesman, said on 12 February: "The implications of this decision are serious and far-reaching and the United States is seriously concerned about them". He was commenting on the Israeli Cabinet's decision to support in principle settlement by Jews in the Arab city of Hebron or Al-Khalil. He further said:

"Any steps such as the moving of Israeli settlers into the city of Hebron would be a step backwards in the peace process and could well have serious consequences for the autonomy negotiations.

"An influx of Jews into Hebron would damage the confidence of the parties, particularly the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, in the peace process because it raises a basic question of Israel's commitment to full autonomy."

141. Well, I am glad to note here that the State Department is really concerned over the feelings of the Palestinians, but I am not really that glad that they are concerned only about Palestinians under occupation. They should be concerned about Palestinians everywhere.

142. In his statement the State Department spokesman just missed saying something that would have been more relevant. If I may express an opinion, he should have said, "Israel's violations and contempt constitute a serious threat to international peace and security" and that "Zionist Israel cannot coexist with peace".

143. *The Washington Post* is definitely more informed and better versed in the Zionist *modus operandi*. On 12 February, *The Washington Post* commented:

"Some Israelis still try to treat Jewish settlement in the West Bank as an issue with two sides: so let's argue it out, but meanwhile let's not allow it to get in the way of more important questions. But you have to be pretty stupid to swallow that line. There is no more important question. Jewish settlements

are regarded everywhere, and most of all by the settlers themselves, as Israel's way to establish its permanent control, leading eventually to outright annexation."

144. This is exactly what the Palestinians, the Arabs and the rest of the world have been calling attention to for a long time. This is creeping annexation, annexation which prompts one to ask: Will the insatiable greed of the Zionists ever be satisfied? *The Washington Post* admits that this pattern of creeping annexation was not exactly a "first" under the Begin Government. It was the Labour Government that began the settlements in the territories occupied since 1967, but again it was the Zionist movement that began the process of colonization in Palestine almost 60 years ago. Then it was not labelled "return to the promised land"; it was not labelled "the right of Jews to settle in the land"; it was soundly and clearly labelled "colonization".

145. *The New York Times*, better describing this creeping expansion and annexation, carried the title "Israel takes another West Bank bite". For those of us who know the Bible, it was that bite that drove Adam and Eve out of Paradise. Its editorial of 13 February exposed this pattern. I quote:

"Under cover of the Camp David accords and East-West tensions, Israel continues to change the legal and demographic conditions in the West Bank. By one ruse after another, Jews are encroaching upon the region's Arabs, adding to the 'archeological' and 'army' camps with newly requisitioned or purchased rural lands and now with claims to ancestral homes inside hostile Arab cities".

It is something to note here that even *The New York Times* admits that Israel is making the best use of the so-called Camp David accords; it is just a vehicle for Israel to attain its ends, call it the Camp David accords or anything you want. But sincerity is not there; peace is not there. *The New York Times* editorial exposes the Zionist *modus operandi*:

"As in the latest move into urban Hebron, the Israelis are careful never to create a clear focus for objection. New policies are adopted, but not immediately acted upon; new rules are labelled tentative, then kept indefinitely; laws are observed, but then bent out of shape."

146. Does not this pattern ring a bell: the annexation of the Sudeten land, the Anschluss, the Munich pact, the aggression against Poland and its occupation? This is the Zionist movement which started with claims supported by Balfour's Government: a home, a national home, a State in all Palestine, aggression and occupation "blessed" by the Washington pact of March 1979. Did I say the Washington pact or the Munich pact? It does not matter; it is all the same

—preceded by accords, ambiguous to some, accords labelled the Camp David framework for peace. And now, a new offensive—Jerusalem, Kafr Qaddum, Hebron—or Al-Khalil—and let us not forget that all these acts received the blessing of the United States Government, despite verbal denouncements. So it was not at all accidental that the Commission reached the following conclusions. I refer to paragraphs 45 to 47 of its report:

"In the period since it submitted its first report to the Security Council, the Commission has detected no evidence of any basic positive change in Israel's policy with regard to the construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories under occupation, particularly in the West Bank of Jordan. On the contrary, the Commission is of the view that that policy has largely contributed to a deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories and that it is incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area.

"In complete disregard of United Nations resolutions and Security Council decisions, Israel is still pursuing its systematic and relentless process of colonization of the occupied territories. This is evidenced by the stated policy of constructing additional settlements in the most viable parts of the West Bank and by the expansion of others already in existence, as well as the long-term planning of still more settlements.

"The methods used by the occupation authorities to seize the lands needed for the construction or expansion of settlements are those already referred to by the Commission in its first report."

When the Commission made its report, it had factual evidence and it could not have been more objective in reaching its conclusions. But let us consider the mandate of the Commission.

147. On 22 March 1979 the Council adopted resolution 446 (1979) which established a commission to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. In the same resolution, the Council determined that the policy of Israel in establishing settlements in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 had no legal validity and constituted a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Council, furthermore, called once more upon Israel, as the occupying Power, to abide scrupulously by the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, to rescind its previous measures and to desist from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status and geographical nature and materially affecting the demographic composition of the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and, in particular, not to transfer parts of its own civilian population into the occupied Arab territories.

148. But what did Israel do? It just reviewed its position and authorized in principle what has been described as Jewish settlement in Hebron and other territories. My delegation is convinced that the Commission had precisely those plans in mind when it submitted its reports. But despite the Council resolution, the Cabinet of Zionist Israel announced that decision supporting what is described as the right of Jews to live in the occupied Palestinian town of Al-Khalil (Hebron). According to Yitzhak Zamir, Israel's Attorney-General, that was basically a political decision. A good friend, Ezer Weizman—he is not my friend, but somebody's friend—declared: "We have not returned to the city of the Patriarchs in order to displace the Arab inhabitants. We have returned to it and we shall remain there, because we were there in most periods of the past and because it is our right to live in this area, a right which is rooted in our religious and national heritage."

149. But the facts prove the contrary. Some Palestinian inhabitants in Hebron were forced out of their homes. A collective punishment, reminiscent of Nazi Germany's methods and brutality against occupied cities and towns, was imposed on the city, including a very long curfew, for 11 days. What is really ironic is the justification for imposing the curfew. *The Jerusalem Post* reported that a spokesman for the military Government told the press that "the curfew applied only to Arabs in order to protect them from attacks by Jews". How pious! How considerate! Sixty thousand Palestinian Arabs are caged in for 11 days, the economy of the town is paralysed and, instead of the atrocities of the invaders and aggressors being prevented, the victim is caged in. That is again the work of a twisted and sick mind. But after all, I did say the atrocity was reminiscent of Nazi acts.

150. Why all these acts? Why the curfew? A mercenary soldier of occupation was killed by the people under alien domination. In all other countries, that would have been considered an act of legitimate resistance. All the people who have been liberated or who were in a war know that a soldier of foreign occupation is a target and that they have the legitimate right to eliminate him. But that cost the city of Hebron so much.

151. And even the Carter Administration condemned Israel for its decision to support settlement in Hebron. I say "even" there. That reaction by the United States did not please Israel's Ambassador-designate to Egypt. Ambassador Elihu Ben-Elissar denounced the Carter Administration and declared, "I deny any right to any foreign Power to intervene in our policy of settlement". He described that as a basic, inherent right. I really do not know whether this is the road to peace. Even the would-be Ambassador has condemned the third party in the pact, the Munich—I mean the Washington—pact.

152. But concerning the Jewish presence in Hebron, we all know that the Jews have lived in Hebron for

hundreds of years. They lived peaceably with their Arab neighbours. But nobody ever wondered why there was a massacre in 1929. It was because then the Zionists used the Jews in order to establish their sovereignty in the country and to throw out the indigenous population. It was not something inherent in the heart of the Arab that he wanted to kill his Jewish neighbour. The Arab had to do it in self-defence because he realized that the Zionist plan was to eliminate him. And the Zionist plan has not been changed since.

153. The Mayor of Hebron—I am grateful to the Council for inviting him—according to *The Jerusalem Post* said, concerning the return of Jews, that if they wanted to return, we would not oppose it. But we ask to be allowed to return to our houses and live there, in Jaffa, Ramleh and Jerusalem. I think that one cannot really be selective. Someone thinks he has the right to return, and we too all have the right to return. That is a basic right. We all have the right to return. I do not see why we should discriminate in the implementation of that right.

154. We are grateful to the Secretary-General, who expressed concern at the implications of the Israeli decision, which he felt was likely to exacerbate an already tense situation.

155. Palestinians under occupation were organizing a massive rally to protest against the latest in the series of atrocities. The rally was scheduled to be held on 19 February, but it had to be called off as a result of an announcement that the Israeli military occupation forces would bar the Arab mayors and other political figures from entering Jerusalem. The rally was to be held in Al-Haram Al-Sharif, in Jerusalem. But at the same time Jewish settlers went ahead with plans to install their families in Hebron immediately. It has been reported that one of the buildings marked by the settlers serves now as a girls' school—I think that, consequently, the girls will have to go on the streets—and another building is leased to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. I am certain the Secretary-General will give special and immediate attention to this particular case, in which the Agency is thrown out of a building in order that some aggressive zealots may be settled there.

156. Are these atrocities perpetrated only in Al-Khalil (Hebron)? Not really. The Commission reports serious developments in all the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. It says in paragraph 41 (e) of its report that "Israel is in the process of implementing a plan prepared by the World Zionist Organization".

157. On 13 February the Finance Committee of the Knesset appropriated \$1.3 million for the purchase of land in the occupied territories from private Arab owners. It was reported that during 1979 only 75 acres were purchased. But the Commission informs us that

40,000 dunums of Arab land have been confiscated, mostly in the Nablus, Bethlehem, Beit Shahour and Jerusalem areas. In addition, 1,125 acres of land have been confiscated as a result of a decision of the Israeli cabinet. Let them not insult our intelligence. Seventy-five acres are purchased, but thousands of acres are arbitrarily confiscated. And Council resolutions—446 (1979) and others—notwithstanding, this theft and robbery is given legal status. This is exactly a case of crime being institutionalized.

158. Article 25 of the Charter reads—I really do not have to repeat this, but sometimes some purpose is served by doing so:

“The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.”

Yet with impunity Israel announces that it has rejected resolution 446 (1979) in its entirety. I am sure the Charter prescribes some remedial action to be taken in such a case. Such remedial action was suggested by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which denounced the Zionist and racist policy pursued by Israel and considered that that policy constituted a challenge to world opinion and a flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations and its resolutions and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Conference invited the Security Council to meet its responsibilities by imposing on Israel the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

159. We sincerely hope that the Council will not stop at condemning the atrocities perpetrated and calling for the rescinding of legislation in violation of conventions, Charter principles and resolutions, but that at this crucial moment the Council will designate a time-limit after which the Council will convene to consider the application of the provisions of the Charter. Again, it is possible that the future of the United Nations is at stake, but the Palestinian people is faced with a plan aiming at its annihilation—and we will fight that.

160. Before I conclude, I should like to say that I have just been shown a cablegram from Reuters and Agence France Presse, Jerusalem, which reads as follows:

“The Israeli military authorities said today they have refused permission to Mayor Qawasma of the West Bank town of Hebron to attend today’s Security Council debate on the situation in his town. The Council is due to discuss complaints by Jordan and Morocco over recent Israeli measures in Hebron, where last week the Israeli Government announced there was no impediment to Jewish settlers moving into the town.”

That is democracy; that is freedom of speech; an elected mayor of a town is denied permission to accept

an invitation from the Security Council. And we are told that we are on the road to peace!

161. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

162. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to join previous speakers in extending to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February.

163. The Council is now considering the report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979). My delegation would like, at this point, to express its appreciation to the Chairman of the Commission, Ambassador Mathias of Portugal, and its members. The report is factual, comprehensive and, above all, objective and impartial.

164. The intensification of Israel’s policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories is of great concern for the maintenance of international peace and security in our region. The lucid and well-documented report submitted by the Commission has confirmed the concern which Egypt has been expressing for a number of years now. Suffice it to cite the following conclusion, which appears in paragraph 46 of the report:

“In complete disregard of United Nations resolutions and Security Council decisions, Israel is still pursuing its systematic and relentless process of colonization of the occupied territories. This is evidenced by the stated policy of constructing additional settlements in the most viable parts of the West Bank and by the expansion of others already in existence, as well as the long-term planning of still more settlements.”

165. The Israeli policy has been, as representatives are well aware, the subject of thorough examination and profound study by the Council. It will be recalled that Egypt, in May 1976 and again in October of the same year, requested the convening of the Council to consider this matter. The Council subsequently reached a consensus on 11 November 1976 [*1969th meeting*], in which it expressed its grave concern over the serious situation in the occupied Arab territories as a result of continued Israeli occupation, and deplored the failure of Israel to show any regard for the resolutions adopted by the Council and the General Assembly in this connection.

166. When Israel persisted with its policy, notwithstanding the unanimous decision of the Council, Egypt requested the inclusion of an item on the agenda of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. The item was entitled “Recent illegal Israeli measures in the occupied Arab territories designed to change

the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of those territories in contravention of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of . . . the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and of United Nations resolutions . . .". Under that item the General Assembly adopted resolution 32/5, which has been reiterated by the Assembly at every session since then.

167. In all those resolutions, the Assembly determined that all such measures and actions in the Palestinian and other territories occupied since 1967 had no legal validity and called upon Israel to comply strictly with its international obligations. We note with regret that Israel has not heeded the injunctions contained in the relevant United Nations resolutions. The number of Israeli settlements has consistently increased. The universal condemnation of those measures has had no effect whatsoever on Israel's policy. The necessity to terminate such illegal practices is often heard from within Israeli society itself, but regrettably to no avail.

168. It was therefore a welcome development when the Council adopted its resolution 446 (1979). The original mandate of the Commission "to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem" was carefully drafted by the Council to encompass all the relevant dimensions of the situation in the occupied territories. It was our earnest hope that Israel would reconsider and extend its co-operation to the Commission and allow its members to discharge their mandate and visit the occupied territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem.

169. The Commission contacted my Government, among other concerned parties, to determine its views and collect information about the Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories. Egypt promised to spare no effort to facilitate the fulfilment of its mandate. The visit of the Commission to Egypt was useful and constructive. Besides meeting government officials, the Commission interviewed public figures and witnesses, including Palestinians. Furthermore, my Government provided the Commission with a detailed report and a precise map containing all available information on the Israeli settlements in the Golan Heights, the West Bank, Gaza and the Sinai. The results of that visit are contained in the first report of the Commission, in which it was stated that Egypt condemned the Israeli settlement policy and insisted that all settlements should be removed. The Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs informed the Commission that that had been achieved in the case of the settlements established in the Sinai and that, for its part, Egypt would endeavour to have them removed from all the Arab territories, including Arab Jerusalem which is an integral part of the West Bank. It was reiterated again by the Minister of State to the Chairman of the Commission at their meeting during the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

170. Egypt has carefully studied the report. We support the conclusions and endorse the recommendations therein. I wish to emphasize in particular paragraphs 54 and 56, on the measures to be adopted by the Council with regard to the establishment of settlements and with respect to the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem.

171. Egypt is committed to striving for the achievement of a comprehensive, just and durable peace in the Middle East and for the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. We therefore hope that Israel's policy will be consistent with the efforts to achieve peace.

172. The latest decision of the Israeli Government to allow its citizens to settle in the surroundings of the Arab City of Al-Khalil has created a serious obstacle. My Government views that decision with the utmost concern. We underline the gravity of such measures and consider Israel's latest decision a noticeable escalation in its settlement policy in occupied Palestinian territories. This illegal policy clearly violates the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, as provided in resolution 242 (1967), which Israel is under a legal obligation to implement. It contravenes also the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. My Government's position on this latest Israeli decision was stated in the letter that I addressed to the Secretary-General on 14 February [S/13795]. In that letter it was stated, *inter alia*, that the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mr. Mostafa Khalil, had stressed that Israel's policy:

"Increases tension in the area and poses a threat to its security;

". . .

"Conflicts with the Camp David agreements in letter and spirit and affects the prospects of a successful conclusion of current efforts to establish full autonomy in the West Bank and Gaza towards a just solution of the Palestinian question;"

173. In conclusion, I should like to state that it is the firm conviction of my Government that the Council should act in conformity with the Commission's recommendations and that the Council's decisions should be promptly and fully implemented.

174. Mr. ESSAAFI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation is seriously concerned at the fact that the Mayor of Al-Khalil has been refused permission to come here to participate in the discussions on the item entitled "The situation in the occupied Arab territories". In view of the invitation extended to him to be present at our discussions, I hope that a request will be sent to the local authorities asking them to allow the Mayor to visit the United Nations in New York to take part in the Council's debate. That request could be sent either by you, Mr. President, or the Secretary-General.

175. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): If there is no objection, it is my intention, in consultation with the Secretary-General, and in accordance with existing practice, to take certain steps.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

² *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, 1980, Supplement No. 3, chap. XXVI, sect. A, resolution 1 (XXXVI).

³ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).