

UNITED NATIONS



**SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

UN LIBRARY

NOV 18 1986

UN/DA COLLECTION

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

2201st MEETING: 26 FEBRUARY 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2201)	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.

2201st MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 26 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/2201)

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 4.05 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*): In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2199th and 2200th meetings, I invite the representative of Jordan to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber. I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table. I invite the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestin-

ian People to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Bouzarbia (Algeria), Mr. Roa-Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Filali (Morocco), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mrs. Nguyen Ngoc Dung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table and 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.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Afghanistan in which he requests 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 that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahak (Afghanistan) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

4. Mrs. NGUYEN NGOC DUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to thank you sincerely, Mr. President, as well as the members of the Council, for giving me this opportunity to express my Government's views on this important question. I would like to take this opportunity to say how happy we are to see the Council presided over this month by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, a socialist country that has deservedly won the esteem and respect of peoples throughout the world by its policy of peace and its outstanding achievements for the well-being of its citizens, a country with which Viet Nam has long-

standing brotherly relations of co-operation and friendship. We are convinced that with his well-known diplomatic talents, his devotion and his wisdom, he will make an important contribution to the search for solutions to sensitive international problems as he discharges his difficult task in the Council.

5. The problem now before the Council is hardly new. For more than 13 years it has been one of the most important topics discussed by the Council, the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations. Regrettably, however, while the number of relevant resolutions and declarations that have been adopted continues to increase yearly, there has been no change in "the situation in the occupied Arab territories". On the contrary, this situation is now deteriorating, with the adoption by the Israeli authorities of new measures of colonization, as they pursue their policy of settlement in occupied Palestinian towns, particularly Al-Khalil.

6. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) on the positive role they have played, and in particular on their second report they submitted to the Council in December 1979 [S/13679]. We thank them for their praiseworthy efforts to compile the information that enables us to follow the development of the situation, despite enormous difficulties arising from the lack of co-operation by the Israeli party.

7. We listened with great attention to the important statements made at the last two meetings by the representatives of Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization, as well as the statements made by the Chairman of the Islamic Group, the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group as well as those of the many colleagues who have already spoken. We share their deep concern at the serious deterioration of the situation in the occupied Arab territories caused by the arrogant policy of the Israeli authorities, who stubbornly pursue their plan to tighten their grip on the occupied Arab territories, in flagrant violation of international law, world public opinion and the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

8. This policy of colonization, consisting of systematically implanting tens of thousands of Israelis in territories usurped from Palestinians, took a new turn with the decision adopted on 10 February by the Council of Ministers of Israel to permit Jews to settle in the town of Al-Khalil. The Israeli Minister of Education, moreover, has undertaken the construction of 1,000 housing units in Kiryat Arba, on additional land confiscated from the Palestinian population of that region.

9. That decision by the Zionist authorities demonstrates once again their stubborn pursuit of the policy

of final annexation of the illegally occupied territories and of expropriation of the property and lands of the Palestinian population, all the while using every means in their power to change the legal status, the geographical character and the demographic composition of the territories they are occupying. That is further evidence of the hypocrisy of the Israeli authorities, who constantly preach their so-called policy of peace and proclaim their goodwill in regard to the achievement of a final solution to the Middle East problem.

10. World public opinion is witnessing with concern the tension now prevailing in Al-Khalil between the Palestinian and Jewish communities; there is particular concern about the possibility of acts of violence being committed in response to provocative acts by Israel in that region. This state of tension in Al-Khalil is spreading at an alarming rate to all the other occupied Arab territories. Moreover, there is information from various sources that Israel intends to pursue between now and 1983 a plan to settle 27,000 Jewish families, for which a budget of 54 billion Israeli pounds will be allocated. It has been emphasized in the many documents on the Middle East problem adopted by all the bodies of United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and other international forums that the Zionist occupation and usurpation of Palestine and the rights of its people are the very core of the conflict in the Middle East. Thus, these acts of defiance committed by Israel, aided and abetted by the United States, are serious obstacles to the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

11. My Government joins many others in vigorously condemning Israel's absolute scorn for the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in particular Council resolutions 338 (1973) and 452 (1979) and General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX), 33/28 and 34/65, and we demand that Israel put an end to this policy by immediately removing the existing settlements.

12. In the Political Declaration adopted by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Havana,

"The Conference invited the Security Council to meet its responsibilities by imposing on Israel the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. The Heads of State or Government participating in the Conference affirmed their commitment, in concert with all peace-loving States and forces, to the adoption of all measures, within the United Nations and in particular in the Security Council, to confront the continuing challenge by Israel. These measures should include the application of all necessary sanctions against Israel . . . [and] study [of] the measures to be taken against countries that support the Zionist racist régime."¹

13. When Israel once again is shamelessly challenging the international community and continuing to impose its military occupation by terror and racist oppression, flouting the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, threatening ever more seriously peace and security in that region of the world, the Vietnamese delegation reaffirms its unswerving and unreversed support for the cause of the Palestinian and Arab peoples in their struggle for the liberation of their occupied territories and for their inalienable national rights of self-determination, sovereignty and territorial integrity. We firmly support their legitimate demands for the immediate and complete return by Israel of the territories it has been occupying by force, and we resolutely support the right of the Palestinian people to return to the land of its birth to found a Palestinian State on the territory of its homeland.

14. In particular, we appreciate the recommendation submitted to the Council by the Commission that it adopt effective and urgent measures to prevail on Israel to cease the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories and to dismantle the existing ones.

15. My delegation hopes that the Council will shoulder its responsibility to serve the cause of justice and peace and adopt urgent measures in consonance with the legitimate demands of the Arab peoples, in particular those of Jordan and Palestine, whose representatives have made overwhelmingly convincing statements at these meetings.

16. Mr. AHSAN (Bangladesh): For the third time in less than a year, we are meeting to consider the grave provocations carried out by Israel in the occupied Arab territories in total disregard and defiance of the Council's resolutions and decisions. My delegation cannot but express its deepest concern at the deteriorating situation and the grave dangers inherent therein.

17. Recent ruthless and inhuman actions and the unleashing of wanton terror and destruction on the peaceful unarmed population of the Palestinian city of Al-Khalil (Hebron) by the Israeli authorities deserve universal condemnation. The Moslems around the world cannot but view the desecration of the Great Mosque, the Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi, as a deliberate affront. Those are yet more examples of atrocities being committed by the Israeli occupation forces on the Palestinian people. We deplore Israel's refusal to allow the Mayor of Al-Khalil (Hebron) to appear before the Council at its invitation.

18. The Council has before it the latest report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) and charged with examining the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. The facts elaborated therein constitute nothing less than an outright indictment of

Israel. The evidence has also been corroborated by impartial outside sources and even by official statements and records of the highest authorities inside Israel itself. I take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation, to express our appreciation to Ambassador Mathias and the other members of the Commission for the objectivity, dedication and competence with which they have discharged their responsibilities.

19. The facts are indeed appalling. They fall clearly into a pattern of cumulative evidence documented over more than a dozen years of illegal occupation of those lands. They establish beyond all doubt that Israel, by whatever means possible, is bent on changing the legal and cultural status, as well as the demographic and geographical character, of those lands. Thus Israel continues its policy of expulsion, deportation, displacement and transfer of local Arab inhabitants. Confiscation and expropriation of Arab property and other more covert property transactions continue unabated. Mass arrests, curfews, administrative detention, ill-treatment, harassment, intimidation and reprisals are regular occurrences. Long-term plans to exploit the natural resources, particularly the water table of the West Bank and other scarce resources, are now well under way and constitute an even more dangerous element of deprivation.

20. The most blatant aspect of Israel's policy is deliberate encouragement of the establishment of agricultural, industrial, archaeological and residential settlements. The ultimate aim cannot but be the establishment of thousands of Israeli immigrants and the permanent annexation of occupied Arab territories. Proof positive of this policy is now acknowledged by virtually all sources, including the closest allies of Israel. The methods used by the occupation authorities to seize lands needed for the construction or expansion of settlements, directly or through subterfuge, have been graphically spelt out in the reports of the Commission and more recently by news media in the United States. The Council must proceed beyond the reiteration of general principles to the adoption of more concrete action in the face of Israel's non-compliance with and rejection and continued defiance of its decisions.

21. Bangladesh strongly condemns the continuation of Israel's illegal military occupation and systematic deprivation of the inalienable national and human rights of the Arab people. We reject Israeli plans and actions to annex those occupied territories by insidious accretion and direct colonization. The Council must adopt effective measures to prevail upon Israel to abandon the establishment of more Jewish settlements and to dismantle those already existing or under construction. Effective measures must also be taken to ensure the protection from Israeli exploitation and expropriation of the vital and scarce natural resources of the territories under illegal occupation.

22. My delegation believes that, given the increasing deterioration in the situation of the occupied Arab territories and the direct threat to peace in the region, as well as to international peace and security, the Council must continue to keep this question under constant review.
23. Bangladesh's position on the question of the Holy City of Jerusalem has been placed on record time and again. The Council must demand that Israel implement fully the resolutions it has adopted on this question since 1967 and desist from taking any measures that would change the religious and historical status of the Holy City.
24. Bangladesh is committed to striving for a comprehensive, lasting and honourable peace in the Middle East, a peace based on justice which demands the undoing of acts contrary to international law, a peace predicated on the norms and principles enshrined in the Charter and the full exercise of fundamental human rights. To that end, Bangladesh has consistently supported a settlement that would ensure the evacuation by Israel of all territories occupied since 1967, the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and a State of their own in their own homeland, and the restoration of the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem under Arab sovereignty.
25. Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): Once again the Security Council has been convened to consider yet another threat to international peace and security resulting from the Israeli policy of intensifying the colonization of Arab territories by force of arms.
26. Serious developments are occurring in the Arab lands which were occupied by Israel in the 1967 Middle East war. For over 13 years now, the occupying Israeli forces have systematically and relentlessly consolidated their illegal military occupation in the West Bank, the Golan Heights of the Syrian Arab Republic and Gaza. Even more ominous developments include the frantic attempts of the ruling circles to legitimize their conquest by turning it into permanent annexation within the so-called Greater Israel. Official Israeli spokesmen are at pains to stake fraudulent claims to the occupied areas on dubious religious grounds. That propagandist attempt to change the facts of history cannot and will not deceive the international community.
27. The reports of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) are a living monument, as they expose all the facts about Israeli practices in, and master plans for, the occupied Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem.
28. It is evident that the Palestinians, who are the legitimate owners of the land, remain undaunted in their resolve to regain their land. Recent instances of resistance to occupation, for example, have occurred in the heart of the occupied West Bank, in the Al-Khalil (Hebron) area and elsewhere, where the unarmed Palestinians continue to challenge the Israeli military occupiers, who are armed to the teeth by certain Powers represented in the Council.
29. History has shown that no amount of repression can kill man's determination to regain his cherished freedom and the dignity of human rights. It is indeed timely for all nations which uphold human rights to support the cause of the Palestinian people, which has been dispossessed for over three decades.
30. Instead of heeding the voice of conciliation, Israeli spokesmen remain defiant of the Council. Israel is continuing to seize and confiscate more and more Arab lands. Unsuspecting Jewish people from all over the world are being lured, through open invitations, to settle in a foreign land which belongs to Palestinians. In Zambia's view, any policy founded on race and ethnicity is doomed to failure. By the same token, all policies of imperialism and expansionism have negative consequences for their originators. We implore the overzealous rulers of Israel to change their policy and master the lessons of history.
31. In my delegation's view, the problem of illegal Israeli settlements in occupied territories is intricately interlinked with the overall Middle East crisis. This problem is even further inflaming tensions in that volatile region of the Middle East.
32. What the Israelis are doing in the occupied territories is to dispossess the Palestinian people of their fundamental rights. In addition to planting Jewish communities in Arab territories illegally, the colonists are exploiting private property, land and natural resources and diverting vital water supplies of the area.
33. Since the issue of how to restore all the rights of the Palestinian people is at the core of the Middle East problem, there can be no peace in the area if the right of the Palestinians to return and establish a homeland is denied. What Israel is doing in the occupied territories is a total negation of the fundamental norms of international law. All the members of the Council should therefore unequivocally state to Israel that the seizure of foreign lands by force of arms is totally inadmissible. This is the time for all those States which are represented in the Council to speak out in defence of international law and the integrity of the Council, for they are at stake in this case.
34. If Israel and its allies want peace, as they profess, their colonization of Arab lands is not the road to peace. Peace by duress is no peace; it is illusory peace.
35. The Israeli settlement policy in occupied territories is a euphemism for modern colonization in the last third of the twentieth century. Stated simply, Israel is consolidating the colonization of Arab territories. Zambia categorically rejects all forms of colo-

nialism, old or modern, on any pretext. Colonialism in all its forms must be liquidated. Exaggerated concerns about security are no justification for any country to commit acts of aggression against other States or other peoples. Israel should not be allowed to advance the dangerous notion that its boundaries are elastic and shifting. In addition, as long as Israel continues to play the role of colonizer and ally of racist South Africa, it should not expect anything less than total condemnation from all freedom-loving peoples and States.

36. The Council should therefore take all effective enforcement measures under the Charter to ensure that Israel withdraws from the occupied territories without any further delay. By withdrawal we mean the removal of all the oppressive apparatus of Israeli administration, including Israeli military and paramilitary machinery, and the demolition of all the settlements. My country cannot accept the establishment of bantustans anywhere, including in the occupied Arab territories.

37. Finally, I wish to thank the Council for having elected Zambia to serve on the Commission. I wish also to pay a particular tribute to the Chairman of our Commission, my friend Ambassador Mathias of Portugal, and Ambassador de Zavala of Bolivia, with whom we have worked most cordially and harmoniously in the Commission in the cause of peace in the Middle East. We continue to devote a great deal of attention to the problem of the Middle East in the hope of contributing to a solution of that problem. Zambia pledges to do its part in the maintenance of international peace and security in the world.

38. Mr. HUSSON (France) (*interpretation from French*): We are meeting once again to examine the situation in the occupied Arab territories. By its resolutions 446 (1979) and 452 (1979) the Council entrusted a Commission composed of three of its members with the task of examining the situation resulting from the presence of Israeli settlements in those territories. The second report drawn up by that Commission, which was circulated to us in December, has been carefully studied by the French authorities. I should like to take this opportunity to convey to the members of the Commission, Mr. Mathias, Mr. de Zavala and Mr. Mutukwa, the thanks of my delegation for the exemplary manner in which they discharged the functions entrusted to them. I should also like to congratulate Mr. Mathias on the objectivity and discernment which he displayed in presenting the report [2199th meeting].

39. However, we must note once again that the Commission, in spite of its efforts, was not successful in obtaining the co-operation and assistance of the Israeli authorities in the performance of its task. We can only regret that it was in this way deprived of information which could have been of the greatest usefulness to all. The conclusions in the report are

such as to substantiate the grave concern which many of us feel. The members of the Commission state in the report that there has been:

“ . . . 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”.
[S/13679, para. 45.]

40. As we have repeatedly stressed, the attitude of Israel towards those territories constitutes a violation of the provisions of international conventions and, in particular, of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949.² The creation or enlargement of settlements is contrary to the norms of international law, whereby, I would remind members, the occupying Power is obliged to preserve the demographic, economic and cultural nature of the occupied areas and must refrain from any interference in the life of those areas which goes beyond the normal needs of administration. The statements recently made by the Israeli authorities in favour of the colonization in Hebron are, in this regard, particularly alarming. Similarly, the decision just taken by those authorities to prevent the Mayor of Hebron from coming to New York for the Council debate appears profoundly regrettable.

41. Acts of that kind can only give rise to tension between the occupying Power and the inhabitants of the occupied territories. In this context, we can only urge that all parties display restraint and moderation, because the maintenance of such a situation can only jeopardize even further the chances of an overall settlement of the Middle East conflict by peaceful means, an overall settlement to which all the peoples of the region and the whole international community aspire.

42. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Security Council has on many occasions considered the question of the situation in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories. In this regard, the Council adopted resolutions 446 (1979) and 452 (1979), condemning Israel for illegally establishing settlements in its occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and demanding that Israel cease all its acts aimed at changing the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. However, defying the unanimous condemnation of the international community, the Israeli authorities have consistently refused to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Recently, the Israeli authorities have gone so far as to make another wanton decision to establish settlements in the Arab city of Al-Khalil (Hebron) on the West Bank of the Jordan, thus further arousing the strong condemnation of Arab countries and world public opinion.

43. The decision to establish settlements in the city of Al-Khalil is only one of a series of flagrant provocations by the Israeli authorities against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. During the past few months the Israeli authorities have adopted decisions to confiscate large tracts of private Arab land in order to expand settlements in the West Bank. They have also adopted another decision to encourage Israeli citizens to purchase land in the occupied West Bank and Gaza, and have planned to build 46 new settlements in the occupied Arab territories by the end of 1983. Furthermore, in defiance of the legitimate rights of the people of the area, they have intensified their control and monopoly over almost all the water resources of the area. What is more, the Israeli occupation authorities have constantly resorted to force against the Palestinians in the city of Al-Khalil and its vicinity on the West Bank of the Jordan and have indulged in deliberate provocations to prevent the local inhabitants from carrying out their religious activities. Meanwhile, they have repeatedly declared that they would not make any concession on the question of Palestine and would oppose any efforts to establish a State of Palestine. By their recent statements and acts, the Israeli authorities have made it abundantly clear that their policy of aggression to perpetuate their occupation of Arab territories has not changed at all and that they are still most adamant in their position on the question of Palestine.

44. As everyone knows, the West Bank of the Jordan, Gaza and some other areas are Arab territories forcibly occupied by Israel by means of wars of aggression. Israel's attempts to legalize and perpetuate its occupation of these territories by establishing settlements and purchasing land there will be of no avail. This can only show that the Israeli authorities are still dreaming of occupying Arab territories for ever and preventing the Palestinian people from regaining their homeland and their national rights. However, the Arab people will eventually recover their own territories and the Palestinian people regain their own national rights. The criminal acts committed by the Israeli authorities can only arouse further indignation and will encourage the Arab people to struggle, so that the day will come when the Arab people regain their national rights and recover their lost territories.

45. The crux of the Israeli-Arab conflict lies in Israel's occupation of Arab territories and the question of Palestine. We have always held that the untold sufferings of the Arab and Palestinian peoples in the occupied territories are solely the result of the Israeli policies of aggression and expansion and the rivalry between the super-Powers in the region. Therefore, in order to resolve the question of the Middle East, it is imperative firmly to do away with super-Power intervention and sabotage, firmly to oppose Israel's policies of aggression and expansion, to recover the occupied Arab territories and realise the national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to

return to their homeland and establish their own State. We sincerely hope that all parties in the Arab world will strengthen their unity against the common enemy so as to strive for an early final victory.

46. In our view, the Council should uphold justice and adopt a resolution strongly condemning Israel for its crimes of aggression and expansion, adopting practical and effective measures to stop the criminal acts being committed by Israel in the occupied territories and supporting the Arab and Palestinian peoples in their just struggle.

47. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Soviet Union fully supports the request of the delegation of Jordan and the Islamic Group of States for the urgent convening of the Security Council to consider the question of the situation in the occupied Arab territories. We share the view of those States that, as a result of the brutal measures that the Israeli occupying forces have been applying against the unarmed inhabitants of those territories, an extremely serious and dangerous situation has arisen, and that danger is growing and worsening.

48. The report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) is, we believe, an objective one, and we can only thank the members of the Commission—the representatives of Portugal, Zambia and Bolivia—who prepared this report—for the impeccable work they have done.

49. Like the delegations of Jordan and other Arab and non-Arab States, the Soviet delegation believes that the Council should take effective measures to put an end to Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, which has been going on for almost 13 years. As has been stressed in the statements of representatives of Arab States, the policy and practices of Israel in the occupied Arab territories represent a constant threat to peace and stability in the explosive Middle East region. And that is a fact that cannot be refuted by anyone.

50. The question of the situation in the Arab territories occupied by Israel has been under consideration by the Security Council, the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations for many years now. Last year alone it was discussed twice in the Council. At that time the Council clearly and unambiguously confirmed the illegitimacy and illegality of the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories and called upon Israel to comply strictly with the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.² In its resolution 446 (1979), the Council established a Commission to examine the situation relating to the settlements in the Arab territories. That Commission has submitted to the Council two very useful and convincing reports.

51. The facts and conclusions contained in those reports have amply demonstrated that Israel is con-

tinuing unflinchingly to disregard all appeals made to it by the Council and all decisions taken on the question of the situation in the occupied territories.

In the Commission's second report it is pointed out, *inter alia*, that:

"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." [S/13679, para. 46.]

The report most emphatically corroborates the view that:

"Israel's policy of settlement, relentlessly pursued in spite of all Security Council decisions and appeals, is incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area and that it is bound to lead to a further deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories" [*ibid.*, para. 51].

52. In this regard our delegation would like to say that not only is the policy of the Government of Israel with regard to the occupied Arab territories incompatible with the desire to establish peace in that region, but its purpose is precisely the opposite—namely to perpetuate the results of the aggression of 1967. That is why it has been carrying out the policy of the gradual annexation of the occupied Arab lands and the expulsion from those lands of the indigenous Arab population; it is thus realizing its long-standing designs and ambitions to create a "Greater Israel". That policy, as is clear to everyone here, can lead only to the maintenance and further intensification of tension both in the occupied territories themselves and in the Middle East region as a whole. It once again serves to expose the assertions of the Israeli leadership and its dollar patrons about so-called peaceful intentions on the part of Tel Aviv and its supposed sincere desire to achieve a just settlement of the conflict with the Arab States.

53. In light of the Commission's conclusions and the facts that have been adduced here by the representatives of Jordan, Syria and the PLO, as well as other Arab States, concerning concrete actions of the Government of Israel with regard to settlement and the taking over of the occupied Arab territories, it has become clearer than ever that the Camp David agreements and the separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty concluded with the active participation of the United States serve only to camouflage the policy pursued by Israel of expansion and aggression against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries.

54. The talks being held by Israel, Egypt and the United States with regard to so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians are an open attempt to prevent the exercise of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, to consolidate

Israel's occupation of the Arab territory it has seized, including the Palestinian lands, and to annex the eastern part of Jerusalem. The facts make it absolutely clear that, since the conclusion of the separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty and the beginning of talks about so-called administrative autonomy, the creation of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, the expulsion of the indigenous population, the seizure of water sources, the building of new roads, and the violation of the elementary rights of the Arab population are all proceeding at an accelerated pace. In the period from April to September 1979 alone, Israel confiscated an additional 230,000 dunums of Arab land, bringing the total to 1,730,000 dunums—that is, 31.4 per cent of the whole territory of the West Bank. Furthermore, nine tenths of all the land seized by the Israelis is private Arab land. Along with this, the Israeli authorities are continuing to deprive the indigenous population of water sources, without which it is impossible not only to engage in agriculture and gardening but even to survive in the occupied lands. For example, it emerges from the Commission's report that Israel is pumping out of artesian wells on the West Bank about 500 million cubic metres of the West Bank water supply, which is 620 million cubic metres annually.

55. The Israeli leaders have over and over again frankly stated that they will never renounce their policy of creating settlements and will not agree to change the status of occupied Arab Jerusalem or permit the creation of an Arab or Palestinian State. In this regard I might remind the Council that on 16 September last year, the Israeli Cabinet took a decision to permit Israelis to acquire land in the occupied West Bank and in the Gaza region. On 28 September last year, the Israeli Cabinet decided to move the Elon Moreh settlement—Qadum—to a new site, a decision the Israeli Supreme Court ruled to be illegal.

56. So quite naturally a question arises here: what would be the meaning, therefore, of the administrative autonomy that the initiators of this design are trying so actively to propagate and in the talks about which they are doing everything they can to include certain Arab countries? If we were to throw out all the verbal baggage and just go to the substance of the matter, the result is that "administrative autonomy" is designed to deprive the Arab people of Palestine for ever of their national and inalienable rights to self-determination and to the creation of their own independent State. Behind the smokescreen of talk and arguments about "administrative autonomy", we find concealed a wholly defined intention on the part of the Israeli authorities to perpetuate the occupation of the Arab lands, to strive for the expulsion of the larger part of the indigenous population and to convert the remaining inhabitants into a landless, homeless source of cheap labour for the Israeli economy in order to ensure the achievement of the expansionist designs of the leaders of Israel. I do not know if this policy can be called

bantustanization, but frankly speaking, something very like it is going on.

57. If Israel can maintain its hold over the Arab territories it seized in June 1967 and pursue its own policy with regard to their population in contravention of generally acknowledged norms of international law it can do so only thanks to the broad and active support extended to it by its protectors. It can continue to defy and disregard the views of the international community only because the Government of the United States—as is clear to everyone—is not only arming Israel with the most modern and most sophisticated types of weaponry which sow death and destruction among tens of thousands of Palestinians, Lebanese, Syrians and other Arabs, but is also constantly blocking action by the Security Council to adopt decisions that would condemn the aggressive expansionist designs of the Israeli leadership and confirm the decisions adopted by the General Assembly with regard to the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

58. In this regard, I should like to quote here what was stated by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, on 18 February this year:

“At the present time in Washington an abundance of speeches are being made which contain assurances to the effect that the United States is the most dedicated friend of Islam and Islamic States. But do they seriously believe that in Islamic countries the constant hostility that was displayed by the initiators of United States foreign policy towards those countries for decades has been forgotten?”

“Who to this very day is maintaining a sharply anti-Arab position on the question of the Arab lands occupied by Israel? Who is creating obstacles to a just Middle East settlement? It is the United States.

“Who is slighting the 4 million Arab inhabitants of Palestine who have been driven out by Israel from their lands and categorically objecting to the exercise of their legitimate right to create their own independent State? It is Washington that is doing this.”

59. With regard to the Arab territories occupied by Israel and Israel's activities in those territories, the position of the Soviet Union is very well known and has been repeatedly set forth in the Council and in the General Assembly. This position has always been and remains that the Soviet Union categorically condemns the policy and practice of the Israeli occupying authorities with regard to the Palestinians and Syrians of the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem. We are against the mass repressions being carried out by the Government of Israel, the suppression of freedom, the oppression and the racial discrimination. We are deeply convinced that an end must be put to these illegal actions, and the sooner the better for peace and for the peaceful existence of Israel itself.

60. A final solution of the problem can be achieved only within the framework of a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East and on the condition that Israel withdraws from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967 and guarantees the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

61. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated and confirmed in deeds its solidarity with the struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, pointed out in this regard that

“Israel can count on a secure existence within the frontiers of 1967 only if it frees and gives up all the Arab lands it has seized since that time and ceases to hinder the exercise of the national rights of the people of Palestine, including its right to create its own independent State.”

62. In so far as concerns the proposals of the representatives of Jordan and the PLO to the effect that the Council should consider the possibility of applying sanctions against Israel pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, the Soviet delegation considers these proposals entirely justified on the basis of the fact that the policy and practices of Israel in the occupied territories are creating a threat not only to peace and security throughout the entire Middle East but also to international peace as a whole.

63. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): The Security Council is once again engaged in a debate on the situation of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories. The debates last year resulted in the establishment of a three-member Commission under resolution 446 (1979). My delegation takes this opportunity to pay a tribute to the members of that Commission, composed of Bolivia, Portugal and Zambia, and to commend their comprehensive and objective report, which attests to the care and diligence the members devoted to their important task. Special mention should be made of the leadership provided by Mr. Mathias of Portugal as Chairman of the Commission.

64. It should be noted that, in resolution 446 (1979), the Council determined that the policy and practices of Israel in establishing settlements in the occupied territories “have no legal validity and constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East”. The Council therefore called on Israel

“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”.

65. The Commission was created to examine the issue of settlements and was requested to submit a report. The first report, contained in document S/13450 and Add.1, was submitted on 12 July 1979. On 20 July, the Council adopted resolution 452 (1979), in which it accepted the Commission's recommendations and requested it to keep under close survey the implementation of that resolution.

66. We should not fail to note in passing that both resolution 446 (1979) and resolution 452 (1979) were adopted with overwhelming support.

67. A second report was submitted by the Commission on 4 December 1979. It was stated therein that since the Commission had submitted its first report, it unfortunately had

“... 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.” [S/13679, para. 45.]

The Commission also reported:

“Israel is still pursuing its systematic and relentless process of colonization of the occupied territories” [ibid., para. 46], in complete disregard of United Nations resolutions and Security Council decisions. It viewed with particular concern the decision by the Israeli Cabinet to allow Israeli citizens and organizations to purchase land in the occupied West Bank and Gaza. It is noteworthy that the Commission concluded that Israel's policy of settlement

“is incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area and that it is bound to lead to a further deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories” [ibid., para. 51].

The Commission also pointed to the “disastrous consequences” which the settlement policy was bound to have on any attempt to reach a peaceful solution in the Middle East.

68. My delegation joins the Commission in calling earnestly upon Israel to make a positive gesture of its own and, before it is too late, to cease the establishment, construction, expansion and planning of settlements in the occupied territories.

69. With regard to Jerusalem, my delegation associates itself with the Commission's recommendation that the Council should urge Israel to implement fully the Council resolutions adopted on that question since 1967,

“and further desist from taking any measures which would change the status of Jerusalem, including the pluralistic and religious dimensions of that Holy City” [ibid., para. 56].

70. It is regrettable that, as Ambassador Mathias said last Friday, speaking as Chairman of the Commission, Israel has refused and continues to refuse to co-operate with the Commission. My delegation agrees with him that it is still not too late to resolve the conflict in the Middle East peacefully, and that it would take, on the part of the peoples of 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” [2199th meeting, para. 28].

71. We have welcomed all positive moves to resolve the long-festering issue of an enduring and just peace in the Middle East, on the assumption that any constructive and favourable movement in the direction of accommodation would constitute a breakthrough in the continuing impasse and serve as the initial stage of a truly comprehensive solution.

72. At a time when momentous events elsewhere threaten world peace and international security, it is unfortunate that the Council is again seized of a hazardous situation in the Middle East, a situation that is part of a problem that remains unresolved. What concerns us specifically at this time is events taking place in connection with Israeli settlements in the Golan Heights, Gaza, the West Bank and the Jordan Valley, including Jerusalem, territories that have been occupied by Israeli forces since 1967.

73. In the view of my delegation, what is happening in the occupied territories is only part of the problem; the larger problem is the fact of the occupation itself. But that, in turn, is again part of a still larger problem: that of restoring a homeland to the Palestinian people and guaranteeing to them their inalienable rights as a people. That is the real problem, which has remained unresolved since the founding of the United Nations. Unless that problem is resolved fully and in a way that is satisfactory to all parties concerned, the United Nations cannot be said to have succeeded in its original mission; unless it is resolved, the world cannot expect to have an enduring peace. Just as after the Second World War the problem was to find and secure a homeland for the Jewish people, for which the Israeli State was founded by the United Nations, the problem today is to find and secure a homeland for the Palestinian people, who have been bereft of their home by history. An even-handed and just approach to the problem of the Middle East requires that we remain seized of the task of finding a permanent homeland for the Palestinian people without a corresponding threat to the Israeli homeland.

74. The position of my Government on the complex problem of the Middle East is clear and unequivocal.

We have from the outset regarded this problem as one of decolonization and since the founding of the United Nations we have supported every effort at decolonization. We never expected decolonization to be an easy process, especially in the Middle East where new forces have arisen within the region that have served to complicate the process of accommodating antagonist interests. But the difficulty should not deter us from proceeding with the task. Unfortunately, at the present stage the process is incomplete, for there are still peoples in that area which have not had the opportunity of regaining their full identity and their homeland. My Government has either supported or subscribed to every resolution or decision adopted to complete the process.

75. In 1948 resolution 194 (III) of the General Assembly called for the return of the Palestinian refugees or their just compensation, and established the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine. After the wars in 1967 and 1973 the Philippines gave its full support to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), both of which called for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, the termination of all states of belligerency and a settlement of the problem of those who had left their homes as a result of the hostilities. My delegation believes that those two resolutions are basic to the solution of all aspects of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the region.

76. The Philippines, in an effort to contribute to the just and peaceful solution of the question of the Middle East, at the core of which is the Palestinian question, has supported the General Assembly resolutions on these questions, in particular resolutions 3236 (XXIX), 3375 (XXX) 31/20, 32/40 A, 33/28, 34/29, 34/52 and 34/65 A, C and D.

77. On 29 November 1979, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, the Philippine Ministry of Foreign Affairs sponsored a Palestinian exhibit at the Philippine International Convention Centre in Manila and also showed on Philippine television the United Nations film, "Palestinians Do Have Rights." On the same occasion, my President, Mr. Ferdinand E. Marcos, sent a message to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Médoune Fall, affirming my Government's support for the just cause of the Palestinian people.

78. To my delegation and to my Government the burden of all these resolutions and decisions is clear. It is to complete a process that was begun by the dissolution of empires after the Second World War, when previously colonized peoples began to assert their identities and to assume their lawful place under the sun. History has left us an unsolved problem in this respect in the Middle East, which we must continually seek to rectify. Not to do so would be a betrayal of the principles upon which the United Nations is

founded. But as the number of unfulfilled resolutions and decisions attests, we seem to have reached an impasse. This does not augur well for the peace and the well-being of the peoples of the Middle East, a region that at present faces other crises as well. This does not augur well for the peace and the well-being of the international community either.

79. As we go about the present task, it is well to remind all parties concerned that the issue is pre-eminently one of the rights of a people to exist as a people, a right that all mankind has asserted to be inalienable and one that we are all trying to uphold everywhere in all parts of the world. Justice demands that if we are to claim this right for ourselves, we cannot in all conscience deny it to others.

80. Mr. MILLS (Jamaica): Nearly one year ago the Council met to consider the situation in the occupied Arab territories. The debate underlined the deep and virtually universal concern at the developments in those territories, and in particular the continuing practice on the part of the Israeli authorities of establishing settlements in the area, to the great detriment of the Palestinian peoples. Members of this Council, and others who spoke in that debate, expressed in varying ways their deep concern at, and strong objection to, the actions of the Israeli authorities in this matter. The Council decided by way of its resolution 446 (1979) to establish a commission to examine the situation relating to the settlements in the Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

81. In July last year the Council again met, to consider the first report of the Commission [*S/13450 and Add.1*]. That report, its conclusions and recommendations, and the manner in which the members of the Commission carried out their task were all the subject of commendation and endorsement by the Council.

82. My delegation has carefully examined the second report of the Commission [*S/13679*].

83. We find it appropriate that the Council should again give due consideration to this vital issue. Such consideration aptly reflects the lasting and deep concern of the international community in respect of a situation which undoubtedly poses a direct and continuing threat to the peace, security and stability of the Middle East.

84. Once again the Commission approached its task with seriousness and objectivity, and as a consequence was able to produce a report which, in our view, is factual, comprehensive and forthright. My delegation expresses its sincere appreciation to the Chairman of the Commission, Ambassador Mathias of Portugal, and his colleagues of Bolivia and Zambia, for the commendable manner in which they accomplished their difficult task and for the invaluable reports they have produced.

85. It is regrettable, however, to note that the persistent efforts made by the Commission to solicit the co-operation and assistance of all Governments and concerned parties, in accordance with its mandate, once more met with a negative response from the Government of Israel. This defiant attitude, coming in the wake of a sincere plea by the Commission to the Government of Israel to reconsider its position towards the Commission, must be deplored. Despite this constraint, the Commission proceeded with its work, in an effort to achieve a factual and balanced picture.

86. The current report testified to the grave and potentially explosive situation prevailing in the occupied territories as a direct consequence of the continuing practice by the occupying Power of promoting and accelerating Jewish settlements in the areas concerned. The evidence presented by the Commission substantiates these charges, which are corroborated by various press reports relating to a process aptly described by some as a form of creeping annexation. The report states in paragraph 41 (a):

"It has come to light that in the last few months additional private Arab land totalling over 40,000 dunums . . . has been confiscated by Israeli occupation authorities for the purpose of expanding settlements in the West Bank, mostly the Nablus, Bethlehem, Beit Shahour and Jerusalem areas."

87. The Commission took note of the decisions by the Israeli Cabinet on 16 September and 14 October last year to permit Israeli citizens to purchase lands in the occupied West Bank and Gaza, and to expand seven existing settlements in the occupied West Bank.

88. Perhaps, however, the most serious information provided by the Commission on the magnitude of Israel's settlement policy is contained in paragraph 41 (e):

"According to information received from various sources, Israel is in the process of implementing a plan prepared by the World Zionist Organization which calls for the building of 46 new settlements in the years 1979-1983. The Commission is calling attention to this project inasmuch as some of the settlements appearing in the plan are already under construction."

Reference to this plan appeared in a recent *New York Times* article, which further stated that it has as its objective the construction of 20 new settlements in the next year, and over the next five years would eventually involve a projected figure of 58,000 families, amounting to a total of 200,000 people.

89. Particularly disquieting have been the current news accounts of the resolution by the Israeli Cabinet earlier this month supporting in principle the right of Jews to settle in the city of Al-Khalil (Hebron). The

Secretary-General in commenting on this matter has stated that such a decision was likely to exacerbate an already tense situation and to hamper efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

90. My delegation regrets that the request that appropriate arrangements be made to enable the Mayor of Al-Khalil to attend these meetings of the Council has not been granted by the Israeli authorities.

91. The Commission's report takes due account of the action being taken in respect of water resources in the occupied territories and of the long-term adverse implications for the Palestinian inhabitants. Citing a study made available to it, the Commission states in paragraph 42 of its report:

" . . . Israel pumps away some 500 million cubic metres of the West Bank's total annual supply of 620 million cubic metres by means of artesian wells drilled within its 1948 borders. The traditional water sources, such as wells and springs, are also being depleted through the use of modern drilling equipment to drain off water for the Israeli settlements in the occupied areas. As the water level continues to drop because of excessive Israeli consumption, the Israeli authorities have resorted to restrictive measures on the use of water by the Arab inhabitants."

92. My delegation also takes note of the report's strong recommendation that the Council urge the Government of Israel to implement fully the Council's resolutions on the question of Jerusalem adopted from 1967, and, further, desist from taking any measures which would change the status of Jerusalem, including the pluralistic and religious dimensions of that Holy City.

93. The findings of the Commission and the evidence that it has presented make it clear that a continued policy which encourages settlements in the occupied territories is most provocative, seriously aggravates the problem of the Middle East, is counter-productive and detrimental to the attainment of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the area. In fully endorsing the Commission's recommendations, my delegation urges the Government of Israel to cease the establishment, construction, expansion and planning of settlements in the occupied territories. On this issue the Council and the international community have agreed that the establishment of these settlements is contrary to international law and to the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. It poses a grave threat to the prospects for peace and stability in the Middle East. Above all, it represents a gross injustice to the Palestinian people, whose inalienable rights, including their right to establish an independent homeland, have been recognized and endorsed by the overwhelming majority of Member States.

94. The achievement of the just aims of the Palestinian people, the establishment of lasting peace in

the Middle East and the ensuring of the right of all States in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries—all of these demand the immediate cessation of the policy and practice relating to the establishment of settlements.

95. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): The second report of the Commission set up under resolution 446 (1979) is in many ways similar to its predecessor. The similarities include its reflection of the continued Israeli refusal either to co-operate with the Commission or to allow it into the occupied territories. In the view of my Government, every Member State, having subscribed to the Charter, ought to facilitate the operations of a body established by a Security Council resolution. We also deeply regret that the Israeli authorities have prevented the Mayor of Hebron from coming to New York to participate in this debate.

96. My Government is once again broadly content with the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission's report. Despite the difficulties that the members of the Commission have encountered in obtaining firsthand information, the result of their researches tallies largely with the results of our own.

97. It seems to my delegation that there are two separate, though interrelated, aspects of Israeli policy in the occupied territories, both of which give rise to serious concern. The first is the illegality of their settlement policy. There is no doubt of this. As the voting patterns of this Organization clearly show, the Israeli Government is in a minority of one in believing that its settlement policy on occupied Arab territory is not in direct contravention of international law. We deplore its decision last year to allow Israeli citizens to buy land in the occupied territories. Moreover, we consider the Israeli claim to ultimate sovereignty over those territories to be incompatible with resolution 242 (1967) and the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. It follows, therefore, that we view recent Israeli decisions concerning the City of Hebron to be both provocative and ill-conceived.

98. The second aspect of concern is the effect of these Israeli policies on the search for a comprehensive peace in the area, a concept to which the whole international community, including Israel, is committed. We are at a loss to understand how settlement policies, measures such as those endorsed for Hebron and claims of sovereignty over the occupied territories, can possibly be compatible with Israel's declared desire for an overall peace. On the contrary, these policies constitute serious and unacceptable obstacles to the pursuit of that goal.

99. Earlier speakers have mentioned other problems arising from the Israeli administration of the occupied territories. I repeat that, in our view, the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 confers specific responsibilities

on the occupying Power and expressly prohibits any unilateral modification of the demographic and physical nature of the territories in question. We continue to oppose any such unilateral modifications, including those to the status of Jerusalem and the Holy Places.

100. In conclusion, I acknowledge with respect the endeavours of the members of the Commission and congratulate them on the tenor and contents of their report. Its balance reflects their creditable efforts to be as objective and uncontentious as possible in commenting on a highly complicated and emotive subject.

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

102. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Algerian delegation, I should like to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. You represent a country which has always vigorously supported just causes throughout the world. Hence we are gratified that it is under your guidance that the Council is once more considering a problem of which our Organization has been seized practically from its inception. My satisfaction and that of my delegation stem first and foremost from our conviction that the skills you have already demonstrated on numerous occasions will ensure that the debate in the Council will be imbued with wisdom and equity.

103. I wish also to take this opportunity to convey the congratulations of the Algerian delegation to your predecessor, Mr. Leprette, the representative of France who during the month of January guided the work of the Council with a tact and ability which won him the respect of all, a respect which was particularly well deserved because the undoubtedly complex international situation called for as much skill as cool-headedness.

104. In a month, to the very day, the Washington agreement will be one year old. The hope of restoring peace, reconciliation and harmony with which they were pleased to deck it out has not stood the test of time or of facts. It could not be otherwise. Because of their fundamental components, the Camp David agreements, as well as the Washington agreement, which set the seal of legal approval on them, never faced the fact that the Palestinian situation was the essence of the crisis and that, hence, any comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem was contingent on that problem's being settled first.

105. Within this context, I should like to emphasize the serious concern and deep misgivings of my country with regard to the situation prevailing in the territories occupied by Israel. The recent establishment of Israeli settlements in the centre of the Arab city of

Al-Khalil and the reprisals, of evil memory, have once again brought a train of humiliation, plunder and distress for the Palestinian people. It is timely to recall that the constant repression of which the Arab population is victim is coupled with an extremely grave danger, that of the progressive, concerted and planned liquidation of the Palestinian people. Resort to methods of widespread reprisal at the smallest sign of resistance to the occupier is becoming ever more frequent, as has been demonstrated by the acts of brutality committed last year against the population of Halhoul, which was literally suffocated and starved, and that of Nablus, whose misfortune was to have protested against the establishment of new settlements on its ancestral lands.

106. Israel's behaviour in the occupied Arab territories is the result of its undertaking to make usurpation and aggression systematically profitable. It is therefore clear that the final objective pursued by Israel throughout all these exactions, as it attempts to tear the Arabs from their homes once and for all, is the seizure of their property in order to establish new settlements.

107. However scattered and fragmented, the following statistics amply demonstrate the nature of that behaviour and that undertaking, against which my delegation protests bitterly and with indignation. I must remind the international community here of the fragmentary nature of these statistics, which is due basically to the obstructionist attitude adopted by Israel *vis-à-vis* all the commissions of inquiry of the United Nations: first, since June 1967 hundreds of thousands of settlers have been installed by force in the occupied Arab territories on the pretext of the need to guarantee so-called secure borders; secondly, more than 120 existing settlements have been expanded; thirdly, it is common knowledge that sizable sums have been allocated to finance the establishment of new settlements; fourthly, the Zionist leaders no longer conceal their intentions, having already announced that the number of settlements should double over the next five years; fifthly, one need only read the report of the Commission entrusted with examining the situation relating to these settlements to learn that 27 per cent of the occupied West Bank of Jordan has been purely and simply confiscated by Israel in order to take in 90,000 new settlers; sixthly, recently the Zionist leaders decided that it is now legal to acquire the property of Arabs, which, in our eyes, constitutes an invitation to continue plundering that cannot be clearer.

108. The chain of events in the Middle East and the consequent heightening of tension in the area have led my Government to the following three conclusions.

109. First, the events in Al-Khalil are neither spontaneous nor fortuitous, and they are not isolated either. The events in Al-Khalil are not spontaneous because, first and foremost, they are part and parcel

of this carefully-thought-out process of increasing settlements which has taken on a new dimension and increased at an unparalleled rate since the conclusion of the Camp David and Washington agreements. Neither are the events in Al-Khalil fortuitous and, therefore, they shed new light on the plots that have been hatched at the regional level by the parties to these agreements and on the alliances and newly established geopolitical balances. Lastly, the lukewarm reactions of these parties and their faint protests which, for the heeds of the cause, are accompanied by a thin veneer of indignation, demonstrate, if there were still need, that these facts are well founded.

110. Secondly, for my Government, the process of intensifying the settlement of the occupied Arab territories is neither a violation of the Camp David and Washington agreements, as some would have us believe, nor a unilateral distortion of their clauses; rather, it flows logically from them. It is scarcely necessary to recall here that one of the basic assumptions, one of the fundamental hypotheses, underlying these agreements point in the direction, if not of radically liquidating the Palestinian situation, at least of stripping it of its national dimension and concealing the claims inherent in it to a dual right of self-determination and independence. It is from the very source of their intellectual approach and the methodology used to construct these assumptions and hypotheses that the latter draw their sustenance.

111. Thirdly, all these facts support my Government in its traditional position. My delegation remains convinced that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East crisis and that no solution of this problem is possible that does not take into consideration the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. These rights entail: first, the restoration to the Palestinian people of all its national rights; secondly, the realization of the right of self-determination and the right of return, as well as the right of the Palestinian people to a national existence in its homeland; thirdly, the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing with all other parties; and fourthly, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force as well as the complete and speedy evacuation of all territories occupied by Israel.

112. The events in Al-Khalil, when placed within the overall geopolitical context of the region, require that the community of nations consider—and indeed draw the necessary conclusions from—the obvious failure of the sort of partial settlement provided for by the Camp David and Washington agreements. It is therefore high time for the Council once again to consider the question of Palestine, taking all its aspects into account and placing it within its natural context, namely, the Middle East, where it occupies a decisive place since the security and stability of that region depend on it.

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

114. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving my delegation an opportunity to express its views before the Council, which is considering the deteriorating situation in the occupied Arab territories. I also wish to extend to you and to your country our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February and to wish you every success in your endeavours.

115. My delegation would also like to express its deep appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Leprette of France, for the wise and skilful manner in which he guided the important work of the Council during the month of January.

116. The Council has before it the report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), which was given the mandate "to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem". My delegation wishes to pay a sincere tribute to the members of the Commission, who have investigated in great detail the facts of the situation in the occupied Arab lands. It is deplorable that the Commission was not allowed by the Israeli authorities to visit the occupied Arab territories for further verification of its findings. The Israeli authorities have also turned down the Council's invitation to the Mayor of Al-Khalil to address it. Those refusals are yet further affronts to the Council on the part of Israel and they once again underline the utter disregard which the Israeli aggressors have repeatedly shown for the decisions of the international community.

117. The Commission's report fully exposes the Israeli policy of expansion and Israel's intention of making its aggression against Palestine permanent. The Israeli Cabinet's decision to create settlements in the heart of the occupied city of Al-Khalil is the latest manifestation of this ruthless policy, which until recently was confined to establishing Jewish settlements on Arab lands outside the occupied Arab cities.

118. The Commission's report and the statement by the representatives of Jordan and Syria and the observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization [2199th and 2200th meetings] have given details of the extent of the colonization already carried out by Israel in the occupied West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights. We have been informed that Israel has confiscated almost 31.4 per cent of the total area of the West Bank and is stepping up its planting of alien populations in that area. The Israeli authorities have already set up 87 illegal settlements on the West Bank, of which 18 are in or around the Holy City of Jerusalem. The

Israeli authorities, in pursuit of their ambition, are now diverting the scarce water resources available in the West Bank to sustain and consolidate those settlements. This policy is a calculated scheme to uproot the remnants of the Palestinian people from their homeland and to change the demographic pattern of the ancient land of Palestine.

119. I need hardly reiterate the position of the Government of Pakistan, which has on many occasions declared its firm condemnation of the Israeli policy of expansionism and Israel's sacrilegious acts in the occupied Arab territories. Palestine belongs to the Palestinians. They have inhabited that sacred land since time immemorial and have developed there a unique and distinctive culture enriching human civilization. The Israeli attempts to change the character of that land is, therefore, in our opinion, a crime against history and mankind. It is a matter of grave concern that Israel is stubbornly pursuing its policy of usurpation of the occupied Arab lands in the face of the universal condemnation by the international community, which recognizes the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to establish its sovereign independent State in its homeland.

120. Israel's decision to violate the Arab character of the ancient city of Al-Khalil and its continuing efforts to confiscate Arab property and land in the occupied Arab territories have evoked criticism even among those that have long purported to side with Israel. They have been compelled to describe it as "creeping annexation". They have admitted that those Jewish settlements are regarded everywhere, and above all by the settlers themselves, as Israel's way of trying to establish its permanent control leading to outright annexation of the occupied territories.

121. What has been described as creeping annexation reveals the ugly features of Israeli aggression and makes a mockery of Israel's professed commitment to peace and to the so-called "full autonomy" for the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza promised in the Camp David agreements. This policy of creeping annexation, advanced on one or another pretext, the collective punishments imposed on the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and the insidious schemes to deprive them of a vital resource for their livelihood jeopardize the very survival of the Palestinian people. The international community can no longer remain a passive witness to this continuing tragedy.

122. It is recognized that Israel's policy of settling alien populations in the heart of Palestine—which is a flagrant violation of the Charter, the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant Geneva Conventions—has led to increased tension and conflict in the occupied Arab territories. It will inevitably lead to more conflict and more bloodshed. It is a dangerous situation and a threat to the peace and security of the entire region and the whole world.

123. The Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, must therefore unequivocally respond to this danger and commit its full authority and prestige to checking Israel's relentless pursuit of its expansionist designs. It must reiterate its strong condemnation of the Israeli policy of establishing settlements in the occupied Arab territories, especially its latest decision to implant alien population in the Arab city of Al-Khalil. The Council must once again condemn Zionist disregard for the sanctity of holy shrines and Zionist interference with religious freedom and practices. The Council must declare null and void all the steps taken by the Israeli authorities to annex the occupied Arab territories by changing their demographic pattern or their institutional structure or status. The Council must also resolutely condemn the confiscation and expropriation of private and public Arab property by Israel and the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the occupied Arab territories. It must declare its complete solidarity with the people of Palestine, which has been the victim of relentless persecution for more than a generation.

124. Past experience has shown that condemnation alone has failed to dissuade the Israeli authorities from the pursuit of their ambitions. The Council should therefore proceed to do everything within its means in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter in order to compel Israel to reverse the course of its expansionist policy and to enforce its compliance with the decisions contained in the resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly, especially resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which mandate an Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories and categorically reject the acquisition of territory by force.

125. In conclusion, let me say that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be realized unless Israel withdraws from the occupied Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and unless the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to establish a sovereign independent State in its homeland, are fully restored. The Council must make every endeavour to attain these objectives. Failure to do so will irrevocably erode the authority of the Council and the faith of the peace-loving peoples in its capacity to ensure a world order based on the Charter.

126. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

127. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Yesterday afternoon, I had occasion to draw attention to a spectacle that has manifested itself on numerous occasions in the past and has reduced debates such as this one to the level of a Punch and Judy show. That phenomenon was, of course, the competition between countries within

the same group or bloc fighting with one another and jockeying for position. Today we have been witness to another familiar spectacle that regrettably has the effect of further downgrading the level of the Council's debate.

128. Yesterday, Cuba, the Soviet proxy in the western hemisphere, echoed its master's voice. Today, Viet Nam, one of the Soviet proxies in the eastern hemisphere, popped up to complete the double act with Cuba. Aside from appearing here in the interest of the Soviet Union, the Vietnamese representative is also attempting to divert attention from the continued activities of her country in Cambodia. Indeed, for the Vietnamese representative to speak of "occupied territory" in any form at the present time is the height of hypocrisy.

129. Both Viet Nam's documented use of chemical weapons and its systematic starvation of Cambodia have ravaged that country in a way that can only be defined as genocide. The invasion of Cambodia and its overwhelming condemnation by the General Assembly surely make Viet Nam an honoured and respected participant here. I am certain that the sponsors of this debate take much pride in Viet Nam's support of their position.

130. Algeria's participation in this debate reveals another facet of the childishly competitive nature of the Council's debates. For within the Arab Group, Algeria's relations with Morocco are well known and need no elaboration. Morocco has spoken in this debate, and hence it follows automatically that Algeria must speak in this debate also.

131. Algeria is also in the throes of other rivalries in North Africa. Recent reports document the "Algerian connection" in the attack made by Libya on 27 January against the Tunisian city of Gafsa. *Jeune Afrique* of 20 February describes how that attack, in which 40 were killed, was staged from Algeria. For Algeria to preach to the Council on ways to bring peace to our region is nothing short of farcical.

132. We have also been lectured by the representative of Bangladesh. It is fortunate that we do not model our relations with Arabs in Judaea and Samaria on the example set by that State, for perhaps no country represented on the Council today has a more abysmal record than Bangladesh. I will not dwell on that record here, but would refer representatives to a devastating report by the Minority Rights Group of London entitled *The Biharis in Bangladesh*, which details the plight of the remnants of that community, twice the victims of the most brutal slaughter and massacre.

133. For those who remain unconvinced, Amnesty International has evidence in one of its recent reports of the "inhuman conditions" in which between 10,000 and 15,000 political prisoners are still held,

the majority without trial. It also reports on hundreds of executions which took place in October 1977 either without trial or after summary military trials without any possibility of appeal. According to Amnesty International, "trials before military tribunals in Bangladesh fall far short of internationally accepted standards".

134. But since Bangladesh spoke here, naturally Pakistan had to speak. One of the more interesting phenomena one encounters at the United Nations is the behaviour of representatives whose Governments have just abolished the last vestiges of democracy in their own country, where presidents and other leading politicians are shot and hanged, where elections are just not held, where rule by military diktat and military tribunals has been imposed without the right of appeal to civil courts, where freedom of speech, freedom of the press and every other personal freedom and human right are suppressed. Those representatives invariably take it upon themselves to preach unto others. One such country is Pakistan.

135. One would have thought that, given recent developments in the Middle East, a country like Pakistan would have concluded that discretion was the better part of valour. After all, Pakistan has only recently woken up to what the real threat to international peace and security is in the region and whence it comes. In response to this recent and very real threat to its sovereignty, one would think that Pakistan would concentrate its efforts on its own defence. However, even now it is aiding the aggressive designs of others.

136. For years, Pakistan has been giving vocal and other support to the Arab rejectionist States. Moreover, this month it came to light that Pakistan is training PLO terrorists to fly. On 5 February, Reuters in Damascus conveyed a press report to this effect from the press agency run by the PLO in Lebanon. The report quoted a statement made last summer by Ahmed Jibril, one of Yasser Arafat's henchmen, to the effect that the PLO was training terrorists who were prepared to crash their aircraft on suicide missions against civilian centres in Israel. Pakistan is the country training those pilots, and thus stands condemned for aiding and abetting the PLO and the rejectionist Arab States in their belligerent campaign.

137. Ever since the appointment of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), we have maintained that its biased mandate was such that its conclusions were predetermined. Everybody who listened here today to the intemperate, even wild, statement of the representative of Zambia, a member of that Commission and a self-appointed historian, cannot but have the most serious reservations about the work of a Commission which counts the representative of Zambia among its members.

138. I was not surprised at the statement of the Soviet representative, since his country's role has long

been overtly designed to torpedo the current peace efforts and to destabilize the region as a whole. The Soviet Union, which has played a key role in every outbreak of violence in the Middle East in the last quarter of a century, continues to supply the "rejectionist front" with huge quantities of the most sophisticated Soviet weapons.

139. For almost 30 years, Israel has drawn attention, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, to Soviet methods of subversion in the Middle East. For almost three decades, the Soviet Union has been fuelling the flames of conflict in the region. It has pumped arms into the area and continues to do so. Despite protestations to the contrary, the Soviet Union has no interest in peace in the Middle East, for it sees its interests best served by the perpetuation of instability in our region. As a result, the Soviet Union is now making every effort to torpedo the ongoing peace process in the Middle East and to prevent the achievement of a durable settlement of at least one of the many conflicts in the volatile region in which Israel is located.

140. At long last many States in the Middle East are coming to recognize the sinister role that the Soviet Union is playing in our region. This realization has come about only gradually because of an earlier Soviet preference for operating through puppets and proxies. Those puppets have in some cases been Arab régimes linked to the Soviet Union ideologically or by so-called "treaties of friendship" and equipped by the infiltration of massive quantities of Soviet arms and matériel sometimes under the benign supervision of Soviet advisers and instructors. The proxies have been the ones used by the Soviet Union in other parts of the world, most conspicuously the Cubans. In the Middle East as elsewhere, Cuba has been ever ready to act on behalf of the Soviet Union.

141. Just as in 1939 the Soviet Union collaborated with the Nazis, who vainly sought to destroy the Jewish people, so today it uses as its proxy the terrorist PLO, which is bent on destroying the Jewish State of Israel. The Soviet Union is giving the PLO terrorists its fullest backing, both militarily and politically. The evidence is overwhelming. Let me just give the Council a few examples. On 17 September 1979, the *New York Post* revealed the following:

"As many as 1,000 Palestinians have undergone indoctrination and training in either Russian military or KGB camps . . . The Russians supply the money, weapons, training, communications and propaganda to the best and brightest of the Palestinian army's officers and officials. And what they learn is passed on to the troops and quickly applied to the Palestinians' war against the Israelis".

In a documentary film entitled "The Russian Connection", screened recently on American and Canadian television, a PLO defector stated that "The PLO

is no longer a revolutionary organization, but a terrorist group manipulated by the Russians for their own purposes". But that, of course, is the statement of a traitor, and Mr. Kharlamov will dismiss it as such.

142. The Soviet Union's support for the PLO is quickly translated into outrageous facts. It is Soviet-made Kalashnikov sub-machine guns that are used by PLO terrorists in their murder raids and incursions against Israeli civilians, including women and children. It is Soviet-made Katyusha rockets in PLO use that hit peaceful Israeli villages in the northern part of my country and threaten the lives of our civilians. We have just, in the course of this month, come across irrefutable evidence that the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries, in a conscious attempt to exacerbate the gravity of the situation in the Middle East, have begun on the unprecedented and extremely reckless path of supplying T-34 tanks directly to PLO terrorists in the Sidon region in southern Lebanon. We also have evidence that those terrorists are receiving training in tank warfare in Syria and in Soviet-bloc countries.

143. Let me put my point in the simplest possible terms. The time has come for the Soviet Union to stop lecturing others about principles concerning the non-use of force in international relations and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States—not to mention principles concerning fundamental human rights and freedoms. Instead, the time has surely come for the Soviet Union to admit its own blatant acts of aggression, in Afghanistan and elsewhere; to face up to its own gross violations of all the principles it claims to stand for; and to set its own house in order.

144. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

145. Mr. MANSOURI (Syrian Arab Republic): I thank you, Mr. President, for giving me this opportunity to speak once again. I feel that I have to make some points for the sake of clarifying and correcting the record with regard to the false and distorted information which was put before this Council during the debate yesterday and today by the Zionist representative of Israel.

146. There is no doubt that the Council members have become accustomed to the tactics and procedures of the Zionist representative. During every debate in the Council he tries to divert the attention of the members from the main item under discussion, and he talks about different and secondary matters which have nothing at all to do with the discussion.

147. I need not reply to whatever he said about my country's position with regard to Lebanon. We have made that position clear many times in the Security

Council and the General Assembly. Time and again we have stated, *inter alia*, that our forces in Lebanon are part of the Arab deterrent forces agreed upon by the Council of the League of Arab States. The forces are at the disposal of the Lebanese Government.

148. The Zionist representative has time and again tried to fish in troubled waters. He always quotes those irresponsible persons who defect from their Governments for personal reasons. I need not elaborate upon his quotation, as that quotation does not in any way reflect the reality of the situation in Syria. However, I should like to state that the same person whom the Israeli representative quoted, stated the following on the question of the occupied territories:

"The Zionists have skilfully fabricated many other lame excuses to justify their implanting of settlements in Arab territory. They have claimed for themselves a right to a 'homeland', forgetting that their 'homeland' was created at the cost of making another people stateless; they have cried for the right to protect this 'homeland' and to 'secure its borders' by implanting settlements which could function as 'security outposts' against their 'unfriendly' Arab neighbours. That is a shameless distortion of facts." [2124th meeting, para. 63.]

That same person also stated:

"the Zionists have reason to despair. Their ideology, which rests on the twin pillars of racism and colonial expansion, is anachronistic in a world in which and at a time when these beliefs are considered abhorrent and unacceptable. Yet they shut their eyes to this inevitability. They wish to turn back the clock and to drive humankind back to the time when invasions, plunder and the looting of other peoples' lands was the name of the game." [Ibid., para. 76.]

149. The subject under consideration in the Council at this moment is the situation in the occupied territories and that is what the Israeli representative should talk about and try to defend if he has any legal point to defend or justify. Up to now, he has not been able to convince the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights or any others. All have time and again condemned the policy of occupation, expansion, and annexation of the Israeli authorities. The latest condemnation was made by the Commission on Human Rights, which adopted a resolution³ in which it stated that the flagrant violations by Israel of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 were war crimes and an insult to mankind.

150. We feel that it is essential that the Council not be drawn into the discussion of subsidiary matters and not engage in unrelated subjects.

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation

Organization has asked to make a statement in reply. I now call on him.

152. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I am grateful to the representative of the United Kingdom, and I hope he will not mind if I quote a passage from his statement. He said:

“As the voting patterns of this Organization clearly show, the Israeli Government is in a minority of one in believing that its settlement policy on occupied Arab territory is not in direct contravention of international law.” [Para. 97 above.]

I think the British representative has made the question very clear and everybody agrees with him that Israel stands as a minority of one. Israel wants us to believe that the rest of the world is wrong. Of course, I think that it took the world a little while to realize that supporting the Zionist racist movement was wrong from the start.

153. Something was said about the relations of the Palestine Liberation Organization. In as much as Israel stands in a minority of one, we gladly note that the resolution supporting the rights of the Palestinian people and the representation of the PLO received 117 positive votes. We cannot therefore really say that the rest of the world is wrong here.

154. Of course, the PLO does have relations with the world. Chairman Arafat visited Portugal and was received by President Eanes. He visited Spain. He was in Austria and he has been in almost all the countries that have relations with us. We are proud of those relations.

155. Since we have children who are denied the right to live in their homes, who are denied the right to go to school in their own country, who are denied the right to play in the playground next to their home, we are proud to have relations with people who open their universities to us. The Soviet Union, the socialist countries in Europe, China and many other countries have been really humane, taking the position that the Palestinian child should have the opportunity to be educated. As a result, we have the highest standard of education in the Middle East. As a matter of fact, we Palestinians believe that our greatest capital investment is from the shoulders up, that is, what we have in our heads. That is why we educate our children because we should like to have an educated and cultured people, so that when they return to their homes they can be very, very constructive in the positive development of their country.

156. We have young people studying medicine, others studying engineering, and still others studying the humanities. But since we are involved in a war of national liberation, we have boys going to military academies—and not only in the Soviet Union, but in many other countries. Military academies are open to

our children. They are taught the use of arms in a human and just cause; they are taught how to defend their cause so that they can regain their rights. We do not send our children to South Africa for the joint development of nuclear warheads and the joint carrying out of nuclear explosions to threaten humanity.

157. With regard to T-34s—and I have read somewhere that the PLO has denied that it is getting T-34s—someone told me, as a joke, that it would be much better to send them to a museum. The T-34 became so famous during the war that it is now something of great value.

158. We are fighting to restore our rights. But at the same time we are teaching our children how to be human, how to coexist and live together with their neighbours. We are not teaching them how to “spirit across” an indigenous population, as was suggested by Herzl, the founder of Zionism. We are not teaching them how to “thin out” a population, as was suggested by Koenig, the Commissioner of Galilee—indeed, the same kind of suggestion was made by Eichmann: he proposed the “thinning out” of the Jewish population of Vienna. I think that the linkage between the ideologies is very, very clear. Nor are we suggesting that anyone should be treated with “positive segregation”. That kind of suggestion was made by a certain Mr. Sharon, who was the adviser on Arab affairs to Prime Minister Begin. No, we are bringing up a generation with human feelings, a generation that can live together with its neighbours, in peace.

159. We are now dealing with the question of Hebron. The Council has been told at its last two meetings that there was a massacre in Hebron in 1929. Let me go to the records and show exactly what happened in Palestine that led to the 1929 massacre.

160. In 1920 there were riots, and in 1937 the Palestine Royal Commission—we were then under the British Mandate—reported on the underlying causes of those riots. I shall read the following excerpt from that report:

“It appeared on investigation that the causes of the trouble had been “(1) The Arabs’ disappointment at the non-fulfilment of the promises of independence which they believed to have been given them in the war; (2) The Arab’s belief that the Balfour Declaration implied a denial of the right of self-determination, and their fear that the establishment of the National Home would mean a great increase of Jewish immigration and would lead to their economic and political subjection to the Jews.”⁴

Thus, it will be seen that our struggle, as long ago as 1920, was motivated—as admitted by the Royal Commission—by our desire for self-determination.

161. In May 1921 there were other riots. The Chief Justice of Palestine, Sir Thomas Haycraft, who headed the inquiry commission, found that:

“The fundamental cause of the Jaffa riots and the subsequent acts of violence was a feeling among the Arabs of discontent with, and hostility to, the Jews, due to political and economic causes, and connected with Jewish immigration, and with their conception of Zionist policy as derived from Jewish exponents.”⁵

162. This led to a further revolt—and this time it was referred to as a “revolt”, not a “riot”. In 1929 the Churchill Memorandum was issued. It reaffirmed the “national home” policy—in other words, the Balfour Declaration. Palestinian resentment again broke out into violence in August 1929; it was sparked by a dispute over the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, as my colleague from Jordan explained yesterday. A commission headed by Sir Walter Shaw, a retired Chief Justice, investigated that outbreak. In its findings on the causes of the violence, the Shaw Commission noted that if there was in Palestine in August last a widespread feeling of resentment amongst the Arabs at the failure of His Majesty’s Government to grant them some measure of self-government, it is at least probable that this resentment would show itself against the Jews, whose presence in Palestine would be regarded by the Arabs as the obstacle to the fulfilment of their aspirations. The Commission also made the following observation:

“In less than 10 years”—that is, between 1920 and 1929—“three serious attacks have been made by Arabs on Jews. For 80 years before the first of these attacks there is no recorded instance of any similar incidents. It is obvious then that the relations between the two races during the past decade must have differed in some material respects from those which previously obtained. Of this we found ample evidence. The reports of the Military Court and of the local Commission which, in 1920 and in 1921 respectively, inquired into the disturbances of those years, drew attention to the change in the attitude of the Arab population towards the Jews in Palestine. This was borne out by the evidence tendered during our inquiry when representatives of all parties told us that before the War”—that is, before 1914—“the Jews and Arabs lived side by side if not in amity, at least with tolerance, a quality which today is almost unknown in Palestine.”⁶

163. The passages I have quoted from the reports of those Commissions show clearly that there is no inherent hatred in the heart of the Arab for his Semitic brother, the Jew. The conflict started when the Zionist movement clearly showed that its aims and aspirations were the conquest of the country.

164. On another issue I would say this: I carry with me as a souvenir a British passport issued to me when

I was still young. It says, “British Passport, Palestine”. Of course, it contains the words “His Majesty’s High Commissioner for Palestine”, and so forth. But what I want to set forth here is that that passport shows that I was a Palestinian citizen when it was issued to me. I secured this passport for a good reason. I wanted to visit Amman and Amman was in Transjordan. I had to go to the Immigration Department, have a passport issued which reads: “Countries for which this passport is valid: Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq and Transjordan.” I believe somebody knows exactly what I am driving at. But it was not easy to take my passport and go to Transjordan. I needed a visa. Page 7 of my passport reads: “Visa for Transjordan.” So, if anybody wants to ask about Transjordan having its individual identity and Palestine having its individual identity, I think this passport—which is an internationally recognized document—will answer that question.

165. I am sorry to have taken up time, but I thought those points of clarification of history were important.

166. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Jordan has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to make his statement.

167. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): While the Council has been assiduously deliberating on the uncontrollably escalating pace of Israeli colonization of the occupied territories, the Israeli security forces of oppression have been equally diligently and ruthlessly exercising their notorious sadism and brutality against the Palestinian people, who correctly see their existence receding into the twilight with every passing day and are determined to struggle to abort Israel’s ill-disguised deals and plans.

168. Messages from the West Bank confirm that the Al-Khalil (Hebron) 11-day curfew has been imposed in varying degrees upon other towns and villages throughout the length and breadth of the whole of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The reports disclose, for example, that the village of Tammoun Tobas, north of Nablus, whose lands have been confiscated, has been subjected to a curfew for a whole week. A similar curfew was imposed on the Jalazon refugee camp, at Dhaisha, and other towns and villages.

169. I have listened very carefully to the learned, objective and succinct statements of the members of the Council, and there is very little left for me to add. With such a convergence and almost an identity of views among the members of the Council, I feel that any additional pleading on my part would be an inexcusable redundancy, the Israeli diversionary and irrelevant statement notwithstanding.

170. The crux of the problem therefore is primarily, if not solely, the solemn responsibility and obligation of the Council to take whatever practical and effective

measures are available to it under the Charter as the guardian of international peace and security, the rejection of illegitimacy and the blatant violation of international law, the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the right of all peoples to exist and determine their future for themselves.

171. We have heard with profound appreciation and equally deep respect the unanimity, the convergence and even the identity of views of a formidable array of Member States representing all regions of the world. What else can one say? Hardly anything—except to restate the colossal question which our people in their captivity and outside are asking.

172. This question is: if the Council is so unequivocally in agreement about the grave danger that is facing it, what is or should be the cure? It is the moral and legal duty of the Council to throw its weight behind international justice, international legality and international peace by positive action.

173. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to exercise his right of reply. I give him the floor.

174. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Everyone participating in the Council's work, of course, reflects on the purpose of the representative of Israel with regard to the question under discussion.

175. I am not sure which statesman of the last century said: "A real diplomat is not someone who increases the number of his country's enemies, but someone who increases the number of his country's friends". In this regard, I do not want to give an appraisal of the statement made by the representative of Israel; he repeats what his predecessor repeated. From all the verbal baggage he extracts old worn-out ideas and "facts", but he has certainly not increased the number of his country's friends. I do not know where he went to school, I do not know what books he has read, but I have no doubt whatsoever that his head is full of all kinds of verbal rubbish. Today's example convinced me of this. Everybody here in the Council is guilty and even the very discussion of this item is a kind of show, in his view, as he was not afraid to say. Representatives of States have met here empowered to take a serious approach to this question and to assist in the political settlement of a very difficult and very urgent matter—the situation in the occupied Arab territories of Palestine. He did not have a good word for anyone. He spared only my neighbour from the United Kingdom—but, no doubt, there are some circumstances that I cannot explain. But everyone else is bad; everybody else is partial, prejudiced and has some ulterior motive. The only just and innocent party here is the representative of Israel. No one will believe that. He really should have thought the matter over.

176. For three days now we have been considering the question of the extremely dangerous situation in the occupied Arab territories of Palestine. Did he answer a single question put in the course of discussion? No, he just adduced all the old "facts". I shall give an example. He dragged out the tired old of-repeated thesis about the conduct of the Soviet Union on the eve of the Second World War. I repeat: I do not know what books he has been reading or where he was at the time of the war. The peoples of the Soviet Union saw the war. I saw the war myself; I know what it was. I know how our people prepared itself for the Fascist threat—and, furthermore, before anything actually happened with regard to Germany our Government appealed to certain Western States to conclude a military-political alliance. But what was the attitude of those to whom we appealed? They sent a mission in a cargo boat for talks with our leaders—a mission which had no authority to conclude any kind of agreement. That went on for two weeks, although there was a grave threat to our country. We would either fight shoulder to shoulder with other nations to resist fascism or if we could not find any allies, we would neutralize the threat of a fascist invasion of our country by other means. The Soviet Government acted wisely and as a result we found allies in the West which could have been our allies earlier on: Britain, the United States and France, and by our joint efforts, in the end we smashed fascism, we removed the threat of Fascist enslavement of the whole of Europe and the threat of the physical annihilation of the Jews. But to speak of the war victims, the 20 million who lost their lives in the struggle against fascism, as the representative of Israel has just done is to profane their memory. Those victims included Jews, who took part in the war against fascism in our country. He played the old tune, told the old horror stories of anti-Soviet propaganda. But perhaps he is alive today precisely because we won a victory over Fascist Germany.

177. Then the representative of Israel went on to say that the Soviet Union did not have any interest in peace in the Middle East. Well, I do not want to offend him. I should really like to have businesslike relations with him, just as I do with any representative of a Member State, but when this monstrous kind of illogical statement is made, I really cannot remain silent. Which country if not the Soviet Union has the very deepest interest in seeing peace in the Middle East—a durable and stable peace? After all, the Middle East is an area next door to us. We have links to other countries through that region. And which country is still doing everything possible to see that peace is consolidated here? We in the Soviet Union have spared no effort to see that a comprehensive peaceful settlement of the quarrels between Israel and the Arabs is achieved. We proposed holding a conference. If those proposals do not suit Israel, let its representative say so frankly. This is no time for shilly-shallying. Perhaps the Soviet proposals are unacceptable to Israel, then he should explain why. Together with the

United States we agreed to make efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. It is not our fault that the United States was busy with other matters and did not go along with us. There are reasons for that. But the representative of Israel is silent about it, and he knows why he remains silent. Separate agreements do not lead to peace and we cannot support them.

178. The representative of Israel accuses us of helping the Arab peoples. Yes, we help those who want it, we do not impose our help on anyone. We are helping the Arab peoples. This is noble assistance, because it is not designed to help some State to occupy land but to prevent a new attack by Israel on neighbouring Arab States. Let him refute that fact! Everything he and his predecessors have said here was all taken out of the gutter press. But the fact still remains that we are giving assistance only for defensive purposes, to defend the other countries against the aggression on the part of his country and its supporters. The question arises: his country is being given arms valued at billions of dollars. Are they for offensive or for defensive purposes? They are not for defensive purposes but for offensive purposes. We have even seen that in the American press. I repeat, we are helping the Arab peoples but we are not imposing our assistance on anyone. We are helping those peoples who want to defend themselves and consolidate their defences—and that is all. Our assistance was mentioned here by the representative of the PLO.

179. It would be better if the representative of Israel said something about the substance of the matter. What does Israel want? He does not say. Israel is gradually increasing the number of colonial settlements in Palestine and in the Arab countries. A little today; more tomorrow; and some day there will be no Arabs there. The word "bantustanization" was used. Well, that is a very correct term. But the matter evidently goes further: they want to exterminate the Arabs, they want them to move to neighbouring countries so they can declare the whole territory Israeli.

180. Who is threatening whom? Are the Israelis threatening the Arabs or are the Arabs threatening the Israelis? Are the Israelis threatening the Palestinians or are the Palestinians threatening the Israelis? The Israelis have dispersed millions of people throughout the world by pursuing an inhumane policy against them in the occupied Arab territories. If the representative of Israel is going to rely on the Bible as a source for justifying the rights of the Israelis, he is going rather far. Centuries ago, a very wise man said: "When Adam delved, and Eve span, where were then those gentlemen who like to govern countries?" He does not have to go back so far. We could quote a passage from the Bible which shows how the people to whom he refers as "forefathers" acted in regard to conquered cities and peoples. I think the Israelis have inherited their present policy from their "forefathers".

181. I apologize for speaking in such a rambling way, I had not prepared my statement. I just wanted to reply to the questions which were raised here. The representative of Israel accused us of avoiding the questions which were relevant and of interest to this discussion. But it is he and those who support him that have avoided the questions and closed their ears to the valuable statements we have heard, aimed at finding a just and peaceful settlement of the question now before the Council.

182. I think that had the representative of Israel made a positive contribution of some kind, he would have been taking a step forward towards what we all want—a just solution. But if he does not want to do that, the Council must itself find a solution which would force Israel to comply with its decisions and those of the General Assembly.

183. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Bangladesh wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I give him the floor.

184. Mr. R. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): I have hesitated to speak in exercise of the right of reply because this is the obvious and much used vehicle by which Israel seeks to divert attention from the issue at hand.

185. Israel's distorted and false allegations against my country, dredged up periodically from its outdated dossiers, do not deserve a reply. This is not the subject under consideration, as has been repeatedly pointed out. The question at issue is the situation in the occupied Arab territories. There is no more obvious proof of Israel's guilt than its attempts wilfully to obscure this issue and divert attention from it. This is the matter to which Israel must address itself, instead of indulging in indiscriminate and wild attacks against virtually every member of the international community.

186. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Zambia wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I give him the floor.

187. Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): As those who preceded me in exercising the right of reply have stated, it is a great pity that we have been drawn into a situation in which the Israelis wanted us to be.

188. I shall make only a few points. We consider it to be an astonishing and shameless act on the part of the representative of Israel to abuse the privilege of his country's being a Member of the United Nations by delivering a barrage of irrelevant statements whose aim is to divert the Council from its main business. This form of undisguised contempt by the Israeli representative is a manifestation of his country's defiance of and lack of respect for the very institution of the United Nations.

189. I want to inform the representative of Israel that no amount of insult and abuse will ever deter Zambia and its spokesmen from speaking out when principles are at stake. The Israeli colonization of the occupied Arab territories is a form of colonialism. It is domination, it is oppression and it is racism. All these things we categorically reject and condemn.

190. Let me reiterate that Israel would be well advised, together with its representatives, to desist from fighting against history. Israel is indeed swimming against a current. It is attempting to fight the modern tide of freedom and independence.

191. We are aware in southern Africa that Israel has been collaborating for a long time with the racist régime of Pretoria. It is that kind of collaboration with the racist régime of Pretoria that has led to the killing of a number of people in our countries.

192. I shall not engage in the debate about the competence of the Israeli representative to evaluate and assess the contributions of representatives at the United Nations. At least, I shall appeal to him to be decent enough to see that he is not competent to do that. If he continues to engage in abuse, my delegation will look for methods of ensuring that that abuse is put to an end.

193. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

194. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I shall be very brief. As I already stated yesterday, I shall not compete with the logic and originality of Mr. Kharlamov, the well-known biblical scholar, or with his standards of courtesy. I shall not stoop to the low level of his style. If he so wishes, however, we can exchange our respective curricula vitae. Mr. Kharlamov is no doubt an excellent diplomat. He has significantly increased the number of the friends of his country here.

195. Mr. Kharlamov has no need to remind the Jewish people of the events of the Second World War, let alone to try to misrepresent them, into the bargain. As everyone knows, the Jewish people was the primary target of the Nazi hordes before and during the Second World War. Six million Jews, more than one third of my people, perished during the Second World War, the war that broke out in the wake of the treaty that Mr. Kharlamov's country concluded with Nazi Germany. Among those 6 million Jews were 1.5 million children. Moreover, 1.5 million Jews fought in the Allied ranks against the Nazi enemy and thus helped to bring this Organization into being. In case he has forgotten it, let me remind the representative of the Soviet Union that hundreds of thousands of those Jewish soldiers fought in the ranks of the Red Army.

196. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

197. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have not asked to speak to exchange courtesies. Once again, I must say that the approach to this very important question of the history leading up to the Second World War as expressed by the representative of Israel is entirely fallacious. But I do not want to go into this question any further. If he so wishes, I would be ready at another time to talk to him about it and even to give him some reference books to read in addition to those that he has apparently already read.

198. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Pakistan has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

199. Mr. R. KHAN (Pakistan): I do not wish to take up the precious time of the Council and will only address myself briefly to certain unwarranted comments of the Israeli representative.

200. The way the Israeli representative tried to slander almost every country whose representative has spoken in the Council leads one to believe that he considers that Zionist Israel is the only exponent of human values and international morality. Proceeding from the assumption of that belief, which regrettably appears to be correct, it becomes understandable why the Israeli representative does not feel obliged to answer the important questions about which the Council is so deeply concerned. For instance, he does not feel obliged to explain why the Israeli authorities are continuing to expel the Palestinians from their homeland, inhabited by them since time immemorial, and why the Palestinians who are living under occupation are being subjected to unrelenting persecution and are being deprived of their basic human rights. He also does not feel obliged to explain why Israel, as a matter of official policy, subjects the Palestinian camps in Lebanon to indiscriminate and brutal attacks, murdering innocent men, women and children. He also does not feel obliged to explain the wanton Israeli acts of sacrilege in the occupied territories.

201. The representative of what has just been described as a minority of one should seriously ponder on these questions if he cares to understand why Israel stands universally condemned by the international community for its policies, which are colonialist and expansionist in essence.

202. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who has asked to make a statement in reply.

203. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): It is very, very low and mean for the racist Zionist to claim to be the representative of the victims of war. There were millions of people who were victims of the holocaust. I could understand it if one of the leaders of the Warsaw ghetto uprising came here and spoke in the name of those heroes who fought the Nazis. But I cannot understand in any way that someone who is financed partly by the Israeli Bank Leumi, which made its capital from the blood money of the Jews in Europe, should sit here and claim that he speaks on behalf of those victims of nazism. I cannot understand that someone who is dropping bombs and killing Palestinian children should claim to be speaking on behalf of the victims of nazism. I cannot understand that one who belongs to a party that has perpetrated and participated in the crime of Deir Yassin, killing 250 unarmed men, women and children, should come here and claim that he is speaking on behalf of those victims. Enough of that, Sir. The Zionists do not represent the Jews. Let us go further. Someone who signs a treaty, a treaty that is blessed by the United States, that denies almost 4 million Palestinians the right to be a nation and condemns 2 million Palestinians to perpetual exile, cannot really speak as a Jew should speak. He is a Zionist; he is not a Jew.

204. This is an infamous day, a day on which, in Jerusalem, the representative of Sadat has been to deliver his credentials. In Jerusalem, a place that even the United Nations does not recognize as part of the Zionist State, the representative of Sadat goes to deliver his credentials.

205. There are odd things happening. But we are glad that thousands of Egyptians marched in the streets of Cairo today, carrying hundreds of thousands of Palestinian flags in protest. And Reuters has reported

that 40 prominent Egyptians, including two former Vice-Presidents and two former Prime Ministers, have signed a petition calling for a boycott against Israel. The petition was read at a press conference. It said: "We are calling on our fellow citizens to impose a total boycott at all levels in legitimate self-defence". The signatories also included a former Deputy Prime Minister, six former Ministers and a deputy editor-in-chief of the semi-official newspaper *Al-Ahram*.

206. For the Palestinians this is an infamous day. There are 2 million Palestinians living or existing outside Palestinian territory, and by virtue of the treaty that was put into effect today they are condemned to perpetual exile and, what is worse, to perpetual bombardment and shelling by the Zionists. And yet we are here appealed to or talked to and our consciences are aroused about the victims of the holocaust. But what are we facing here? We are facing a holocaust, a planned holocaust, with 4 million Palestinians as the victims.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 130.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

³ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1979, Supplement No. 6*, chap. XXIV, sect. A, resolution 1 A (XXXV).

⁴ *Palestine Royal Commission, Report*, Cmd. 5479, London, H.M. Stationery Office, 1937, part I, chap. III, para. 17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 18.

⁶ *Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929*, Cmd. 3530, London, H.M. Stationery Office, 1930, chap. XIII.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
