

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

NOV 13 1986

UN COLLECTION

# 2208<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 9 APRIL 1980

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2208) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights: Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832); Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855) .....	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.

## 2208th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 9 April 1980, at 11 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Porfirio MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico).

*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/2208)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:  
Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);  
Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

*The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:**

Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);

Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [2204th, 2205th and 2207th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote and I invite the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable

Rights of the Palestinian People and the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take places at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Al-Saffar (Bahrain), Mr. Roa-Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. B. C. Mishra (India), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Ayachi (Morocco), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and Mr. Kane (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Hungary and Yemen in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hollai (Hungary) and Mr. Alaini (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): I should like to express my sincere appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to express my Government's views on the highly important issue on the agenda. It is a special pleasure for us to see you, a most prominent diplomat of a friendly country, in the highly important office of President of the Council, and I am sure that, under your guidance, this body will be able to fulfil its task in a most efficient manner.

5. We have expressed our desire to take part in this debate as a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

6. In the opinion of my Government, the present debate is an extremely important one, because it deals with the real heart of the Middle East problem. One may try to conceal, but cannot deny, the fact that no lasting and stable solution can be reached in the Middle East which does not fully take into account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. There is an international consensus to the effect that the Arab people of Palestine has the inalienable rights to national identity, self-determination and a homeland. Nobody can deny that the Palestinian Arab people has its genuine national liberation movement, recognized by the majority of the members of the League of Arab States, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the non-aligned countries, the whole socialist world, and a number of Western European countries as well.

7. At its twenty-ninth session, the General Assembly recognized the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Assembly established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. That Committee made its recommendations four years ago for the first time and called for the establishment of a timetable for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and the creation of an independent Palestinian State. It is the responsibility of this body to work out and take a decision on a draft containing the elements of those recommendations, which were endorsed by the General Assembly. We should like to hope that the members of the Council under your guidance, Mr. President, will give their support to such a draft. The peoples of the Middle East have already paid a heavy toll in untold sufferings during the last three decades. It is high time to turn that hotbed of unending wars into a home of lasting peace and justice for all the peoples of the region without exception.

8. My Government is firmly convinced that a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict can be conceived only on the basis of three well-known inseparable principles: first, complete liquidation of the consequences of Israeli aggression and immediate and unconditional return of all the occupied Arab lands to the countries of whose territories they formed a legitimate part; second, full recognition of the Palestinian Arab people's national right to self-determination; and, third, ensuring for all States and peoples of the region an independent life of their own, free from fears.

9. I should like to mention that a relatively short time ago there were fruitful exchanges of opinion between the members of the Council in an atmosphere of co-operation and mutual understanding on the subject under consideration in the Council now. At that time they shared a common approach to the crucial problem of a Middle East settlement. Much has since been changed. The Camp David accords and the separate treaty are raising serious obstacles in the

way of the rights and vital interests of all Arab countries in general and the Arab people of Palestine in particular. Using the treaty as a cover-up, the parties pursue a policy of expansion and aggression against the Arab people of Palestine, while one of them is striving to expand its military and political presence in the region. This course of action by the parties involved is blocking the road to a just and lasting peace and seriously damaging the struggle waged by the Arab people.

10. We continue to believe that the relevant resolutions of the United Nations contain the genuine guidelines for a Middle East settlement and cover all aspects of the question in their entirety. That is why my Government does not give its support to any separate agreement or arrangement contrary to those decisions.

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

12. Mr. ROA-KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to extend to you the warmest congratulations of the Cuban delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. To your great devotion to Latin America and your progressive spirit, derived from the best traditions of your country, is added the fact that you represent Mexico, a friendly brother country, where the true Cuban revolutionaries from José Martí to Fidel Castro have always found more than a brotherly helping hand—a common homeland. I think it only fair to say that the land of Cuauhtémoc, Morelos and Juárez, which never bowed nor compromised when the powerful imperialist neighbour wished to stifle the Cuban Revolution, has always earned the esteem and the respect of all the patriots of the continent. In you then, Sir, I salute the worthy representative of what the founder of our independence nearly 100 years ago called "our America", brought together in exploitation and hope in the age-old struggle against those who have tried "to pit one part of the world against another" and in their unbounded greed to treat our lands merely as their own backyard. I am confident that, under your unswerving guidance, the Council will take up in a principled manner the question of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, which can no longer be delayed.

13. For the past three decades the Council has been meeting to consider "the question before us", as it has been called in such a drearily routine manner. The aloof attitude of many of the dozens of speakers who have taxed our patience during that period seems inconceivable, as if this were just a verbal exercise, as if we were not really talking about the destiny of a people. There are those who think they can bridle passions as one might bridle a horse.

14. We have heard the deafening silence of those who wished to keep the freedom of the Palestinian people

within a rigid time-frame, predetermined by the holding of august meetings which will then bring us to the truth on schedule. In the meantime, the architects of the new *pax americana* meet comfortably at Camp David or in Washington, satisfied that certain members of the international community are prepared not to do anything until a better opportunity arises.

15. Now that the fireworks and confetti and all the fanfare that attended the Camp David production are over, the objective pursued is becoming clear. Not so long ago the press revealed that the President of Egypt was prepared to work for "self-government" for the occupied territory of Gaza, because it was not yet opportune to talk about the West Bank of the Jordan. Not only is the inalienable right of a people to decide its destiny being usurped and its genuine representatives being disregarded in international negotiations affecting it directly, but an attempt is also being made to subdivide the question of Palestine and, step by step, with the infamous acquiescence of some quislings, if they find any, to dismember the age-old homeland of the Palestinian people.

16. Not so very long ago we met in the Council to condemn the colonialist policy of Israel, which was reasserted with the new settlements in Al-Khalil and Jerusalem. Zionist expansionism, which has ostensibly been censured by the Camp David conspirators, has now found in the doctrine of piecemeal self-government a beaten path to its ultimate goal: the zionization of Palestine.

17. For those who still have any doubts about the reactionary and hegemonistic nature of zionism, and who, like Paul of Tarsus, need more proof to be convinced, we would say that Begin is not the only one responsible for what has happened in Al-Khalil, Jerusalem and other occupied territories. More recently, the well-known opponent of the Israeli Government, Abba Eban, in a newspaper of the Holy City, openly questioned the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

18. The Zionists generally call anybody who is opposed to the imperialist goals of the State of Israel an anti-Semite, but they deny the right of the Palestinian nation to dwell in its own homeland just as their friends and racist allies of South Africa deny the same right to the black population. Or have the Palestinians not also been living on that land for the last 2,000 years? It is a strange theory that affirms the right of a people to trample the right of another underfoot.

19. The host of the meeting on the banks of the Potomac has made his intentions clear: he will use force to guarantee supplies of the oil that belongs to others; for this purpose he has escalated his country's military presence in the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean and the Middle East and tried to set up new bases and facilities in the countries of those areas; he is setting up rapid-deployment units to intervene any-

where in the world where the interests of the major Yankee monopolies are "threatened"; he is supplying weapons, economic assistance and military advice to the Fascist junta in El Salvador, which is daily killing its patriots, and he is propping up puppets in neighbouring countries and intervening directly against the forces of the people; and in the coming days he will assert his anti-Palestine and pro-Zionist policies to the drum-beat of a new cold war.

20. The settlement of the problem of the Middle East cannot be left in those hands. No one can sincerely believe in their "solutions", least of all the Palestinian people whose cause has won the support of the overwhelming majority of mankind and whose plight is at the very centre of the conflict in that part of the world.

21. Nor is it possible to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East—as stated by the resolutions of the General Assembly—if we do not, *inter alia*, bring about a just settlement of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to independence and national sovereignty in Palestine, in accordance with the Charter.

22. The history of the past 30 years would undoubtedly be justification for an unending description of the great selfless and heroic struggle of the Palestinian people to achieve full independence and freedom in their own State, and of the shame and ignominy of those who have stood in the way of their inalienable rights using the most inhuman and despicable methods. But now is not the time to be recounting history.

23. The Council has a clear mandate from the General Assembly. The Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries which met in Havana invited the Council to act in keeping with its responsibilities and to impose on Israel the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. At the same time, it declared its unreserved solidarity with the cause of the Palestinian people. General Assembly resolutions 31/20, 32/40 A, 33/28 A, and 34/65 A are equally unequivocal as regards the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

24. We hope that on this occasion we shall not fail to approve the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In that way this supreme tribunal will live up to the expectations of the international community. To postpone a decision would be to condone the continued existence of the greatest injustice of our era. Now it is the Council that must speak out.

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

26. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, "respect for the rights of others is peace", as Benito Juárez, one of the greatest men of your national revolution, once said. Who then better than yourself, the heir of a long and distressing tradition of fighting for the ideals of liberty, justice and peace, could appreciate the full extent of the plundering, the suffering and the sacrifices which the Palestinian tragedy has brought in its wake, without peace, the inseparable partner of justice, having returned to that long-suffering land. The Algerian delegation remains convinced that your personal qualities, your great competence and your perfect understanding of this tragedy will ensure that this debate will be as significant as it should be.

27. The congratulations and gratitude of the Algerian delegation are also extended to your predecessor, Ambassador Mills, the highly respected representative of Jamaica, who conducted the proceedings of the Council last month with the diligence, zeal and constructive skill which we know him to possess.

28. The fact that the Council has met twice in a month to take cognizance, at its last meetings, of the situation in the occupied Arab territories and, today, of the whole Palestinian question, reveals a three-fold situation: first, there is a universal awakening to the national dimension of the Palestinian phenomenon, which has three facets in the right to self-determination, the right to independence and the right of return; then there is the profound credibility crisis to which the prospects of a separate and partial settlement opened up by the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty are increasingly subject; and finally, there is the return of the Palestinian question to its breeding ground, in this case, the United Nations, which is a challenge to the community of nations in this very place where the seeds of the tragedy of the plunder which ensued were actually fertilized.

29. The frequency with which the Council has been seized of this question is not an accident. It is to be seen primarily as an effect, in reaction to the sterility of an approach based fundamentally on the perversion of the traditional institutional framework for the discussion of the problem of the Middle East, to the extent that a fragmentary structure is being substituted for the universal forum of the United Nations. It is, furthermore, a reaction to the attempts to distort the Palestinian national phenomenon, which is being reduced by political and legal artifices to a mere claim for municipal and administrative autonomy.

30. Ten negotiating sessions on the status of autonomy to be conferred upon the West Bank of Jordan and the Gaza Strip have betrayed, by their political procedure and by their material content, the fallacious nature of this allegedly comprehensive, just and lasting solution which some thought they offered. By taking charge of the Palestinian situation and dealing solely with the technical allocation of management

responsibility, the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty have provided ample fuel for the already severely exacerbated environment of crisis in the Middle East. In so doing, they have in fact given clear proof of the twofold need for a return to the universal framework of the United Nations and for the adoption of a new approach which would involve the entire spectrum of aspects of this crisis.

31. The lack of validity of the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty emerges quite clearly from five different standpoints, if one examines these texts with reference, first, to the entitlement of the contracting parties, then to the procedure followed for the conclusion of those agreements, then to the contents of the texts, then to the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Organization and, finally, to Egypt's prior commitments.

32. The Algerian delegation would have liked to say a great deal about the lack of validity of the agreements from the five points of view that I have mentioned, but, in order not to waste the Council's time, it will limit itself solely to certain general points.

33. The first point is the lack of validity with regard to the entitlement of the contracting parties. It has been said that any State has the sovereign right to conclude a treaty. This argument, true as far as it goes, is here made in a specious manner. The sovereign right of any State to conclude a treaty is, of course, an elementary principle of international law. But no one can fail to understand the natural and clear limits of such a principle. No State has, in fact, the right to conclude a treaty which is incompatible with the imperative norms of law which can brook no derogation or breach. And one of those is the right of peoples to self-determination. Now, as will be seen, the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty eliminate the national rights of the Palestinian people.

34. Moreover, in actual fact the defenders of the Camp David and Washington agreements deliberately distort the problem. It is not really a question of whether the Egyptian régime has the right to conclude a treaty for itself, but rather a question of whether it has the right to conclude a treaty for other States, in their stead and place. This argument can thus be turned against its proponents because it contravenes the right of other States to conclude or not to conclude, in exercise of their sovereign right, a treaty in keeping with their interests. In other words, by signing the Camp David and Washington agreements, the Egyptian régime did not confine itself, as is claimed, to the exercise of its sovereign right; it actually usurped that right and that of other States and another people, namely the Palestinian people.

35. The Egyptian régime has received no mandate, either from Jordan, which rejected the agreements, or from the Palestine Liberation Organization, or from Syria, which condemned them. The only too well-

known Balfour Declaration of 1917 was formerly described as "a promise made by a State to a private person to found a nation on territory belonging to another nation". This is clearly a new Balfour-type promise that the inglorious Washington treaty has the Egyptian régime make to Israel about Palestinian territory. It is thus another instance of the cession of territory belonging to somebody else, when the Washington treaty offers what remains of Palestinian territory, the West Bank, Gaza and Jerusalem, for final occupation and settlement and in denial of independence.

36. The legality of the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty is therefore more than doubtful. Moreover, not only have Jordan and the Palestinian people been involved, without prior consultation, in the "solutions" decided upon in those agreements, but even the United Nations is implicated under certain of their provisions. That poses the much broader problem of the procedure followed for this so-called peace settlement in the Middle East. That is the point which the Algerian delegation would now like to examine.

37. The procedure followed at Camp David and in Washington in no way corresponds to what was decided upon and has been expected by the international community since the June 1967 war. Comprehensive negotiations and a similarly comprehensive peace were called for by the international community, which rejected any separate negotiation and any partial solution, so as not to circumvent the United Nations or the Arab States concerned or, of course, the Palestinian people itself.

38. Those comprehensive negotiations should, essentially, have had a twofold imperative result: first, withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, out of profound respect for the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force; and secondly, the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to independence, to the creation of a State and to a return to their homeland.

39. Consequently, the valid procedure conceived by the international community called, on the one hand, for peace negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations and, particularly, through the convening of a Geneva Conference as proposed by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session, and, on the other hand, for the necessary participation of the indispensable party to the negotiations, the PLO.

40. Beyond all the aspects just mentioned, and turning now to the substantive problem involved, we shall see that here the lack of validity of the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty is just as flagrant. Those instruments are in effect a plan for the liquidation of Palestinian national rights and the disruption of the territorial integrity of neighbouring Arab States.

41. In the first place, the liquidation of the Palestinian national rights is an element of a coherent approach which, in turn, forms part of a drastic plan for the destruction of all Palestinian resistance by the elimination of the PLO—that is to say, the Palestinian political leadership—by the elimination of the Palestinian people itself, and finally by the recognition of Israel. Thus the objective sought is the elimination of the PLO and of all political leadership in order to bring about the elimination of the Palestinian people both as the entity to which those national rights belong and as an entity struggling for the exercise of those national rights.

42. By depriving this people of its political rights, the idea was to reduce it to a mere aggregation of persons or individuals without national rights, which would open the way to solutions quite different from those of self-determination and independence. Thus, it was necessary to embark upon the elimination of the PLO in terms of its international status and its three-fold traditional function as leader of the Palestinian resistance, as the sole legitimate representative of its people and as a possible negotiating partner for peace.

43. The Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty consummated the attack on the international status of the PLO, which is neither more nor less than the reflection of the international status of the Palestinian people itself. The Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty have not only ignored the PLO, as we shall see, but have sought to destroy its international status, a status which it has acquired as a member of the Arab League, a member of the non-aligned movement and a member of the Coordinating Bureau of that movement, enjoying observer status in the United Nations since 1974 and full diplomatic status in a very large number of countries. Some 110 States now recognize the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Now the instruments signed at Camp David and Washington establish the official commitment—I stress commitment—of the Egyptian régime, along with the Zionist entity, to eliminate this body of leadership of the Palestinian people. It suffices to read article III of the Washington treaty to realize that the two contracting parties undertook to drive out and eliminate Palestinian resistance not only on their respective territories, but also in any corner of the world and in any form. The terms are so general that such an interpretation is perfectly possible. The Washington treaty describes the liberation struggle of the Palestinian people as a subversive endeavour and goes so far as to organize the method of its repression, even outside the respective territories of the parties to the agreement.

44. In the same spirit, the PLO and all Palestinian organizations are excluded in advance from all negotiations, even those on the West Bank and Gaza. Thus, the exchange of letters dated 26 March 1979 annexed to the Washington treaty states explicitly:

“The delegations of Egypt and Jordan”—the latter once more involved against its will—“may include Palestinians of the West Bank or Gaza, or other Palestinians, as mutually agreed”.

So it is not the PLO or the Palestinian people, as such, that is consulted, but “inhabitants”—individuals, carefully selected to boot, by the two parties to the agreement. It is to be noted, furthermore, as we shall see, that the Palestinians in exile, who number nearly 2 million, will in any event be excluded from any consultation and any representation. It is thus the Egyptian régime and the Israeli entity which “mutually agree” to talk with partners whom they describe as Palestinians and whom they themselves select. This is a “solution” which violates the basic rights of the Palestinian people and the general consensus which exists on the Palestinian problem.

45. The attempt to liquidate the PLO as a political leader in the Washington and Camp David agreements was a condition for and a prelude to the second point, that is, the elimination of the Palestinian people as a people possessing rights to self-determination, to the liberation of its territory, to the return to its homeland and to the building of its own independent State. Once having carefully read these agreements, one can affirm that the combined effect of the provisions of the Camp David accords and the Washington treaty—a few of which I have just mentioned so as not to take up too much of the Council’s time—scientifically plan the fragmentation and dissolution of the Palestinian people. The unity of that people is once again called in question; it is broken up into several parts: first of all, there are the Palestinians who are in exile, having left their country in 1948—that is, 2 million people who will not be consulted; then there are the Palestinians removed from the West Bank and Gaza since the 1967 war, from whom the Israelis themselves will choose a few, at their own discretion, then, if they consider it necessary, either to consult them or to bring them back; thirdly, there are the “inhabitants” of the West Bank and Gaza, who will be very carefully guided in designating an autonomous authority which will be merely an administrative council—this is the expression used—in office for five years; and finally, there are the Palestinians remaining in Israel of whom nothing is said in the agreements because they will have to remain Israeli, cut off from their brothers.

46. It was certainly not to be expected that the Washington treaty would have formally agreed to Palestine’s right to independence. It is in the logic of things that it should have imposed obligatory recognition of Israel and no less obligatory diplomatic relations with it on the other party to the agreement. But the Washington treaty goes even further by formally excluding even the independence of the West Bank and by recognizing, as we shall see later, a State of Israel with dangerously extendible frontiers.

47. After the Camp David agreements, the Washington treaty sets itself the target of simple administra-

tive autonomy for the West Bank, or rather for the “inhabitants” of the West Bank and not for the territory of the West Bank. This is mere municipal control. In effect, there is no question of the independence of the West Bank or of the creation of a Palestinian mini-State. The Washington treaty does less than this by promising the Palestinians of the West Bank five years of Israeli trusteeship, at the end of which they will be consulted on the elimination of this administrative autonomy and on pure and simple integration with Israel.

48. The West Bank is officially called “Judaea and Samaria” in the Washington treaty, which constitutes a recognition of Israel’s sovereignty over the West Bank, and, thus, over Jerusalem. And the fact that the fate of the West Bank and Gaza is settled by a simple exchange of letters in an annex, and not by the treaty itself, demonstrates the determination to relegate this question to the status of a mere detail, when it is, in fact, the central problem. So it is not surprising nowadays to hear the leaders of the Egyptian régime abandoning the discussion even of the mere autonomy of the West Bank and contenting themselves with discussing the fate of the small Gaza enclave.

49. According to the agreements signed, there will be no referendum on the self-determination of the Palestinian people, a people which, as I have just noted, has been entirely broken up. The Israeli army, however, according to these agreements, will still remain in the West Bank.

50. In the final analysis, Israel wants to establish in the West Bank and Gaza an administrative council made up of a few tame Palestinians, if there are any to be found. That council would, what is more, be permanently—and I stress permanently—under the heel of the Israeli military Government, and Israel would have control of all the land in the area and of all its water resources. In this way Israel seeks to reduce the solution of the Palestinian problem to a mere municipal concern ridiculously confined within a narrow perspective which makes of it a true policy of bantustanization.

51. As to the question of Jerusalem, there is much to be said. I will content myself with recalling that the provisions of agreements which have been signed flagrantly contravene all the resolutions of all international or regional organizations, including the Security Council. It is enough to re-read the letter, dated 17 September 1978 and annexed to the Camp David agreements, by which Begin imposed, in a veritable *diktat*, the “final”—to use his word—annexation of the thrice-Holy City, citing a Knesset bill of 1967, according to which “the Government is empowered . . . to apply the law, the jurisdiction and administration of the State to any part of Eretz Israel (land of Israel—Palestine)”.

52. The political procedure and strategic aims of the Camp David and Washington agreements emerge with



dazzling clarity from this analysis. They have thus methodically programmed: first, the elimination of the PLO as the leader of the struggle and the sole political representative and appropriate negotiating partner for peace by violating and disregarding its international status and committing the contracting parties to its elimination, which carries the most severe consequences for history; secondly, the elimination of the Palestinian people as an entity possessing national rights, and as an entity fighting for the exercise of those rights—elimination being achieved in the text that was signed, not only by the categorical exclusion of any kind of self-determination for Palestine, but also by a no less categorical exclusion of withdrawal from the West Bank occupied in 1967 and the denial of its independence—the texts even hold out the promise of extending Israeli sovereignty over that part of Palestine after a five-year period of administrative autonomy and municipalism; thirdly, as part and parcel of this coldly calculated plan, and as its consequence and crowning glory, there is, first of all, the recognition of Israel by the Egyptian régime without any *quid pro quo*, since even the territories returned to Egypt are not wholly under its sovereignty and have been almost entirely demilitarized, and, what is even worse, the recognition of an Israel with extendible frontiers which might even include the final incorporation of the West Bank and Gaza. In a word, this is perpetuation of Israel's right of conquest over Palestinian territories, as well as over Arab territories with a certain foreign presence in Egyptian Sinai, in the Jordanian port of Eilat, which is still being occupied, and of the Syrian Golan, which is still under the Israeli heel.

53. The territorial situation which would result from the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty would be practically equivalent to the Zionist proposals for a Jewish State made at the 1919 Versailles Peace Conference—that is to say, a State comprising the whole of Palestine, the River Jordan, its left and right banks, southern Lebanon and the present Jewish settlements, particularly in Gaza. And yet, how many peoples in the world can claim, as the Palestinians can, 1,600 years of existence on their national soil? Even those who could make that claim would be liable, if the Zionist thesis were to be applied to them, to lose the land where the bones of their ancestors lie.

54. Today, we have a new act of provocation—another in a long chain—in the creation of new Israeli settlements in the West Bank. We must put an end to the sort of absurd logic by which, in response to Israel's successive expansions and to its renewed acts of defiance, the Arabs and the Palestinians are called upon over and over again to reduce the problem of Israel to the dimensions of its most recent conquests. Indeed, the Arabs and the Palestinians are being advised to abandon a comprehensive approach to the problem of the Middle East and Palestine, so that they can be pushed closer and closer to the trap of a discussion limited each time to the most recent problem created by Israel—and that in the name of a so-called

realism which means nothing but outright capitulation. The Arabs and the Palestinians are called upon incessantly to endorse what has happened previously so that they will only have to discuss the current event, which Israel is always in a position to embark upon, as in the present case of the settlements and the new land expropriations in the West Bank.

55. The recognition in the Camp David agreements and Washington treaty of an Israel with extendible frontiers that might even have total sovereignty over the entire West Bank after a five-year period somehow consecrates the "final solution" to the problem of Palestine and the Palestinian people. It is a calling into question by Israel of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force as contained in all relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Council resolution 242 (1967).

56. It is a curious procedure to appear to seek a comprehensive peace while artificially splitting up the problems. The technique—if not the tactic—of the framework agreement is officially to claim to be a common basis for a settlement; it claims to deal with a common problem in a comprehensive fashion and on a common basis, when in fact it borrows from the techniques of a bilateral agreement which would gradually break the Arab front, as if the problem consisted in the juxtaposition of specific problems not having any common cause. An attempt is being made to neutralize or to win over one Arab country after another. The common cause—namely, the national rights of the Palestinian people—is thus being completely disregarded. The agreements and the treaty have organized its planned elimination, and it is in order to eliminate this common cause that the signatories have broken up the comprehensive negotiations and have given pride of place to the tactics of the partial and separate settlement.

57. So we really should ask ourselves the question: what kind of strange peace treaty is it that we have here which involves the over-arming of the signatories? What is the meaning of the preparation for war by two States which are trying to make peace? What is the meaning of that peace, if not war, that the new allies want to impose on the Palestinian people and the Arab countries? Indeed, everyone realizes that the Washington treaty has been accompanied by immediate measures to over-arm the signatories to that so-called peace treaty. It is certainly a very strange peace, in any event, that has just been established by a treaty which has provisions for turning the region into a permanent powder keg and for making Israel the fourth largest exporter of arms in the world—and this includes South Africa and Rhodesia.

58. The nature of the new responsibilities which a return to the Security Council entails should be understood in the light of the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. Those recommendations have,

moreover, received the moral backing and political support of the General Assembly, the non-aligned movement, the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

59. In this connection, we wish to convey our warm congratulations and sincere appreciation to the Chairman and other members of that Committee, whose perseverance, devotion and imaginative enthusiasm in the service of the cause of justice, peace and freedom have contributed greatly to placing the Palestinian question within its proper perspective.

60. By refusing to heed the many appeals which have been so regularly made by that Committee, the Council would seem, up to now, curiously to have ostracized conclusions actually based upon relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Thus the Council has found itself for at least three reasons out of step with the prevailing international will—first of all, because it has deliberately disregarded the spirit and the letter of the General Assembly resolutions, all questions of differences of competence as between these two major bodies set aside; then because it has adopted an attitude of indifference to the desires of other international organizations that are among the most representative in the world; and finally, because it has given effect to a denial of right and justice with regard to the approach to the Palestinian question.

61. However, the Committee, in certain of its judgments and analyses, is doing nothing more than concurring in the conclusions of the Commission established by the Council to inquire into the situation of the settlements in the occupied Arab territories. The Committee has indeed traced the outline of action that would be likely to lead to a just and lasting solution of the Middle East crisis on the basis of the following guidelines: first, the perception of the Palestinian question as the Gordian knot of the Middle East problem, whereby any search for a just and lasting solution would be dependent on full account being taken of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; secondly, the genuine exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination, to national independence and sovereignty; thirdly, the participation of the PLO as a fully-fledged partner in all efforts and negotiations on the Middle East undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations; fourthly, an increase in and strengthening of the role of the United Nations and of its organs in the search for an equitable solution of the question of Palestine and in the implementation of such a solution; fifthly, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the consequent obligation on Israel totally and rapidly to evacuate all Arab territory thus occupied.

62. Formulated in this way, these major axes of an over-all settlement are the outcome of the condemnation in principle and the challenging of the validity of the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty.

63. Alive to the strictly bilateral nature of these agreements aimed at a mere facade settlement of the territorial issue between Israel and Egypt, the international community soon became aware of the fact that, even if fully implemented and taken to their ultimate conclusion, the agreements would not give rise to the much-hoped-for solution of the Palestinian problem.

64. Such an awareness corroborates the evaluations and prophecies solemnly made at a certain point by the whole Arab world. In this context, the attitude adopted by the Arab resistance front, which some have been pleased to consider isolated or a mere emotional reaction, had a certain warning value and, as such, was the forerunner and precursor of the sentiments of doubt and scepticism that now grip the international community. The expected failure, which is taking place today, of the Israeli-Egyptian agreements should not give rise to any astonishment or surprise. The true objectives and avowed ambitions of those agreements obviously lay elsewhere.

65. The deterioration of international political relations, the geopolitical bases of whose equilibrium have suddenly revealed their instability and precariousness, throws further light on the strategic importance of the Middle East—an importance that has never been denied. Endowed as it is with so many natural strategic advantages, being both a window open wide to three continents, a repository of oil and a highly desirable outlet for the surplus production of the industrialized nations in this time of recession, the Middle East stimulates appetites and provokes covetousness.

66. As the key instruments of a global power strategy, the Camp David agreements and the Washington treaty have amply revealed their nature as an endeavour totally aimed at a resolute transformation of the region into the imperialist sphere of influence.

67. Such a strategy naturally presupposes the establishment of relay-States, made all the more necessary because the Iranian defection has given rise to the disruption of alliances that cannot be qualitatively assessed. The setting up of the Tel Aviv-Cairo geopolitical axis, the intensification of the arming of Egypt and Israel and the proliferation of United States air and naval bases in the region were therefore aimed at preparing the ground for new alliances and relationships of rationalized suzerainty.

68. By stressing local conflicts, by fanning differences of outlook and approach and by using military threats against the independence movements and the aspirations of Arab States to unity, that strategy is another modern version of the 2,000-year-old Roman principle of *divide et impera*. As part of the implementation of that strategy, the collusion and the organic links between Zionism and imperialism constitute the means for carrying out this work of division. In the same way, Israel's insatiable expansionism is

not centred upon itself and is not simply a response to its own needs for security or vital living space. Essentially it serves the interests of world imperialism.

69. In the light of this analysis, the differences of understanding and approach on the part of the Israelis and the Egyptians rather proceed from merely formal differences of opinion than testify to any profound conflict over the nature and status of the autonomy to be established, because fundamentally the Egyptian and the Israeli policies in this matter are united by their ultimate objectives, inasmuch as they are jointly aimed at the establishment of a vassal entity and a feudalized institutional structure that would operate a strategic junction between the parties.

70. My delegation remains convinced that the question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East crisis and that no solution of the problem is possible if the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are not taken into account.

71. The universal appeal addressed to our Organization today should find the necessary and salutary response. It is time—if we want to avoid bitterness and blockage—for the principal organs of the United Nations, looking beyond their respective spheres of competence, to co-ordinate their positions on the Palestinian problem so as to make progress towards a courageous settlement of a problem so vital to the peace of the world. We would venture, once again, to hope for this from the Council.

72. By permitting the Palestinian nation, through the authentic exercise of its threefold right to self-determination, independence and return, to gather its people together, now temporarily divided, the international community will be redressing an historic injustice and will thus contribute to bringing the Middle East back to what it was originally—a meeting place and a land of understanding and concord among men.

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

74. Mr. ALAINI (Yemen): Allow me at the outset to express my delegation's warmest congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. You represent a great country, Mexico, with which my country has growing friendly relations. I should like also to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to express the views of the Yemen Arab Republic on the question of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

75. Once more the Security Council has met within less than two months to consider the most important issue in the Middle East today, an issue that directly

threatens world peace and stability. It was only a few weeks ago that the Council unanimously adopted a positive resolution [*resolution 465 (1980)*] on the issue of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab lands, a resolution that was not only rejected by the Israeli Government but also followed by intransigence. Instead of complying with the Council's resolution, the Israeli Cabinet decided on an act of defiance, the confiscation of more Arab lands, thus disregarding both the deep interest of the Council and world public opinion.

76. However, my delegation is confident that the Council's deliberations on this crucial issue will be commensurate with its high responsibilities and the gravity of the situation. We are equally confident that the Council's decision this time will be no less positive than its resolution on the question of the settlements. After all, the issue under consideration, namely, the destiny of the valiant and long-neglected Palestinians, is the heart of the Middle East question, an issue that threatens the peace and prosperity not only of the region but also of the entire world.

77. Has the Council ever been seized of a more just cause and a clearer issue than the Palestinian issue? Has a more modest and flexible decision ever been required of the Council than is required today? During the last three decades and more, more than two thirds of the nations of the world have won their freedom and independence with the help of this Organization. Is the Palestinian people unjustifiably considered a rare exception?

78. We firmly believe that neither intransigence nor blind fanaticism will prevent the Palestinian people from achieving the ultimate victory. History has witnessed the collapse of the imperialist empires, the Fascist dreams and the Nazi ambitions. The destiny of racist zionism, we are sure, will not be different.

79. We all remember when freedom fighters were not recognized and were labelled differently in various places: they were called Mau Mau in Kenya, Viet Cong in Viet Nam, and terrorists in Algeria and Zimbabwe. Today, Kenya, Viet Nam, Algeria and Zimbabwe are free and independent nations like any others in our world.

80. We in the Yemen Arab Republic have no doubt whatsoever of the fact that Palestine belongs only to its faithful sons and rightful owners; and we feel that the day is not far away when the struggling Palestinian people, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, will have its own independent and free State, thus occupying its rightful place in the community of free, sovereign and independent nations.

81. The ineffectiveness of the United Nations and its reluctance to shoulder its responsibility has opened the door to activities outside the framework of the Organization. The situation in the Middle East has,

as a consequence of those practices, become worse, owing to the plans and dreams of the Camp David designers.

82. The Yemen Arab Republic, like other Arab States, is scrupulously and faithfully complying with the resolutions of the Arab Summit Conferences of Baghdad and Tunis.

83. We regard the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and as truly expressive of their will and aspirations. In our view, any attempt at a solution of the Middle East question that does not recognize the political reality of the existence of an independent Palestinian identity and the imperative of independent Palestinian statehood is doomed to failure.

84. Freedom and independent statehood for the Palestinian people will be achieved by continuous armed struggle under its own leadership and that of the PLO, with the solidarity of the Arab, Moslem and non-aligned countries, as well as the support of peace-loving nations throughout the world.

85. Like any other people in the world, the Palestinian people have a basic human right to self-determination, to return to their land and properties and to the establishment of their independent State in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

86. We are resolutely against the Camp David framework agreements, but absolutely not against Egypt. Egypt is the greatest Arab country where Al-Azhar Al-Sharif and other glorious religious and cultural institutions symbolize the common Arab heritage and destiny. Many of the leading Arab politicians and intellectuals were educated in Egypt, and all of them harbour only feelings of fraternity and love for the great Egyptian people.

87. The Camp David conspiracies are undoubtedly distorting Egyptian history; they are distorting the glorious record of the Egyptian people, which fought against all invaders of their homeland and against the imperialist invasions of other Arab and African lands. We in the Yemen Arab Republic will never forget the contribution of revolutionary Egypt to the Yemeni Revolution against the autocratic Imams in the north and British imperialism in the south. It is a source of pleasure to note that we are not alone in our rejection of the Camp David agreements. A substantial number of Egypt's leading intellectuals as well as a large number of students have publicly announced their rejection of those agreements.

88. Only within the framework of the United Nations and with the participation of the PLO can a reasonable solution to the Middle East problem possibly be found. Without its participation, no solution to the chronic problem is viable.

89. The Palestinians are obviously not asking for the impossible. In this connection I should like to quote from Chairman Yasser Arafat's interview with a correspondent of *Time* magazine published in this week's issue:

"There are birds that fly around the world but come back to their original nest. There are fish that swim from the rivers to the sea, but somehow their sons go back to their original source. Home is something in the heart of every human being. I want my people to be able to return as human beings. In appearance, perhaps I look happy, but in my heart something has cracked. I live the tragedy of my people. But I am optimistic because sooner or later our people will achieve their goal."

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

91. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The question of Palestine is now at a most crucial crossroads both in occupied Palestine itself and in the international forum of the United Nations. Time and inaction have exacted an unbearable, if not crushing, toll and clouded any prospect of peaceful accommodation based on justice. The situation with which the Palestinian people are confronted today is one in which an exclusivist, expansionist, oppressive and discriminatory Zionist entity is bent upon, and in hot pursuit of, the eventual total extinction of the Palestinian people and their removal from their ancestral homeland.

92. In 1947 and 1948 that goal was massively achieved behind the pre-1967 Zionist armistice line. In the post-1967 era, there was relentless occupation and colonization, a thinning-out and reshaping of the demography as well as the geography of an area which has already reached over 32 per cent of the remnants of Palestinian territory.

93. In the aftermath of 1948, the Knesset legally institutionalized the political reality of racist, imperialist, exclusivist Israel by its passage in 1950 of its notorious Law of Return granting exclusive citizenship rights to all members of the Jewish communities throughout the world—one hears of residents hailing from Canada, the United States, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and from all over the world—while closing the door totally and unconditionally to the right of return of the Palestinian refugees, the lawful inhabitants of Palestine since the dawn of history.

94. It is axiomatic that this notorious law is predicated on the premise that a Jewish State, to the extent that it is Jewish, can neither offer redemption to the Palestine people in exile nor afford the tiny remnants which remained any semblance of democratic equality or civil and human rights, let alone political rights. Ninety per cent of pre-1967 Palestin-

ians had their lands confiscated during the period from 1948 to 1967. No wonder that the Palestinians inside Palestine, which became Israel, remained under military confinement and constraint until the mid-1960s, and their plight was the subject of yearly discussions at every session of the General Assembly, as many old-timers remember all too well. They lived under military rule for 15 years. Those wanting to go from Nazareth to Haifa had to have a special permit from the military Governor, even though they were supposed to be Israeli citizens. Joseph Weitz, former Deputy Chairman of the Jewish National Fund and a leading Zionist, stated his convictions in his diary as early as 1940 and reiterated them after 1967. He wrote:

“Among ourselves it must be clear that there is no place in the country for both peoples together. With the Arabs, we shall not achieve our aim of being an independent people in this country. The only solution is Eretz Ysrael. And there is no other way but to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries. Transfer of all, not one village or tribe should remain.”

We know how many villages have been destroyed in implementation of his views: at least 375 villages and scores of towns.

95. The Zionists have indeed gone a long way towards achieving this goal both in terms of land and in terms of population. There should be no mistake about it. There can be no solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict so long as Israel continues to be dominated by Zionist nationalism, which is the antithesis of the true Judaic ancient spiritual relationship to parts of the Holy Land—a relationship that we recognize. Indeed, the truly religious regard the establishment of Israel in the mundane sense as sacrilegious, and they categorically refuse to recognize it or even to deal with it.

96. In 1951, a rabbi at Princeton said to me, “I agree with everything you have said but, believe me, we have been threatened that unless we toe the line we will not be buried in Jewish cemeteries”.

97. In 1919, before the Zionists gained a stranglehold on American Jews, by means fair and foul, a memorandum signed by 300 prominent American Jews was presented to the Peace Conference through President Wilson. Those distinguished American Jews stated:

“We raise our voices, in warning and protest, against the demand of the Zionists for the reorganization of the Jews as a national unit, to whom now or in the future, territorial sovereignty in Palestine shall be committed. . . . The re-establishment in Palestine of a distinctively Jewish State is utterly opposed to the principles of democracy which it is the avowed purpose of the World Peace Conference to establish. . . . To unite church and State,

in any form, as under the old Jewish Hierarchy, would be a leap backward of two thousand years. . . . We ask that Palestine be constituted as a free and independent State, to be governed under a democratic form of government, recognizing no distinctions of creed or race or ethnic descent, and with adequate power to protect the country against oppression of any kind. We do not wish to see Palestine, either now or at any time in the future, organized as an exclusively Jewish State.”

98. Professor Morris Jastrow, one of those who signed that memorandum, wrote a book entitled *Zionism and the Future of Palestine*, in which he said:

“I should like to envisage a Palestine that may become a beacon-light for the world, that may again become a spiritual focus, furnishing further inspiration for mankind. . . . Such a Palestine, however, cannot be built up through the creation of a Jewish State. A Jewish State would simply mean a glorified ghetto, narrow in its outlook, undemocratic in its organization, and that may well turn out to be reactionary in its tendencies.”

We have seen how progressive it has turned out to be.

99. The Neturei Karta of the United States, a Jewish religious organization, has published declarations on many occasions since 1947 opposing a Jewish State in Palestine. One of the latest declarations was a letter to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, published in *The Wall Street Journal* of 13 November 1975, which states:

“We would like to call to your attention that even after 27 years of the State of Israel’s existence, there are large numbers of Jews in the Holy Land and in the entire world who are opposed to Zionists and to the Zionist State.”

But we know that any dissenting voice is immediately silenced and its owner even accused of treason.

“The Zionist State has usurped without justification the holy name of Israel. Torah true Jews wish to live in peace and harmony with their neighbours and with the community of nations.”

100. Thus, there might have been a totally different, more humane, more civilized and more tranquil turn of events in the whole of the Middle East region if the original handful of zealots, helped enormously by the inhumanity of other peoples, let alone imperialist designs in other regions of the world, had not inflicted their views upon the masses of ordinary Jews in Europe. But why should that have been taken out on the Palestinians who in those days did not even know of what was happening elsewhere? That was in the days before the radio and television, and communications were extremely poor.

101. I am sure one does not have to be a political scientist to differentiate between autonomy or so-called self-rule, even if maximized, and true freedom and independence, which is the inalienable birthright of every nation. The United States in the eighteenth century enjoyed a great deal of autonomy, particularly municipal autonomy, and yet it rebelled against British colonial rule in its struggle for freedom and independence, even though the people on either side of the Atlantic in those days were closely related.

102. And so it is with the Arabs of Palestine, whose independence was recognized in 1919 by the League of Nations and, as I said in my earlier statement, 30 years later by the British Government itself. After numerous rebellions in which over 100,000 Palestinians, Moslem and Christian Arabs lost their lives, particularly between 1936 and 1939—and, of course, tens of thousands were detained in concentration camps and prisons—the British Government issued the White Paper of May 1939. That White Paper remained applicable until the British, fed up with the problem, handed it over to the trusteeship of the United Nations. That White Paper stated, *inter alia*:

“. . . The proposal of partition recommended by the Royal Commission”—namely, the establishment of self-supporting independent Arab and Jewish States within Palestine—“has been found to be impracticable.

“. . .

“. . . His Majesty's Government therefore now declare unequivocally that it is not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish State. They would indeed regard it as contrary to their obligations to the Arabs under the Mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the past”—presumably, of course, referring to the McMahon-Hussein agreements—“that the Arab population of Palestine should not be made the subjects of a Jewish State against their will.

“. . .

“The objective of His Majesty's Government is the establishment within 10 years of an independent Palestine State. . . .”

The interim period of 10 years was dictated not by any dilly-dallying but by the fact that the Second World War had broken out and the British were in need of a transitional period because they were engaged in a life-and-death war. They told the Arab leadership that

“The independent State should be one in which Arabs and Jews share in government in such a way as to ensure that the essential interests of each community are safeguarded.

“The establishment of the independent State will be preceded by a transitional period throughout which His Majesty's Government will retain responsibility for the government of the country.”<sup>1</sup>

103. The Zionists in Palestine and indeed abroad rejected the British White Paper and revolted against the British administration of Palestine. From 1941 to 1947 the three Zionist terrorist gangs—the Haganah, the Irgun and the Stern—carried out the most dastardly crimes and massacres against the civilian Arab population, as well as against officials of the British Government.

104. It will thus be seen that the question of Palestine should be put back on the right track, in consonance with international law and justice, which provide the only standards by which the United Nations is guided.

105. Military occupation does not displace or transfer sovereignty. Sovereignty belongs to each people which has had it for a prolonged and uninterrupted period. In the case of Palestine, sovereignty belongs to the indigenous Palestinian people and has done so for 5,000 to 6,000 years. So long as the people of the occupied territory do not accept military conquest, so long as they can manifest their unalterable will to regain freedom, their sovereignty—even though thwarted, restricted and, as it were, sent into exile—still exists.

106. The late Dag Hammarskjöld stated the following in 1961 in the introduction to his last annual report on the work of the Organization:

“Were nations, under the Charter, to be allowed, by the use of their military strength, to achieve ends contrary to the principle . . . of justice, it would obviously deprive those very principles of all substance and significance. . . . the organs of the United Nations have consistently maintained that the use of force, contrary to the Charter as interpreted by those organs, cannot be permitted to yield results which can be accepted as valid by the Organization and as establishing new rights.”<sup>2</sup>

This idea is also included in Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), namely, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

107. I need hardly add that the inhabitants of the occupied West Bank, including Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, are living in a large concentration camp. For 13 years there have been deportations, large-scale imprisonment, the heinous torture of 10,000 young boys and girls, in rotation, and the desecration of Holy Places. For example, the Al-Aqsa Mosque sanctuary has been subjected to continuous drilling to a depth of 10 to 15 metres, which, of course, threatens the whole structure. Also the Sayyiduna Al-Khalil Mosque sanctuary in Hebron has been virtually converted into a synagogue. These are simply

examples of the desecration of Holy Places. Many other Holy Places have since been destroyed in the Old City of Jerusalem. The intensity of repression, oppression, intimidation, harassment and outright confiscation and expulsion is unparalleled anywhere in the world.

108. Is it not high time, after 35 years of inaction, that the Council took action-oriented steps to redeem the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, particularly to achieve total Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories and to restore the right of return to every Palestinian who chooses to return to his homeland? There are at least 100,000 inhabitants of Jerusalem, both of East and West Jerusalem, who are deprived of the right of return to their homes and homeland. This deprivation applies equally to Palestinian exiles from numerous other towns and villages through the length and breadth of Palestine. They are the Palestinian refugees. The autonomy talks provide—if anything, and temporarily at that—a brief respite; they give Palestinians no entitlement to the territory in question, as Begin never tires of asserting, except as guest residents, until the process of natural attrition and human repression takes its normal toll.

109. Even resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) have been blatantly flouted, even though those resolutions did not take the Palestinian dimension into account or refer to the only recognized representative of the Palestinian people, namely the Palestine Liberation Organization. In other words, what will be the fate of the 4 million Palestinians dispersed all over the world? That is the question that I posed in my first statement:

what does the international community propose to do about them?

110. A solution to the Palestine question should be achieved right here at the United Nations and not anywhere else. Anyone who thinks otherwise is simply being deluded and deceived by what are the real designs of the Zionists and their ultimate goal. The Palestinians are not so deceived.

111. Jordan, which is a principal party, and other concerned parties are willing to play a constructive and positive role in any authentic United Nations initiative. But Jordan will never abandon or forsake the inalienable rights of its brethren, the Palestinian people.

112. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no further speakers on my list for this morning's meeting. Since we have decided to deal with another subject of urgency tomorrow, the next meeting of the Council, to continue consideration of the item on the agenda, will be scheduled in consultation with members of the Council.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Palestine: Statement of Policy*, Cmd. 6019, London, HM Stationery Office, 1939, pp. 3, 4 and 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 1 A*, pp. 2-3.

---

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم 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销处均有发售。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.

---