

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

2221st MEETING: 8 MAY 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2221)	1
Tribute to the memory of Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories: Letter dated 6 May 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13926)	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.

2221st MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 8 May 1980, at 4.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Idé OUMAROU (Niger).

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/2221)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 6 May 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13926)

The meeting was called to order at 5.10 p.m.

Tribute to the memory of Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): This meeting of the Security Council is taking place at a time of great sorrow, when the world is mourning the death of Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. His commitment to the work of the United Nations was a source of inspiration to the entire world community. President Tito was one of the founders of the non-aligned movement, to which he brought great vision. His passing on 4 May 1980 leaves the world bereft of one of its foremost personalities. He was a champion of the cause of peace and of humanity as a whole, and his great qualities will ensure that he will be remembered by future generations. On behalf of the Council, I intend to send a telegram today to the Government of Yugoslavia conveying the Council's sincere condolences to that Government and to the people of Yugoslavia and our heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved family.

On the proposal of the President, the members of the Council observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of President Tito.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Since this is the first meeting of the Council in May,

I should like at the outset to pay a tribute, on behalf of the members of the Council, to Ambassador Porfirio Muñoz Ledo of Mexico, for the masterly way in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council in April.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

Letter dated 6 May 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13926)

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Israel and Jordan, in which they ask 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 accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 8 May from the representative of Tunisia [S/13932], which reads as follows:

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

5. The proposal of the representative of Tunisia is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when invited to participate under rule 37.

6. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

7. Mr. vanden HEUVEL (United States of America): The delegation of the United States has repeatedly made clear its view that it is inappropriate for the Council to couch an invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the debate in terms that some seek to interpret as conferring rights of participation as if it were a Member State. For this reason, the United States will once again vote against the manner in which this invitation has been phrased.

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

A vote was taken by show of hands.

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

Against: United States of America

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

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

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

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council is meeting today following a request submitted by the representative of Tunisia contained in a letter dated 6 May, which was circulated as document S/13926.

10. Members of the Council have before them document S/13930, which contains the text of a draft resolution that was drafted in the course of consultations. I understand that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: 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, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 468 (1980)).

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those representatives who have asked to speak after the vote.

12. Mr. vanden HEUVEL (United States of America): Mr. President, the month of May has brought the distinction of your presence as the leader of our deliberations. During the membership of the Niger on the Council you have been a most eloquent spokesman for justice and your advice and guidance have always been wise. Already you have shown the firmness and the judgement that promise a most successful tenure. The United States welcomes your presidency.

13. May I also use this occasion to salute our brother the representative of Mexico, whose energy and instinct for leadership and substantive acumen made his incumbency a model. These months have been endlessly difficult, complex and frequently exhausting. But, reflecting the qualities of his great country, Ambassador Muñoz Ledo led us through the turmoil of April with a sure hand and boundless skill, courtesy and wisdom. We are grateful for that.

14. I regret that it has not been possible for the United States to join in a unanimous decision of the Council on the question before it today. As has been made clear by a spokesman for my Government, the United States holds that the deportations of Mayors Milhem and Qawasma and Sharia Judge Attamimi are contrary to the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention and that the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,¹ apply to the conduct of Israeli military authorities in the West Bank and Gaza.

15. However, my Government could not support this draft resolution. We are dealing here, as we have been for a number of years, with a tragic cycle of violence in which one violent act begets another. It has been and remains the position of the United States that we cannot focus on a single act in this cycle. We deeply regret that the resolution does not refer to the killing in Hebron of six Israelis and the wounding of 16 others—an act which preceded the deportations of the Palestinian officials and which constitutes an obvious factor in the present situation. We condemn this wanton act of violence at Hebron and the Palestine Liberation Organization's responsibility for it.

16. It is sadly apparent that in recent weeks the Council has been unable to condemn the murder of Israeli citizens, whether at Misgav Am or at Hebron. In these circumstances, we are forced to conclude that the Council's deliberations on these matters, despite the good faith and sincere effort to find common ground which have generally characterized them, cannot achieve a constructive and balanced result. In reaching this conclusion, we have also been mindful of the extraordinarily difficult and complex negotiations in which my Government is participating and which have the objective of reaching agreement

on full autonomy for the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza while preserving security for the people of Israel.

17. My delegation has therefore abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

18. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, I should like warmly to congratulate you, the representative of the Republic of the Niger, as President of the Security Council and to express my conviction that your diplomatic talents will help us solve the problems which remain for the Security Council to discuss during this month of May. I take this opportunity to express the hope that the relations of co-operation between our countries—and they include relations within the United Nations—will be positively advanced.

19. I should like also to express my sincere gratitude to the representative of Mexico, under whose skilful leadership during the month of April the Council discussed a number of important matters relating to the situation in the Middle East. His great diplomatic qualities did much to help those discussions. Although, for reasons beyond his control, the goals pursued were not fully achieved, those discussions will nevertheless promote progress towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

20. The delegation of the Soviet Union voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted for the Council's consideration in document S/13930. At the same time, our delegation would like to point out that, unfortunately, the text does not contain a decisive condemnation of Israel as the occupying Power, for those illegal actions which it has committed with regard to Palestinian leaders and which should be immediately repealed. Nor can we overlook any attempts to place on the same footing the actions of the Israeli occupiers who have committed atrocities in the Arab lands that they have seized in violation of the norms of international law and the heroic struggle of the Palestinian patriots who are fighting to drive out the occupiers and to restore their inalienable rights which have been recognized by the overwhelming majority of the international community. Such attempts can be viewed only as direct support of the Israeli aggressors in their attempts to annex Arab lands.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset let me pay my respects to you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month.

23. May I also pay a tribute to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Muñoz Ledo, for the exemplary

manner in which he conducted the Council's proceedings last month.

24. On behalf of the people of Israel, I should also like to take this opportunity to extend our deepest condolences to the people of Yugoslavia on the sad passing of their great leader, President Josip Broz Tito. Together, we the Jewish people and the people of Yugoslavia were targets of nazism and fascism during the Second World War; together we fought the Nazi-Fascist scourge. Both our peoples suffered terribly at the hands of the Nazi oppressors. Many of my people who also fought in the ranks of the heroic anti-Fascist resistance led by President Tito gave their lives for the struggle against tyranny and oppression and for the liberation of Yugoslavia. We shall always remember President Tito as a great fighter for the freedom of his country and for his unmatched part in consolidating the independence of Yugoslavia. We shall also remember his help to the survivors of the Holocaust and to the Jews of Yugoslavia to allow them to reach the shores of Israel.

25. Last Friday, six Jews were callously murdered in Hebron. Sixteen others were wounded, two of them critically. While Israel is still mourning its dead, this Council is already engaged in yet another one-sided exercise against Israel.

26. Let me acquaint the Council with the facts.

27. Last Friday night, a group of Jewish worshippers, mostly students at religious seminaries, were returning from their Sabbath eve devotions at the Tomb of the Hebrew Patriarchs—the Cave of Machpela—in Hebron, on foot, in accordance with Jewish religious law regarding the Sabbath. While they were walking down a narrow alley, PLO terrorists attacked them from the roofs of two buildings, first by hailing them with bullets from the rear and then by hurling hand-grenades and explosives at them from several directions. As I have just said, six persons were killed in that brutal and cowardly attack and 16 others were wounded, among them women and children; two of the wounded remain in critical condition.

28. Within hours, the gang of terrorists called Al-Fatah, which is headed by Yasser Arafat and is the largest constituent group within the criminal PLO, took responsibility for this outrage in a statement broadcast on the terrorists' radio in Lebanon. On 3 May, Arafat himself applauded that atrocity on arrival in Kuwait for a visit, and he again justified it in unqualified terms in Beirut yesterday, as reported today in *The New York Times*.

29. It will be recalled that in 1929 the existence of the millenia-old Jewish community of Hebron was virtually brought to a close as a result of a brutal pogrom staged by the forerunners of the terrorist PLO. At that time the community consisted mainly of pious scholars and students. More than 60 of them were

brutally murdered and scores of others were wounded and tortured, their homes pillaged and their places of worship desecrated. That pogrom was instigated by the notorious Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin Al-Husseini, who during the Second World War collaborated with the Nazis in the extermination of the Jews of Europe and was wanted thereafter as a war criminal to answer at Nuremberg for his crimes. By perpetrating this latest outrage in Hebron, the terrorist PLO has proved once again that its criminals are the faithful disciples of their infamous mentor.

30. Once again the aim was mass murder for its own sake. The target was a peaceful group of worshippers returning from prayer, and the timing was the Sabbath eve.

31. Beyond indiscriminate murder, the object of this unconscionable atrocity was to inflame religious sentiments among local Arabs, and to foment incitement in an attempt to interfere with the ongoing peace process in the Middle East and in particular with the negotiations on full autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district.

32. The fact is that the outrage which took place in Hebron last Friday night is known to the whole world. People everywhere were shocked when they heard about it on their radios and saw the gruesome aftermath on their television screens. But for some reason, that atrocity has escaped the attention of the Council. I say "escaped the attention" advisedly, because that is the most charitable construction that can be put on the Council's meeting this afternoon and on the resolution which has just been adopted. But such an assumption is hardly credible, since I brought the facts to the Council's attention in my letter of 4 May to the Secretary-General, which was also circulated under the symbol S/13923.

33. We are thus left with an even more uncomfortable alternative—namely, that while the Council, like the rest of the world, is aware of the wanton murder perpetrated in Hebron last Friday, it has purposely chosen to ignore it.

34. Such "oversights" have long characterized the Council's debates on matters regarding the Arab-Israel conflict. This familiar pattern has been highlighted in the last three months when the opponents of peace in the Middle East, both in the region and beyond, have kept the Council in almost constant session on selected aspects of the conflict, invariably abstracted from their proper and full context.

35. Indeed, anyone reviewing the agenda of the Council in recent months would be obliged to conclude that there are no international crises in the world, other than the Arab-Israel conflict. The Soviet Union has withdrawn from Afghanistan; its troops have stopped slaughtering hundreds of ordinary Afghan citizens. The Syrian army of occupation has pulled

back from Lebanon, and no one is being killed in and around Beirut. Refugees are not fleeing Cuba in their thousands. All is quiet in Africa, particularly in the Sahara, the Maghreb and the Horn of Africa. Sweetness and light radiate from South-East Asia. International terrorism has been brought under control worldwide. In brief, the international scene is a happy one. Were it not for Israel, there would be no threats to international peace—or at least the Security Council does not know of them.

36. The resolution which has just been adopted is highly reminiscent of resolution 467 (1980) adopted two weeks ago.

37. As will be recalled, that resolution was the product of a debate which came in the wake of a despicable outrage perpetrated by PLO terrorists who took hostage babes in arms at Kibbutz Misgav Am. That criminal act resulted in the deaths of an infant and a civilian, as well as the wounding of four toddlers, not to mention the death of an Israel Defence Forces soldier and the injury of 11 other soldiers in the action to free the little hostages. None the less, the Council's resolution in question made no reference to that atrocity and confined itself mainly to placing blame on Israel, regardless of the wider context and of the implications for Israel's security.

38. An act of hypocrisy and of selective conscience of precisely the same kind is being played out in the Council today. The resolution which has just been adopted makes no reference to the background to the events mentioned in it. The Council's vision is eclectic, to put it mildly: it sees what it wants to see. It ignores what it is told to ignore.

39. The Government of Israel, like any Government, has a primary duty and responsibility for the preservation of law and order and the maintenance of security. It has taken a number of steps in order to prevent the recurrence of outrages of the kind which occurred in Hebron last Friday night. These steps included the deportation of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and the Qadi of Hebron.

40. Over the last few months, these three individuals, on instructions from the PLO and the Arab rejectionist States, have been actively and systematically engaged in inciting the local Arab population to acts of violence and subversion against Israel and Israelis alike. In so doing, they have abused their public offices, and even channelled PLO funds for these purposes. I could cite at length inflammatory statements made at open meetings by the two Mayors and from the pulpit by the Qadi of Hebron, despite repeated warnings that they were far exceeding the norms of freedom of expression guaranteed and protected by the authorities. However, since the Council is not a court of law—even though it frequently chooses to act as though it were one—I shall perhaps limit myself to a few instances of what Israel has had to deal with and

had chosen not to act upon until the murders in Hebron last Friday night.

41. At the beginning of February of this year, the Mayor of Halhoul spoke at a meeting at the Municipal Building and declared that there had been enough of words. He said that "the time has come to act, and one must not recoil from the use of any means". He concluded by expressing the hope that the *Jihad*—the Holy War—would go on forever.

42. On 23 March, the Qadi of Hebron raised a call for violence until the Palestinian flag flew not only in Hebron, but also in Jaffa, Haifa and Acre—in other words, in Israel.

43. The Mayor of Hebron has a long record of subversive activities. The disturbances in the Tomb of the Patriarchs—the Cave of Machpela—in October 1976 were fanned by an inflammatory broadsheet which Mr. Qawasma issued himself and in which he incited the Moslem community to despoil the things held holy by the Jews in the Cave of Machpela. Instead of trying to ensure public order in Hebron, Mr. Qawasma worked openly in the opposite direction. In the last few days he has again given unrestrained expression to his views. According to the PLO radio in Lebanon, Mr. Qawasma called yesterday on Palestinian refugees in Sidon to return to Jaffa and Haifa over the blood of innocent Israelis.

44. The deportation of these three individuals was based on the Defence (Emergency) Regulations of 1945, issued by the British Mandatory authorities, regulation 112 of which authorizes deportation on grounds of certain activities against security. These regulations were in force and were acted upon on several occasions in Judea and Samaria under the Jordanian occupation prior to 4 June 1967. I do not recall any Council meeting being called to discuss those deportations. These regulations have remained in force since that date, 4 June 1967, in accordance with the principles of article 43 of the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention of 1907² and the first paragraph of article 64 of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949,¹ and that without prejudice to Israel's well-known position of principle with regard to the non-applicability of the Geneva Convention in the present context.

45. One of the tragedies of the Palestinian Arabs has been that for almost 60 years they have been dominated by an extremist and fanatical leadership. Starting with the notorious Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin Al-Husseini, that leadership has had no compunction about terrorizing and assassinating its political rivals. It was totally lacking in political realism and obstinately opposed to compromise. It led the Palestinian Arabs, whom it claimed to represent, from one disaster to another.

46. The direct heir to that political legacy is the terrorist PLO. That organization has also waged a steady campaign of intimidation and assassination against Palestinian Arabs in Judea, Samaria and the

Gaza district who were willing to co-exist peacefully with Israel. Moreover, that organization has used Judea and Samaria as a launching pad for acts of hostility and terror against Israel. In recent months it has stepped up its campaign against the peace process and the current talks aimed at achieving full autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district. And prominent among those involved in this campaign were the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and the Qadi of Hebron, whom Israel decided to deport only after their words and activities had led to bloodshed. The deportations had as one of their major purposes the prevention of further outrages of the kind perpetrated in Hebron last Friday night and the unnecessary and unforgivable shedding of more blood.

47. Those both inside and beyond the Council who have rushed to the defence of the three individuals in question are in fact those who have taken the lead in trying to frustrate the inexorable process leading to peace in the Middle East.

48. I have on numerous occasions indicated in the Council and in other organs of the United Nations who those Arab enemies of peace are and also who their supporters in other parts of the globe are. The most extreme of them within the Arab world are those who call themselves the Steadfastness Front and who met in Tripoli in the middle of last month with the participation of Yasser Arafat. The declaration which that Front issued at the conclusion of their meeting and recently had distributed as an official document both of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as document S/13912, was one expression of their implacable opposition to peace and their active campaign against Israel, no matter how brutal and inhuman the means. The murders in Hebron last Friday night were another expression of the same phenomenon. Their repeated resort to the United Nations, and particularly to the Security Council, which they are confident they can always manipulate for their bellicose purposes, adds a third dimension to their tactics.

49. Israel, for its part, will not take risks with its security. Similarly it will not be deterred from continuing its efforts to achieve peace within the framework of the Camp David accords, which offer the only practical approach for the achievement of a stable, just and comprehensive peace in the region. Israel will not be deflected by acts of terror in the region or by transparent exercises in hypocrisy and selective conscience in the Council.

50. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I call upon him.

51. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, at the outset I should like to welcome you and to express our great satisfaction and pleasure at seeing you conducting the deliberations of the Council during the current month.

52. The action taken by the Council last month under the able leadership of Ambassador Muñoz Ledo gave us much more reassurance and reason to trust in the productiveness and fruitfulness of bringing our case before the international Organization.

53. Mr. President, we wish through you to express our condolences to the peoples of Yugoslavia, the Government of Yugoslavia and our colleagues in the Yugoslav Mission. The role of Tito in his unswerving determination to eliminate all forms of racism, whether the Fascist occupation of Yugoslavia or the Zionist occupation of Palestine, showed that such determination was a constant in the policy adopted by the great hero Tito.

54. We are not really surprised at the attitude taken by the United States on the resolution that has just been adopted. That country has regretted that it was not possible for it to recall the Geneva Convention of 1949. Apparently, it really feels allergic to the Geneva Convention, which, I understand, is the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, which is applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. It was not possible for the United States to vote in favour of such a statement. It is not at all concerned at the expulsion by the Israeli military occupation authorities of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and the Sharia Judge of Hebron—at least, it could not vote in favour of an expression of such concern. It does not intend to join in the call upon the Government of Israel as occupying Power to rescind its illegal measures and to facilitate the immediate return of the expelled Palestinian leaders so that they can resume the functions for which they were elected and appointed. Naturally, it would simply like to encourage the Secretary-General to report upon the implementation of the resolution.

55. Well, I am not surprised. I am not running for President of the United States. Are the high values and principles of the Charter of the United Nations just another card in the game? Besides, after the experience of 1 March, I am really not that certain that the attitude of the representative of the United States will not be disavowed within the next 48 hours. I do not know; we have had that experience.

56. Somebody has mentioned a cycle of violence in my country. There is no cycle of violence there. There is a military occupation; there is violence; there is an attempt at genocide; and there is legitimate resistance, including resistance through resort to armed struggle. That is not what I would call a cycle of violence. I would say that there is provocation, there is a plan to eliminate the Palestinians from their country and to commit genocide. And then, of course, there is the exercise of legitimate resistance, including armed struggle.

57. We are grateful that the Secretary-General has expressed his great anxiety and concern at the

heightened and heightening tension in the West Bank, which led to the serious incident. We are sure that the Secretary-General really is concerned about what is happening.

58. The fight now going on is a fight for survival. The Palestinians have been denied the right to existence; they have been denied the right to return to their homes; they have been denied the right to self-determination. And now they are being denied the right to life. So what they are involved in is a fight for survival. I should like here to make it clear that there will never be another Deir Yassin. The Palestinians are determined that Deir Yassin will not be repeated. We shall prevent that. We know we can do so, and we know that the international community will support us in preventing another Deir Yassin.

59. On 1 March the Council unanimously adopted resolution 465 (1980), in which it strongly deplored "the continuation and persistence of Israel in pursuing those policies and practices" and called upon the Government and people of Israel to rescind those measures, to dismantle the settlements and to cease the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. Now what was the response? The response was rejection of that. The response was additional aid—\$200 million—from the Government of the United States to Israel. The response was the disavowal by the President of the United States of the position taken by his representative.

60. That is what happened here. But what happened in the region itself? Immediately after that decision was taken by the Council, the Israeli Cabinet decided to expropriate 1,000 acres of land in Jerusalem. That response shows how much the Israelis respect Article 25 of the Charter. On 11 March, the Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew announced that:

"It now emerges that in the area between Neve Yaacov and French Hill in Jerusalem some 4,000 dunums of land have been expropriated. In this area only 500 dunums are owned by Jews."

According to that broadcast, it was not yet clear how the landowners would be compensated.

61. The Minister of Justice of Israel responded to the resolution adopted by the Council. According to a broadcast of the Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew, of 11 March, 1400 GMT, he said that if the Government faced a legal situation in which the courts instructed it to dismantle Jewish settlements in Judaea and Samaria—he was, of course, referring to the West Bank—the Ministry would legislate a retroactive law that would prevent such a situation.

62. I would merely like to draw the attention of a member of the Council to the way in which the Cabinet of a State with which it has very good diplomatic

relations and which it supplies with millions and millions of dollars responds to a decision adopted unanimously by the Council.

63. On 17 March, *The New York Times* reported that the Israeli authorities had fenced off 375 acres of Arab land near Bethlehem: another violation.

64. To turn to Hebron, on 23 March, the Cabinet voted 8 to 6 to set up what the Israelis call religious institutions in two houses in Hebron.

65. I am referring to these matters merely to call the Council's attention to the response given to the resolution it adopted.

66. We are told that the Gush Emunim or squatters are involved. But let us see what the Tel Aviv newspaper *Hatzofe* reported on 24 March: "The Government is due to invest more than 100 million Israeli pounds in the establishment of *yeshivas* and field schools in Hebron". It was not the Gush Emunim, it was not a faction, it was the Cabinet that decided to do this.

67. According to *The Jerusalem Post*, work began on 3 April on one of a cluster of settlements planned for the Jericho area. That means that the people of the area will be thrown out in order that this cluster of settlements can be constructed.

68. I turn now to the area around Nablus. According to *The Jerusalem Post* of 4 April, the military Government decided to close off 1,000 dunums of privately owned land near the village of Talluza, north of Nablus.

69. *The Jerusalem Post* also reported on 13 April that 800 dunums of land in the Ramallah district had been seized by the military Government and that officials of that Government were unable to comment on the subject. The newspaper stated that, according to some sources, the mukhtars of the villages of Kafr Malik and Mughair, in the Ramallah district, had been summoned to the military Government headquarters on the preceding Wednesday evening and had been informed that land around their villages had already been seized. So, they just summon the mukhtar at night and say, "Listen, old man, 800 dunums of your land has been seized and you can go to hell". The newspaper stated also that it was not clear whether the land was intended for military purposes or for a settlement. But that is irrelevant, because the land has been expropriated.

70. With regard to the vandalizing of Arab towns, we sent a letter to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General.

71. How are the people treated? In this respect, I should like again to quote from *The Jerusalem Post*. I do that because I do not think the representative

of the Zionists will wish to refute what is published there.

72. On 4 March, *The Jerusalem Post* reported that residents of the Jalazoun refugee camp near Ramallah—refugees who have been denied the right to live in their homes—had complained during the past few days that troops had kept them waiting in the cold and wet for hours, while questioning them. These are the new SS troops. All this is so reminiscent of the Nazis. Residents of the camp, near the military Government headquarters on the Ramallah-Nablus road, said that soldiers had forced them to wait outside while questioning them about stone-throwing attacks on Israeli cars. That is a very humane way of treating people, is it not? They bring them out at night; they make them sit in the rain—and all this to find out who threw a stone.

73. One would have thought that a lesson had been learned in Viet Nam, but the same kinds of things are being done in my country. Again, according to *The Jerusalem Post*, an army patrol called the "Green Patrol" had mistakenly sprayed more than 400 dunums of cultivated land in the area south of Hebron with an agricultural poison several weeks before the date on which this report appeared, 16 April. A "Green Patrol" spraying an agricultural poison on more than 400 dunums of agricultural land can only be a manifestation of inherent hatred by the Zionists for the Arabs merely because they are Arabs. That is racism in its ugliest form.

74. Let us now turn again to Hebron and see what has been reported. According to a broadcast of the Jerusalem Domestic Service in English of 26 March:

"Sources in the West Bank military Government say that for now Governor Binyamin Ben-Eliassar will not go beyond the stern warning he delivered to Mayor Fahd Qawasma yesterday. Ben-Eliassar made it clear that Israel would not tolerate statements similar to the ones he made comparing zionism and nazism. Ben-Eliassar told Qawasma that his remarks at the mass protest meeting on Monday were incitement."

75. If the United Nations considers zionism to be a form of racism, if the United Nations and indeed the entire world fought nazism, if more than 40 million lives were lost in that fight against nazism, a form of racism, I do not see why the Mayor of Hebron should be warned that he will not be allowed to compare zionism with nazism. It is the opinion—indeed the determination—of the international community that zionism is a form of nazism.

76. I continue quoting from the report by the Jerusalem Domestic Service of 26 March:

"What, then, are the options open to the military Government? The most serious are deportation"

—which has happened—“trial and imprisonment” —something they would not dare do—“or removing Qawasma from his post. But a number of key personalities on the West Bank who would not be quoted by name said they did not really take the warning to Qawasma seriously, because the military Government had earlier issued an even sterner warning to the Nablus Mayor, ordering him not to engage in political activity, and that warning had gone unheeded.”

77. The Council, of course, knows that at that time the General Assembly condemned Israel and asked it to rescind that order so that the Mayor, who had been elected by his own people, would be able to return to his post. And he did return. That is why we find that there is in the United Nations a very constructive approach conducive to peace.

78. Again, on 25 March, the Jerusalem Domestic Television Service quoted General Binyamin Ben-Eliassar as saying:

“It seems to me that in the talk I held today with Mayor Qawasma I explicitly made clear to him the seriousness of the remarks uttered. I also told him in a clear-cut manner that there is an accepted framework which we will be ready to tolerate and that he had to obey it. Any deviation from this framework will be seriously regarded by us.”

So we have this very benign sort of alien domination: “You do what we tell you; otherwise we kick you in the pants and throw you out or put you in prison. You have no right to express an opinion. You have no right to freedom of thought or freedom of speech”. Those of us who have read the history of Nazi behaviour in occupied Europe are familiar with all these things.

79. Let us now see what the settlers who came to live in Hebron as students have to say.

80. The head of one of those settlements, a certain Noam Arnon, is reported in *The Jerusalem Post* of 26 March to have said:

“The stronger the Jewish presence in the town, the less the danger. The Arabs will not fight the master. They only act when they feel there is no master.”

Is this not a master and slave notion? Is it not a racist ideology? But then, this Noam Arnon continued, saying that, in the long run, the Arabs would have to choose between allegiance to Israel or getting out of Palestine. That we will not do. We will stay there. We will fight for our survival. We will fight for a permanent status in our own country.

81. It was really touching emotionally to have shown on television here the funeral of a certain Mr. Hazeev. That Mr. Hazeev, who died, did not die carrying the

Torah or the Holy Book. According to *The New York Times*, he died carrying his rifle on his shoulder. He did not really die while praying. That Hazeev was a graduate of the imperialist, racist war in Viet Nam. He believed in the motto: “The only good Arab is a dead one”. That was the prototype of those settlers who came to evict the Palestinian from his home in Hebron and to take his place. They, too, believed in that saying.

82. How did certain members of the Knesset react? I shall quote only one, according to *The New York Times* of 6 May. Haim Bar-Lev, a former chief of staff, said “that the killings would not have occurred if no Jews had been living in Hebron”. Now if the Israelis were just to live there, as they had for more than a hundred years before 1929, if they were willing to live and let the Palestinians live in their own homes in Haifa, in Nazareth and in Jaffa, I think we could reach some sort of peaceful coexistence.

83. But here, because the Mayor spoke out there was an order—I do not even know if it was an order, given the way these people were expelled. They were called in the middle of the night, taken to the police station with black hoods on their heads—apparently, the chief of that operation was an ex-chief of the Ku Klux Klan—put in a helicopter, told they were wanted to meet with the Minister of War and they ended up in southern Lebanon with no papers, no passports, nothing. Eventually, they found a cab to bring them to Beirut.

84. Why was that done? Nobody seems to know. According to Major-General Danny Matt, who is the military co-ordinator for the occupied areas, there was no evidence of their direct involvement in the Hebron attack. Frankly, if the military governor seems to have no evidence that those people were involved, we naturally do not know why they were expelled. If they were expelled simply for having said that the Zionist empire would fall, just as the British empire and the Nazi empire fell in the past, that is no crime to my mind. It is a very historical prediction. All those racist empires, based on exploitation, fall not of themselves, but because peoples rise against them. That is what the Palestinians are doing.

85. How will the Israelis carry on with this occupation of our country and our lands? Foreign Minister Shamir, who was connected with the murder of Bernadotte, said that the only way to deal with such a situation would be to maintain a huge Jewish presence in the occupied areas.

86. The situation is really very serious. It is the duty of the Council to find a solution—and the solution is there, before our eyes. Let the Palestinians return to their homes. Let them live in dignity in their own homes. Let them exercise their right to self-determination. Let Israel and those who voted in favour of the resolutions of the Council implement those resolu-

tions. Let Israel withdraw from the territories it occupied in 1967. Let the Palestinians establish their own State. That would be a concrete and constructive step, conducive to peace. If that is not done, if we are denied the right to live in peace in our own homes, we cannot conceive of peace for anyone. That is our inalienable right. It is in accordance with the Charter and with United Nations resolutions. How much longer do we have to suffer? Do we really have to wait for genocide?

87. For those who sometimes watch television at noon, that Mr. Hazeev, who died with his rifle on his shoulder, was on television two or three days ago on Channel 9. He was being interviewed and there were some boys in the street in Hebron. Apparently, the reporter asked him a question, whereupon he turned to the Arab boys in the vicinity and said, "Oh, these damn bastards". Excuse me, but that was the language he used. That is the spirit of colonialism. One does not refer to people as "those damn bastards".

88. Reference was made once again to the incident of 1929 in Hebron. It was reported in the Peel Report of 1937, as follows:

"The Arab reaction to the sudden and striking development was quite natural. All that the Arab leaders had felt in 1929 they now felt more bitterly . . . the greater the Jewish inflow, the greater obstacle to their attainment of national independence."³

In 1929, Sir Walter Shaw, who was at the head of a special Commission, wrote:

"In less than ten years, three serious attacks have been made by Arabs on Jews. For eighty 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 respect 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, enquired 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 enquiry, when representatives of all parties told us that before the War the Jews and Arabs lived side by side, if not in amity, at least with tolerance, a quality which, to-day"—that is, 1929—"is almost unknown in Palestine."⁴

89. I should just appeal to the Council to consider for a moment. Why was it that for decades Arabs and Jews lived together in amity and tolerance and then, after 1929, there was a change in attitude? It was, as we realized then, because the Zionist movement had brought a new dimension to the country. They wanted

to expel us, to take our country. Those pamphlets distributed only a few days ago by the group of the United States citizen, Kahane, tell us that there is no room for us in the country, to get out. Well, we are not getting out; we are staying in. And we shall fight for our survival and permanent status in our country.

90. Finally, I think that I should thank—and it gives me pleasure to do so—those who voted in favour of the resolution, which simply reasserts or restates the affirmation that those expelled leaders should be permitted immediately to return to the posts to which they were elected. Otherwise, there will be a violation of the resolution, a violation of the Charter, and a continued violation of our inalienable rights. Article 25 of the Charter speaks very clearly to this point:

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

91. I take it that, should those two Mayors and the Qadi decide to return within the next 24 hours or so, they will have the way open for them. They might go to the bridge over the River Jordan, take a cab on the other side of the bridge and return to resume their functions. If they still think that zionism and nazism are equal, they have that right. They will not hold an opinion different from that of the rest of the world. Should Israel deny them entry, I should think that the Council would then have to meet again and consider what further steps it will take, again in the spirit of the Charter.

92. I shall not talk about other matters because we should confine our discussion today to the exercise of an inalienable right of a person to be in his home and to carry out the functions for which he has been elected.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Yugoslavia, in which he requests to be invited in order to make a statement. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

94. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from French*): I invite the representative of Yugoslavia to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

95. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): We are deeply touched by the expressions of condolence and sympathy that you, Mr. President, have conveyed, on the demise of the President of my country, to the Government and people of Yugoslavia and to the members of President Tito's family. I am very grateful for this opportunity most warmly to thank the President and all the other members of the Council.

96. In our deep sorrow and great sense of loss which are felt in the hearts of all Yugoslavs, these marks of sympathy give us further encouragement resolutely to pursue the efforts of our late President in promoting the realization of the lofty ideals that are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

97. I should like also to thank the representative of Israel for the expression of his condolences. I am thankful to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization for the sympathy that he has expressed to my country and to my people.

98. President Tito consistently stressed the crucial role of the Security Council in promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes and in safeguarding international peace and security on the basis of the principles of the Charter.

99. To the last moments of his life, to his last breath, from his sickbed President Tito participated actively in all world developments just as, throughout his life, he was not only a witness to, but also a participant in, all historical and revolutionary transformations. Shortly before his death, he mustered sufficient strength to address to world statesmen messages echoing the voice of reason and calling upon them to settle disputes by peaceful means, to refrain from the use of force and to continue to promote détente.

100. He urged that the deterioration of the international situation must be checked, emphasizing that solutions to conflicts and crises cannot be found in bloc rivalry, the arms race, the policy of force and the deepening of international tensions. He pointed out that the only way leading to these solutions is through full respect for the principles of peaceful co-existence in relations among all nations, in negotiations and in the strengthening of equitable co-operation among equal and independent countries.

101. We have lost a man who guided us during the long and trying years of our recent history along the path of freedom, independence and progress. Our grief is as profound as the love we felt for our late President, who was a symbol of the new Yugoslavia. He was a legend during his lifetime and he has become a legend of history.

102. The death of President Tito has created a void that we in Yugoslavia can only fill by daily commitment to carrying on his life work. His accomplishments inspired us during the liberation war; they imbued us with faith in peacetime; they became an integral part of the life of new Yugoslavia, and with his accomplishments are irrevocably linked the present and the future of all the Yugoslav peoples.

103. I shall convey, Mr. President, your condolences and expressions of sympathy to the Government and the people of Yugoslavia and to the members of the family of our late President, who will find in them a source of encouragement, consolation and inspiration.

104. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are no further speakers for this meeting. The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

NOTES

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

² Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1915.

³ *Palestine Royal Commission, Report*, Cmd. 5479, London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1937, part I, chap. III, para. 76.

⁴ *Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August 1929*, Cmd. 3530, London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1930, p. 150.