

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

NOV 13 1986

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

**2202<sup>nd</sup>** MEETING: 27 FEBRUARY 1980

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2202) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
(a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);	
(b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802) .....	1

#### NOTE

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

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

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

## 2202nd MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 27 February 1980, at 3.30 p.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2202)

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

*The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [2199th to 2201st meetings], I invite the representative of Jordan to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; and I invite the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the

Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Indonesia and Kuwait 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 accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamil (Indonesia) and Mr. Bishara (Kuwait) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

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

4. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It must have become evident by now that this debate is essentially a diversionary exercise calculated to frustrate the ongoing peace process. It is also obvious that there is a convergence of interests between the "rejectionist" States in the Arab camp and the Soviet Union, which seeks to divert attention from its continuing aggression against and occupation of Afghanistan, and all that that aggression signifies.

5. Moreover, as I already pointed out, the Council's debates and resolutions on the Arab-Israel conflict

in recent years have been generally characterized by a fundamental defect. It is that they have consciously and consistently ignored the threat to Israel's security posed by Arab hostility and belligerency in its various manifestations. Deliberate attempts have been made to fragment the Arab-Israel conflict and to focus attention exclusively on one or another of its secondary aspects, out of context and with total disregard for broader considerations which, from Israel's point of view, are crucial. Nothing we have heard in the course of the debate thus far leads us to alter our basic assessment of it.

6. The present debate is entitled "The situation in the occupied Arab territories". The very formulation of the agenda item under consideration is intended to imply that the territories in question are nothing but Arab. This in itself already reflects a biased and slanted approach. I feel in duty bound to rectify this fallacious conception. While the final status of the territories in question is to be resolved through negotiations and agreement, it is imperative that it be clearly understood that the Jewish people and the State of Israel have the right in principle, as well as in law and in terms of national security, to a permanent presence in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District.

7. The inseparable bond between the Jewish people and its homeland Eretz Yisrael—the land of Israel—is an integral part of world history, inextricably entwined in the cultural heritage of mankind. The right of the Jewish people to its land was recognized as a matter of course by the League of Nations and enshrined in its Mandate for Palestine,<sup>1</sup> which stressed: "... the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and ... the grounds for reconstituting"—and I stress 'reconstituting'—"their national home in that country". The Mandatory Power was also entrusted with the duty of encouraging "... close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes".

8. Last Monday [2200th meeting], I had the opportunity to describe in some detail how Jordan illegally occupied Judaea and Samaria in 1948, and I shall not weary the Council by repeating what I said then. Let me state only that the fact that the Arab States failed in their armed aggression aimed at destroying Israel does not legitimize their violation of international law. On the other hand, that armed aggression precludes them from invoking in any form the benefits of a General Assembly resolution which they themselves both rejected and destroyed by force of arms.

9. Most of these Arab States have not changed their fundamental attitude towards Israel, and they are now engaged in a determined effort—of which this debate is part—to frustrate the ongoing peace process. The Arab States concerned reject the peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict through negotiations, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Instead, they strive to impose

their own solution, if not in one fell swoop, then in stages.

10. The solution they advocate is essentially that of the terrorist PLO. Certain Governments and quarters delude themselves and try to present that organization and its leaders as "moderates". However, the latter, even if they sometimes speak in muted tones, do not generally suffer from any inhibitions. Thus, for example, in an interview with *El Mundo* in Caracas, Venezuela, on 11 February—that is, just a fortnight ago—Yasser Arafat declared:

"Peace for us means the destruction of Israel.

"We are preparing for an all-out war, a war which will last for generations . . . We shall not rest until the day when we return to our home, and until we destroy Israel. The unity of the Arab world will make this possible.

"The destruction of Israel is the goal of our struggle, and the guidelines of that struggle have remained firm since the establishment of Fatah in 1965 . . . We know that the intention of some of the Arab leaders is to solve the conflict by peaceful means. When this occurs, we shall oppose it."<sup>2</sup>

11. That political approach, aimed at the destruction of a nation and of a State Member of this Organization, did not begin in 1965, as Arafat suggests, or even in 1947-1948, when the Arab States at the time vowed to destroy the Jewish State in embryo. Throughout this debate the Council has been treated to discourses in which the massacre of the Jews of Hebron in 1929 has been shamelessly justified. It should be remembered that the ancient Jewish community was made up of pious Jews, elderly, religious and defenceless. But in this debate the bloody pogrom visited upon them half a century ago has been casually brushed off as a necessary and justified act.

12. Thus the aim is to destroy Israel. It is the aim of those States which created the PLO in the first place as an instrument of warfare against Israel and of all those States which are maintaining it as such by financing and equipping it militarily and providing a whole range of other services.

13. That is the goal of the rejectionists and of their stooge the terrorist PLO. To implement their sinister designs, the rejectionists have created an enormous war machine and thus an ominous threat to peace. The rejectionists' strategy has been to create an "eastern front" combining, in the first instance, the armed forces of Syria to the north of Israel, Jordan and Iraq to the east and Saudi Arabia to the south. The combined military weight of these countries will be supplemented in times of war with sophisticated weapons available in enormous quantities from the arsenals of other rejectionist States. This colossal array of force will be mounted against Israel also from

southern Lebanon and, if at all possible, through Judaea and Samaria.

14. I shall try to give some notion of what we are talking about. The Arab States have today 500,000 more men under arms than has the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and three times the artillery of the combined NATO forces. They also have 3,000 more tanks and several hundred more combat aircraft than NATO. The "eastern front" alone—that is, Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia—is currently equivalent to NATO in manpower and tanks and already has twice as much artillery. In terms of air power, the Arab armies will this year equal the combined strength of the Warsaw Pact forces. They will be double that of NATO, or three times that of the People's Republic of China. In terms of ground forces, the Arab States have today almost as many tanks as the United States and more artillery than it has.

15. And against whom, one may well ask, is this colossal array of military power to be used? One does not need to look very far for the answer. The leaders of the Arab rejectionist States within and beyond the "eastern front" are only too ready to provide it. Thus, for example, shortly after seizing total power in Iraq, Saddam Hussein announced on 3 July 1979, according to the Iraq news agency report of the same date: "Iraq is preparing itself in the economic, political, social, intellectual and military fields for the liberation of Jerusalem and all the lands of Palestine."

16. At the beginning of this month Kuwait conducted military manoeuvres, using for the first time Soviet-made surface-to-surface missiles. Those missiles, which were shown on Kuwaiti television, are of the Luna type and have a range of 68 kilometres. On 9 February the Kuwaiti Minister of Defence emphasized on television that the importance of those missiles is that they can be used from a long distance. He went on to stress that his country was preparing for its part in the liberation of what he called the "occupied Arab territories". Members of the Council will no doubt recall that Kuwait has persistently refused to accept Council resolution 242 (1967).

17. Then again, there is Colonel Kaddafi. I need not elaborate on the fact, known to all of us here, that Libya has in recent years become the major stockpile of Soviet weaponry in North Africa and possibly in the whole of the African continent. How then are we to view the following declaration by Colonel Kaddafi which appeared in the Kuwaiti newspaper *Al-Qabas* on 3 September 1978? I quote:

"We will tear into pieces any Arab-Israeli agreement concluded against the will of the Arab nation, whether it be signed in Jerusalem, the 'Black House' or the Camp David barn."

18. Perhaps some members of the Council can take lightly these hard military facts and declared military

intentions when considering the developments in Judaea and Samaria. Israel cannot. Not surprisingly, some of the Arab rejectionist States, notably Syria, and the PLO were among the first to applaud the Soviet aggression against Afghanistan, for they saw in it a precedent and a model for their intended aggression against Israel.

19. The rejectionists regard Judaea and Samaria, as well as the Gaza District and southern Lebanon, as the most important bridgeheads through which they might realize their dream of a war of annihilation against Israel. A glance at the map will show why. Before 1967, Israel at its narrowest point was less than nine miles wide, that is, less than the length of Manhattan island. Half of Israel's population is concentrated in the narrow coastal plain between Netanya and Tel Aviv. Before 1967, all this population was within easy reach of Jordan's long guns. The residents of Israel's capital, Jerusalem, were even worse off. The city was divided by barbed wire and hand grenades could be lobbed across by the men of Jordan's Arab Legion. Snipers on the battlement of the Walled City had no difficulty in picking off their targets and *légionnaires* with machine-guns could and did wreak havoc at will. Ever since Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District have been under Israeli control, the Arab rejectionists have tried to reconvert them into forward bases. In this they have allocated to the PLO a special role and set it the task of using the territories as bridgeheads for acts of hostility, terror, sabotage and subversion against Israel and its civilian population.

20. While the rejectionist States build up their war machine, as they wait for an opportune moment to launch what they call the "next round", the PLO continues to act. Since 1967, there have been approximately 10,000 such acts of indiscriminate violence and terror in Israel and the territories. Six hundred and forty-three people have been murdered and 3,425 others have been wounded in Israel by the PLO. It has also terrorized and intimidated Arabs prepared to negotiate peace with Israel, killing more than 350 Arabs and injuring almost 2,000 others.

21. As part of the "grand design", the rejectionists would obviously like the territories leading to the outskirts of Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv and every other town and city in Israel to be cleared of any Israeli presence that might stand in the way of their armies. Israel sees no reason to oblige them.

22. Once again, countries perhaps thousands of miles away, unfamiliar with the perils of protracted conflict and hostile neighbours, can turn a blind eye to these harsh facts. Israel, I repeat, cannot. Other States enjoy considerable security and strategic depth. Israel does not. Other States have not been subjected to the impact of four wars of aggression launched by hostile neighbours in the span of three decades. Israel has. Other nations do not know what it is like

to be ringed by countries which consider themselves to be in a state of war and which are arming for yet another war of annihilation. Israel does.

23. In the light of past experience and present realities, Israel has no grounds for underestimating the intentions and belligerent activities of the Arab rejectionists, or what would be more foolhardy, of ignoring them. Despite this, other States, which sit on the sidelines, ask Israel to adopt an ostrich-like posture and to do what no responsible State would do, namely, to expose itself in its entirety to the immediate military threat of an implacable foe; in brief, to put its very existence at risk.

24. Any discussion of the situation in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District which does not take Israel's fundamental right to self-preservation and its legitimate concern for its security and defence into account is meaningless. Similarly, any United Nations commissions which are established without regard to the background of persistent Arab aggression against Israel for over 30 years are detached from reality and lack coherence. This is all the more so, when, as in the case of the mandate of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), their conclusions are determined in advance by the resolution in question.

25. The mandate of the Commission requiring it to produce a second report, as laid down in resolution 452 (1979), was even more biased than its first one. Resolution 452 (1979) blindly embraced the recommendations contained in the Commission's first report [*S/13450 and Add.1 of 12 July 1979*]. Then, having reiterated in its preambular part all the elements which predetermined the first report's conclusions, and having added, for good measure, that Israel's settlement policy is bound to have "grave consequences" on "any attempt to reach a peaceful solution in the Middle East", the resolution requested the Commission to prepare another report. In short, the shape of the Commission's report and the nature of its conclusions were once again determined in advance.

26. Predictably, the Commission's second report [*S/13679 of 4 December 1979*] suffers from all the defects of the first, both on the factual level and in terms of the conclusions drawn therefrom. It is permeated with a wholly uncritical approach, heavily slanted in favour of Israel's enemies. And once again no consideration whatsoever has been given to the highly detailed information published by the Government of Israel, including the information presented by me in the course of the Council's debates last March and July.

27. For example, there is the sheer ignorance evidenced in subparagraph 41 (d), where the settlement of Elon Moreh is equated with Qaddum while anyone who bothers to read a daily newspaper knows that

these are not one and the same. But let us overlook such a minor point. Instead let us look at the substance of the matter. In that subparagraph note is taken of the decision of the Government of Israel to move the settlement of Elon Moreh to a new site, in the light of a ruling given by Israel's Supreme Court, sitting as a High Court of Justice. Then in paragraph 49, the report deplors "the efforts of the Israeli Government to side-step that decision". Members of Council should be aware that the Government of Israel has not side-stepped that decision and that the decision has been implemented.

28. In subparagraph 41 (a), the report alleges that in recent months large tracts of private Arab land, totalling 40,000 dunums, have been "confiscated" for the purpose of expanding Jewish settlements. This is a falsehood. No such land has been requisitioned at all. Some land has been "closed" by the military authorities of the area for the purpose of training without the use of live ammunition. A closure order of this kind is temporary. It does not affect ownership. Moreover, even while the order is in effect the owners are able to use their land and cultivate it. If the military activities cause any damage, the owners are entitled to receive compensation.

29. Subparagraph 41 (b) mentions the decision by the Government of Israel of 16 September 1979 to permit Israeli citizens to purchase land in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District. It goes on to state that the decision rescinds a previous one which, according to the Commission, had hitherto prohibited Israeli citizens and organizations from purchasing land in those areas. This too is false. In accordance with Order No. 25, promulgated by the Military Governor in 1967, and in conformity with international law, land purchases were permitted, subject to authorization by the administering authorities. The Cabinet's decision of 16 September was thus purely of an administrative nature and did not in any way affect the provisions of the Order of 1967.

30. Subparagraph 41 (c) draws attention to a decision adopted by the Government of Israel on 14 October 1979 to expand seven existing settlements. The authors of the report were unable to conceal their bias, since, when referring to the land to be used for this purpose, they found it necessary to insert the words "allegedly not privately owned by Arab inhabitants". The fact is that the land in question was not—I repeat, not—privately owned in any of the cases covered by the Government's decision. All the land used was either legally owned by Jewish individuals or was State-owned land. The relevant decision taken by the Government began explicitly with these words:

"There will be no confiscation or requisitioning of any private land whatsoever. Any expansion of the settlements or allocation of land to them will be done from State-owned land, after strict and detailed scrutiny by the Attorney-General."

31. Last Friday [2199th meeting] we were treated to a turgid and confusing lecture by Ambassador Nuseibeh concerning different categories of land. Anyone who is at all familiar with land law is aware of the elementary distinction existing between privately owned lands and State-owned lands. The laws which apply in Judaea and Samaria are based on the Ottoman legislation, which has been in effect in the region since 1858. Minor changes were made in that law during the time of the British Mandate and under the Jordanian occupation of Judaea and Samaria. There have been no changes whatsoever in the law since 1967, when Judaea and Samaria came under Israel's control.

32. Paragraphs 41 (f) and 42 regurgitate the false allegations that Israel is siphoning off the water supplies of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District. This is another striking example of the Commission's refusal to consider the official information readily available to it, including information which I offered at considerable length on this topic in the debates of March and July last.

33. If Israel was indeed siphoning off the water, then how does the Commission account for the fact that the area of irrigated land cultivated by the Arabs in the areas in question has increased since 1967 by 160 per cent? How does it explain that the number of agricultural tractors in use has gone up over ten times, from 130 in 1967 to 1,750 in 1976? How does it explain that agricultural output has shown a growth rate of 11 per cent a year since 1967? How does it explain that in real terms income from agriculture has grown more than two-and-a-half times? All this information was laid before the Council in detail in my statements of 13 March [2125th meeting] and 18 July 1979 [2156th meeting]. The Commission, in its partiality, has chosen to ignore it.

34. To compound the demonstratively false nature of their charge, the authors of the report describe the conditions prevailing in the village of Al-Auja as a "case in a point". According to the report, in August last the villagers protested that their economy was being ruined because Israeli wells and the water network supplying the nearby settlements had drastically depleted the village's water resources. As the authors of the report think that this is a case in point, let me address myself to it in some detail.

35. There are two villages situated in the Auja basin: Auja Fawka and Auja Takhta. The inhabitants earn their livelihood from agriculture, working their own plots of land or those of several landowners who live elsewhere. Most of the water they consume comes from the Auja Springs and from several shallow wells in the area. The Auja Springs flow from the ground at an elevation of 20 metres above sea level, at an annual rate of about 10 million cubic metres, which fluctuates radically in direct relation to the amount of rainfall in the region. In a year of plentiful rain, the flow can reach as much as 25 million cubic

metres, whereas in a year of drought it can drop as low as 1 million cubic metres or less. In the drought year of 1962 to 1963, under the Jordanian occupation, the springs produced only 1.1 million cubic metres of water.

36. The wells sunk in the area by the Mekorot Water Company of Israel reach a depth of 190 metres below sea level, fully 210 metres below the level of the Auja Springs, and there is no interflow or physical connection whatsoever between the two. Therefore, the claim that the Mekorot wells affect the flow of the spring waters is entirely unfounded.

37. The drastic reduction of the flow of the Auja Springs waters between July and November 1979 resulted from a drastically curtailed flow of spring water resulting from the cumulative effect of sparse rainfall in the three years from 1976 to 1978 and the severe drought of 1978 to 1979, when annual rainfall levels were 70 to 80 per cent below average. Given the over-all tenor of the Commission's report, it comes somewhat as a surprise that those drought years were not blamed on Israel.

38. The heavy rainfalls of December 1979 brought a renewed flow from the Auja Springs. If the abundant rain which has fallen this winter continues, the spring water will undoubtedly prove adequate to permit the irrigation of crops as in the past. The flow has already been renewed, and that in itself is ample proof that its recent cessation cannot in any way be attributed to the Jewish villages in the vicinity.

39. I could go on quoting chapter and verse to refute the so-called "findings" of the report, but to what purpose? Not only are the so-called findings wrong, but the whole report is permeated with instances of an uncritical approach. That uncritical approach in turn was predetermined by the Commission's mandate. For examples of this uncritical nature of the report, one need only look at its paragraphs 33 and 37.

40. In the first of those paragraphs, one of Yasser Arafat's henchmen is quoted as saying that there is "no religious freedom in Jerusalem for Christians and Moslems" and that access to the Holy Places is "still restricted". This so-called information, given by someone who represents an organization committed to the destruction of Israel, is offered without comment or reserve by the authors of the report. Surely the Commission must know the truth. Millions of Moslem and Christian tourists and pilgrims, in addition to Jewish visitors, have visited Jerusalem since 1967 and prayed and worshipped freely at its mosques and churches. All those visitors can attest to the complete freedom of access to and worship at the shrines holy to the adherents of all faiths, which is unprecedented in the history of the city.

41. Similarly, in the second of these paragraphs the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan

is recorded as having presented the Commission with a series of documents, including one that purports to be an Israeli plan for the seizure of the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock. Nothing could be more fantastic. The authors of the report were apparently prepared to accept this wild fantasy without demur or reserve.

42. In the light of the above, what can be expected of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report? If they were placed before any court of law they would be disqualified as evidence and thrown out unceremoniously.

43. Several speakers have seen fit to exploit this debate to play on religious sentiments in order to fan the flames of incitement, both religious and political, against Israel. They have focused not only on Hebron, but also on Jerusalem—the eternal capital of Israel and of the Jewish people.

44. Jerusalem has known many foreign rulers during the course of its long history, but none of them ever regarded it as their capital. Only the Jewish people has always maintained it as the centre and sole focus of its national and spiritual life. The Jews of Jerusalem have the longest unbroken historical association with the Holy City. The city of Jerusalem has been the heart and soul of the Jewish people since King David, 3,000 years ago, transferred his capital from Hebron to Jerusalem and established it as the capital of Israel. Jews for thousands of years have prayed daily for their return to Jerusalem as the centre of Jewish life, hope and yearning. For the past century and a half, Jerusalem has had a continuous and uninterrupted Jewish majority.

45. As the representative of Israel, I must therefore state here again that Jerusalem—one, undivided and indivisible—shall remain for ever, as it is now, the capital of Israel and of the Jewish people.

46. At the same time the Government of Israel has always been conscious of the fact that Jerusalem is of deep concern also to other faiths. Its religious and cultural sites are precious to Christians and Moslems, as well as to Jews. Israel is mindful of the historical treasures and manifold spiritual heritage of Jerusalem.

47. Israel's policy with regard to Jerusalem's Holy Places is governed by the Law on the Protection of Holy Places of June 1967. Under this law, unrestricted access to Holy Places is guaranteed to all members of all faiths. Respect for and preservation of the Holy Places is also ensured.

48. In this regard it is relevant to recall again the dismal record of the Jordanian occupation between 1948 and 1967. From the outset, the Jordanian Government began to eliminate systematically every trace of Jerusalem's Jewish past. Fifty-eight synagogues, some of great antiquity, like the 700-year-old Hurva Syna-

gogue, were wantonly destroyed and desecrated. In the process, hundreds of Holy Torah scrolls and books reverently preserved for generations were plundered and burnt to ashes. In flagrant violation of the 1949 Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement, Jordan barred access by Jews to their Holy Places and cultural institutions. Moreover, Israeli Moslems were barred by Jordan from praying in the mosques in the Old City of Jerusalem. They gained access to them only in 1967, when the city was reunited.

49. Let us be candid with ourselves and see this debate for what it really is. Let us also have the honesty to admit that debates such as this will not advance the cause of peace one iota.

50. For 30 years there was no progress in the numerous attempts made to resolve the Arab-Israel conflict. For the last two years we have been engaged in a peace process that has already shown its potential and produced the first historic breakthrough in the conflict. That breakthrough came, of course, in the form of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt which has already led to the establishment of full diplomatic relations between our two countries, with our Ambassadors presenting their credentials yesterday.

51. The fact is that the only practical solution to the Arab-Israel conflict, including the question of the Palestinian Arabs in all its aspects, is the one outlined in the Camp David framework for peace in the Middle East. That framework is squarely based on resolution 242 (1967), which remains to this day the only agreed basis for peace negotiations in the Middle East. The Camp David framework sees the solution to the question of the Palestinian Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District in terms of granting them full autonomy for a transitional period of five years before reaching an agreement on the final status of the areas concerned. To that end it was agreed to negotiate on a principle of self-government, to be exercised through an administrative council, for the Arab inhabitants of the areas in question.

52. Moreover, in that framework the Palestinian Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District were invited to play an active role in shaping their future by participating in all aspects of the negotiations. They have been invited to participate not only in current negotiations to set up a self-governing administrative council, but also in the negotiations that will determine the final status of the areas they live in and in the eventual negotiations on a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, in which the determination of boundaries between the two countries will be agreed upon.

53. The Camp David framework also envisages a withdrawal of the Israeli military government and its civilian administration, accompanied by a redeployment of Israeli forces into specified security locations.



54. This solution provided for in the Camp David framework offers the Palestinian Arabs concerned greater opportunities than they have ever before experienced in their history. It offers them the prospect of governing themselves, of prosperity and of peaceful coexistence alongside their neighbours. It offers them a secure future, free from terror.

55. As the President of Israel, Yitzhak Navon, remarked yesterday on receiving the credentials of the Ambassador of the Arab Republic of Egypt:

"We are still confronted with problems that we shall have to solve, but when we look back at the ground we have already covered we are filled with hope that those problems which still face us will be solved in mutual understanding and peace."

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Kuwait. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Allow me first, Mr. President, to express to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I note with great satisfaction the growing co-operation between my country and yours, particularly recently in the field of trade and economic development.

58. I should like to express to the members of the Commission, my dear friend Ambassador Mathias and the other two members of the Commission, my sentiment of admiration for their unflagging efforts in the search for peace. They were given an undertaking for a noble cause and they vindicated their judiciousness in an exemplary manner. Objectivity was their companion. I would say to them that they should not be discouraged by the criticism of the representative of Israel, for they are in good company. Every commission, every body, every committee that investigates Israeli practices or examines Israeli policies, either in the occupied territories or beyond, is always subjected to harsh criticism simply because Israeli policy is to silence, suppress and eliminate criticism. Ambassador Mathias is in very good company, the company of many distinguished representatives of Member States, and of others outside the Organization who have espoused a noble cause, because that noble cause collides fundamentally with the policy of Israel.

59. For the last three days I have been reading the statements of the Israeli representative. I said last March, when Kuwait was a member of the Council, that he enjoys "linguistic globe-trotting" [2134th meeting] in order to divert. He has assumed the role of a linguistic globe-trotter. Linguistic globe-trotting is an exercise which many of us are technically capable of. But that is not the issue before the Council. Linguistic ability is not the monopoly of anyone; it is within the capacity of so many of us. In all fair-

ness, I admire not only the members of the Council but primarily the members of the Commission for the composure, the coolness and the quite manner they have displayed in the face of the most provocative element of linguistic globe-trotting. If we want to enjoy semantics or acrobatics, whether linguistic or physical, this chamber is not the place. We know what is the place: on Broadway, or at Lincoln Center perhaps, which is more sophisticated than Broadway. But that is not the case.

60. I have come here, prompted to speak on this issue because I feel that I have a personal obligation to do so, primarily because last March I was among those who encouraged the members of the Commission to undertake such a colossal duty. I was also among those members of the Council who encouraged members of the Commission not to pay any attention to unprovoked, unwarranted and unwelcome criticism or harsh critiques.

61. There is no need for me to enumerate the conclusions of the Commission. That has been done so ably and amply by many members of the Council and particularly by the representative of Jordan. What is being discussed here is the essence of the whole Middle East problem. In a very short phrase, I would say that it is Zionism versus the rights of the Palestinians. I have a text here, but I shall not read it out, simply because the issue demands more than the reading of a text.

62. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Mr. Terzi, knows better perhaps than anybody else what Zionism means, what kind of harshness, what sorts of unconventional means have been used for the expulsion of the Palestinians. Before 1948 terroristic methods, psychological warfare and terrorizing ways were used to expel the Palestinians from their land, simply because they had to make room for the Zionist settlers coming from all over Europe—and some from the United States. After 1948 new methods were used, and since 1967 more sophisticated, more subtle ways have been employed: the diversion of water, the demolition of houses, deportation to the desert, psychological warfare to terrorize the indigenous and native Palestinians, vandalism by kids, teenagers who have come primarily—I must unfortunately say—from Florida and elsewhere in the United States, youngsters, fanatical Jews who went to Palestine on the grounds that it was their own country. Whereas our friend here, Mr. Terzi, who is the pure product of Palestine, cannot go there. What do we call it here? When we mention that Zionism is racism, many Member States take issue with us. But if it is not racism, then what is it?

63. The other point that I should like to make about this debate is that there is a new concept now, introduced by Israel. The new concept is the concept of what I call absolutism. The concept of absolutism means that the Israelis insist on absolute security;

on the absolute right—as it perceives it—to settle anywhere in Palestinian territory. Absolutism means even the right to divert water for the sake of the Jews at the expense of the Palestinians; in other words, to make the Palestinians so thirsty that they will leave the land of their ancestors. The principle of absolutism is based on force, on the belief that the ultimate objective is the triumph of force. The principle of absolutism gets its strength from political support—and I shall revert to this.

64. The principle of absolutism has given Israel the Jewish settlements in the West Bank, as well as in the Golan Heights—the occupied Syrian territory. The principle of absolutism is the salient element in southern Lebanon's suffering. We periodically debate here the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. We talk about Major Haddad, and about the Force's inability to discharge its mandate in southern Lebanon. The principle of absolutism is involved in all that, too.

65. The principle of absolutism means absolute security for Israel, at the expense of the security of others. In other words, by its very nature, absolute security means insecurity for others. It means the absolute right for Israel to build Jewish settlements in the West Bank and in other places, the absolute right to import adventurers from Florida and elsewhere, the absolute right to vandalize Palestinians, the absolute right to live—where? In the city of Al-Khalil (Hebron). And their grounds for claiming the absolute right to live in that city are that Jews had lived there until 1929. If those grounds are valid, what about the right of the Palestinians? The Palestinians lived in their country for thousands of years, until 1948, when they were forcefully and forcibly expelled by the terror of Israel.

66. That is what we call the principle of absolutism. It is based on State gangsterism. It is based on the conviction that force will triumph. In a nutshell, that is Israel's policy—notwithstanding all these long lectures to which we have been subjected in regard to peace and the possibility of future signals on the horizon for accommodation.

67. What encourages this principle of absolutism? Political support from the United States. My dear friend Ambassador McHenry just came back from our area. We were honoured to receive him in my country. I am sure he was well aware of the feelings there. This principle of absolutism is propped up by the uninterrupted support given by the United States to Israel. It is generated and given its strength by this political support by the United States.

68. Let us call a spade a spade. The other day President Carter—and I have the greatest respect for his integrity—said that under his Administration the United States had given Israel \$10 billion. I well understand the motivation for that statement. Presi-

dent Carter also pledged his moral and political support for Israel. All this was reported in *The New York Times* of 26 February. What a timely statement it was—or, rather, an untimely statement, for, whether we like it or not, it has affected the current debate in the Council. It has encouraged Mr. Blum and his Government to display this total contempt for the Council—and one cannot blame them for taking advantage of the statement. When the President of the United States makes that kind of statement in the very midst of a debate in the Council on Jewish colonization of what is left of Palestinian land, that debate is bound to be adversely affected and influenced. It is the reason for this Napoleonic spirit that we see in Mr. Blum's speeches. It is a Napoleonic spirit that is derived from such statements by President Carter. And it is unfair.

69. Mr. McHenry went to our area of the world in the aftermath of what we in that area call President Carter's doctrine. President Carter's doctrine was addressed to my area—I am a product of the Gulf. That doctrine is that the United States will confront and repel any Soviet threat to or invasion of our area. I want to say, on the record and very frankly, that as a Kuwaiti I am not afraid of the rumbling of Soviet tanks, because I do not believe that the Soviet Union will touch our area. What we are afraid of is, not the rumbling of Soviet tanks, but the instability caused by Israeli policy.

70. In a nutshell, what has been presented to us as a doctrine for our protection is really counter-productive because it does not confront the real issue—the rights of the Palestinians. So long as the Palestinians are unable to exercise their rights, so long as Palestinians like my friend Mr. Terzi—this elderly man, with all his serenity—are unable to go home, so long as Palestinians in my country or in Lebanon or in Syria are unable to fulfil their aspirations, our area will be unstable. And that will not be because of the rumbling of Mr. Kharlamov's tanks; it will be because of the insensibility and intrasigence of Israeli policy.

71. And what is Israeli policy? In a nutshell, Mr. McHenry, it is to expel all Palestinians. Israel calls them "unwanted" and "nuisances". The Israelis act as though the Palestinians existed by accident in their own country and must therefore be deported to the desert. And where is the desert? Saudi Arabia and my country. So long as Palestinians continue to be deported, they will be receptive to radicalization. And radicalization means instability. That is the danger to my country, not the Soviets in Afghanistan—although I would remind the Council that I made what I would call one of the most militant statements in the General Assembly against the Soviet presence in Afghanistan.

72. But one should be fair. One should confront the issue. One should heal the wounds where they exist. The cause of the instability is not the Soviet threat to the Gulf. It is not the terrorism, as they call

it, of the Palestine Liberation Organization—and I would say that I am prepared to engage in a debate, although not at this juncture, on who is the terrorist. The cause of the instability is the senseless, insensible, brutal gangsterism of modern Israel, modern Zionism. That is the *raison d'être* of the instability in our area.

73. The Palestinians are restless, yes; restive, yes; dissatisfied, yes. And why? Because they are not treated as human beings. They are treated as sub-human beings. A Jew travelling from the comforts of Beverley Hills to Israel could immediately go to the home of Mr. Terzi and his relatives and occupy it as his own home. But not only are these Palestinians not allowed to do that, they are gunned down. And their intellectuals who speak out are gunned down. Their militants are gunned down. And they should be militant; if I were a Palestinian I would not be satisfied with making statements here.

74. We talk to them and blame them when they find refuge in despair, but we do not pay attention to them when they find refuge in tranquillity. We ignore them when they are tranquil; we blame them when they are violent. I am one of those who blame them. Mr. Terzi knows that during the last two years when I sat in the Council I calmed him down; I told him that here we had to practise the art of the possible, not of the impossible. It is the art of accommodation, not the language of the gun. He understood it, so much so that he has become an "outmoded revolutionary".

75. This is a very serious debate, and because of that we cannot treat it in the usual ritualistic way. We cannot be satisfied with sitting here debating the essence of Zionism versus the right of the Palestinians. We cannot be satisfied with reading out statements.

76. What can the Council do? We know the Council's limitations, and it is unfair to fix our sites on the peak of the mountain. We have to be realistic. I think that the best way to proceed is to tell those poor Palestinians under occupation that the Council and, through it, world public opinion are aware of their ordeal. In my view, it is enough. The Council should tell those Palestinians who have been under occupation, who have been forced since 1967 to endure the tribulations of occupation, that it is aware of their ordeal, aspirations and predicament. That is the best thing the Council can do.

77. Israel invites sanctions; but, unfortunately, Israel always gets what it does not deserve and gets away with what it is not entitled to. That is in the nature of things; and, as I said earlier, that is derived from the principle of absolutism, supported by—I shall not use an unflattering adjective—United States policy. Let us be fair. That is the problem.

78. I am always accused of coming with quotations. I have one from the Prophet Mohammed, who said

something that we here in the Council should emulate. He said:

"If you see the outrageous, you have to resist it with action; if you cannot with action, then with words; if you cannot with words, then in your heart—and that is the feeblest form of resistance."

79. I know the Council cannot resist the outrageous with action. But I expect the Council to resist the outrageous with words. I hope that the Council will not resist the outrageous merely in its heart, because that is the feeblest form of resistance and we do not like the Council to be reduced to the lowest form of resistance. I hope that it will confront the outrageous, not necessarily with action—because we are aware of the situation—but at least with words.

80. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have convened here to examine the second report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979). The members of the Commission accepted the task with a keen sense of responsibility and have fulfilled that task with objectivity and good balance. The data contained in the report, as well as its conclusions and recommendations, are correct and impartial. They therefore deserve the Council's recognition and support.

81. My delegation wishes to stress the value that we think should be attached to the work of commissions. In the terms of Article 29 of the Charter, the Council may establish such "subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions". The mandate given to a commission represents the delegation of power to exercise functions which are the Council's—in this case investigative functions. The commissions therefore act on behalf and in the name of the Council and when we invite Member States to make up commissions we place our full trust in them.

82. We wish to express appreciation to the representatives of the Governments of Portugal, Bolivia and Zambia for having accepted and diligently fulfilled their mandate. The counterpart to the commitment they entered into and the difficulties they faced should be firm support for the report that they have submitted to us and endorsement of their recommendations.

83. We deplore the fact that Israel has refused to co-operate with the Commission in its work, and it would be incongruous for the Council passively to accept such obvious violations of the Charter by a State—any State Member. The resolution we adopt should include measures commensurate with the seriousness of that fact, which is so significant and which in and of itself renders meaningless any argument against the report that we are considering.

84. We wish also to state our concern at some features of this debate which are degrading to the dignity of the Council. Consideration of the report

entails further elucidation of the facts included in it. Instead of this, yesterday we witnessed a round of insults and accusations foreign to the subject under consideration and addressed to States whose behaviour was not on the agenda.

85. The Commission has reached two major conclusions. First, the policy of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories continues systematically in disregard of General Assembly and Council resolutions. Secondly, from all the indications available, this attitude is part of a deliberate strategy aimed at creating irreversible situations which, given their emotive content and their political implications, impede a prompt, peaceful and just solution of the Palestinian problem.

86. We are faced with a case in which fundamental principles of our Organization are affected and, at the same time, objectives pursued by the international community are undermined. Hence the legitimate interest which all States have in this problem, because we all care about compliance with the basic rules which make coexistence possible and because the situation obtaining in the Middle East continues to constitute the most serious threat to international peace and security.

87. The violation of principles such as the territorial integrity of States, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the right of peoples to self-determination affects all nations but, in particular, it affects developing countries, which find in those principles the best guarantee of their own independence.

88. What is taking place in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is unacceptable. Changing the pattern of land ownership, altering the demographic structure and exploiting the natural resources in a manner detrimental to the Palestinian people are actions contrary to universally accepted principles and resolutions. In this case we find particularly applicable the principle of international law, which has been known as the Stimson Doctrine, to the effect that conquest confers no rights. The practices we condemn seem in fact to have been conceived of in accordance with a typical model of colonial behaviour according to which the occupying community assumes the right to appropriate territories, to subjugate populations and to extract wealth, while the colonized community is deprived of its most basic rights.

89. The problems which arise in the Middle East are part of a single web and must be approached from a global standpoint. They will be solved only if we effectively guarantee for all States of the region that they will live in peace and security through the recognition of the right of each of those States to exist independently. Israel cannot validly demand recognition of that right for itself if at the same time it does not recognize the right of the Palestinian people to establish a national home by constituting a State in

Palestine. No nation can expect of another the recognition of a right which it itself denies to that other nation.

90. Despite the partial solutions which have been found so far, we shall not attain peace and security for the region as long as the conflict between the Jewish and the Palestinian nations is not settled. With the approval of the United Nations, the former constituted a State over 30 years ago. The Palestinian people, which has affirmed its identity through a life of deprivation and common hopes, has the right, like so many other nations, to constitute itself politically with all the attributes of a sovereign State. While in this conflict both nations maintain that their survival is at stake, the truth is that the colonization of occupied territories only objectively affects the rights of the Palestinian nation.

91. In the Middle East, channels of understanding have begun to open up. Never in the last three decades have we been closer to real peace. The conditions are there thanks to which, by courageous decisions promoting the advent of the Palestinian State, harmony can be restored. The friendly relations which exist between Mexico and all the States and peoples of that region enable us to appeal to them, at this crossroads, to adopt decisions of a scope commensurate with the dimensions of the problem and not sacrifice the future through measures which, like those we are analysing in this debate, are inspired by narrow objectives and are irrevocably doomed to failure.

92. Many decisions and much of the world's stability depend today on peace in the Middle East. The sharper the tensions in that region, the more reasons or pretexts will there be for accentuating bipolarity, for reducing the margin for independent action by States and for succumbing to the temptation of resorting to force.

93. The focal point of a deep conflict that for three decades has pitted two significant sources of civilization against each other, a region which provides and produces an important part of the energy available to the world, the Middle East continues to be a major axis in the disputes and ambitions of our times. Hence the importance we attach to abiding by the decisions of the Council and to the solution of the problem which they address.

94. Not long ago, in this same chamber, we heard appeals for strengthening the credibility of the United Nations and for increased trust in its decisions. In this case, too, we believe it necessary to find appropriate measures consistent with the powers of the Council which may assure effective respect for law and the restoration of peace.

95. Mr. OUMAROU (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): The obstinacy of the facts, themselves engendered and rendered more serious by the obsti-

nacy of a State which finds amusement in defying the international community and all its peace-keeping institutions, has again brought us here to this prestigious chamber to discuss the attitude of Israel in the region.

96. Indeed, a new phase in the Israeli settlements policy, which has already been amply denounced in the conclusions of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), once again shows that Israel remains deaf to the injunctions of international opinion, deaf to the resolutions of the United Nations and the decisions of the Security Council, deaf to the after all well-meaning and urgent advice of those who have always been its friends and its most determined allies.

97. Now it is the Arab city of Al-Khalil in which Israel has chosen to show the world that it is not only pursuing its systematic and determined process of seizing Arab lands but is also planning to expand its policy of establishing new Jewish settlements both on the most fertile tracts of the West Bank and in the most homogeneous Arab agglomerations, despite the protests of the whole Arab world, despite the courageous resistance of the indigenous populations and despite the opposition of Israel's High Court of Justice, which is timidly endeavouring to ensure a certain degree of protection against the arbitrary seizure of coveted lands.

98. Some aspects of official Israeli policy recall another policy that has been internationally condemned, the policy of South Africa which is based on the principle: nothing for the blacks and everything for the whites. In any event, it is becoming increasingly clear that in the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem, it is now: everything for the Jews and nothing for the Arabs.

99. That is the case, for example, with the traditional sources of water, which Israel is exploiting intensively and exclusively for the benefit of its own population and the Jewish settlements which it has arbitrarily organized, established and imposed. A passage in the Commission's last report strikes us as being particularly poignant. Let me quote it.

"According to a study on water resources in the West Bank made available to the Commission, Israel pumps away some 500 million cubic metres of the West Bank's total annual supply of 620 million cubic metres by means of artesian wells drilled within its 1948 borders. The traditional water sources, such as wells and springs, are also being depleted through the use of modern drilling equipment to drain off water for the Israeli settlements in the occupied areas. As the water level continues to drop because of excessive Israeli consumption, the Israeli authorities have resorted to restrictive measures on the use of water by the Arab inhabitants, such as the prohibition of drilling new wells on the western side of the West Bank." [S/13679, para. 42.]

100. If I have dwelt at length on that aspect it is because we find the attitude of the Israeli authorities particularly revealing. As is well known, Niger, as a Sahelian country that has recently suffered from many years of drought, is one of those countries which are very familiar with the place and the value water has in the life of all living things and for the prosperity of the human community. We therefore cannot imagine any greater deprivation than the one which Israel is currently inflicting upon the Arab populations, which it is methodically striving to break up and drive out after having confiscated a good part of their lands.

101. How then could we allow Israel to pursue its annexationist policy, extend its settlements to all the Arab lands it covets in the area, and implant Jewish families in the very heart of certain cities, as it has recently done in Al-Khalil?

102. Niger denounces that policy and strongly opposes any presence of the Jewish entity in occupied lands. It therefore demands that Israel should return to its frontiers prior to the 1967 war, dismantle the Jewish settlements and immediately cease all forms of oppression and deprivation which the Jewish State is currently inflicting on the Arab communities.

103. The policy of force, frustration and arrogance has never given rise to anything but condemnation. It has always led to discontent and revolt. It will succeed only in jeopardizing harmony and peaceful coexistence between countries and peoples. The present policy of Israel in no way reduces tension in that dangerous region of the Middle East, where already weapons are used more than tools, and our species is becoming more and more intolerant and is disobeying God, who has frequently manifested there his deep love for mankind.

104. While continuing to defy the international community in this manner, while using its force and perhaps the overt or covert support it receives from others in order to continue to occupy land contrary to international law, while striving to wipe out populations by persecution and exactions, and while continuing to profane Jerusalem, although its religion prescribes veneration of that city just as the Moslem and Christian religions do, Israel cannot but be aware of the fact that it is acting against world peace and the moral law of nations. In so doing it is acting as a fomenter of tension; it is deliberately pushing the region nearer, nearer to an explosion.

105. We are in duty bound to denounce that state of affairs, to prevent Israel not only from resorting to the law of the jungle in the Middle East, but especially from isolating itself in its arrogance and imagining that it can from now on conceive and execute any plan with impunity, since its weapons are always at the ready and the international community does nothing to counter its acts or claims. We must induce Israel to recognize and respect the Arab entities of the region, to renounce once and for all its aggressive settlement

policy, to take account of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and to accept the representativeness of the Palestine Liberation Organization, with which it should agree immediately to discuss the real substance of the problem of the Middle East, that is to say, the constitution of a Palestinian State, free to organize and develop in full security. In the absence of such action, tension in the region will never slacken and we shall be in danger of going from crisis to crisis, from one meeting of the Council to another, in which we shall continue indefinitely to discuss and deplore catastrophic and increasingly uncontrollable outbursts.

106. It is true that the means available to us are very limited, but the Charter provides for action and measures which have not yet been proved to be ineffective. We certainly shall have to resort to them one day, and on that day, Niger will not be found wanting.

107. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Afghanistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table.

108. The representative of the United States has asked to speak on a point of order. I give him the floor.

109. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): On a point of order, I should like to reiterate what was said in the Council by the United States on 5 January [2185th session] with regard to statements by representatives of the authorities in Kabul. While we have made no objection to acceding to the request of Afghanistan to participate in the current discussion in the Council, the United States is in no way according status to the régime that has been installed and maintained in Afghanistan.

110. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

111. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom): The position of the United Kingdom delegation remains as stated in the Council on 5 January [*ibid.*]. My delegation has raised no objection to the invitation to Afghanistan to participate in this debate, but this should not in any way be taken to imply that the Government of the United Kingdom recognizes the new régime in Afghanistan as the Government of that country. We do not.

112. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Norway on a point of order.

113. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): The decision to hear the next speaker in this debate does not have any implication for my Government's view of recent events in Afghanistan as stated both here in the Council [*ibid.*] and in the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup>

114. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Portugal on a point of order.

115. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): On 5 January [*ibid.*], my delegation in the Council voiced our reservations about hearing a representative of the present powers in Kabul. We reaffirm those reservations.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of China on a point of order.

117. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): During the debate in the Council in January on Soviet aggression against Afghanistan, the Chinese delegation made the following solemn statement concerning the participation of the representative of Afghanistan in the meetings:

"In the view of the Chinese delegation, the permission for the representative of Afghanistan to participate in and address today's meeting can in no way be interpreted as acquiescence in the situation created by Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan." [*Ibid.*, para. 43.]

118. With regard to the permission given today to the representative of Afghanistan to participate in the debate on the situation in the occupied Arab territories, the Chinese delegation continues to maintain the position it has already stated.

119. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Bangladesh on a point of order.

120. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): The Council's decision with regard to the invitation extended to the representative of Afghanistan to address the Council does not in any way prejudice my delegation's position on the situation in Afghanistan. Our position remains the same as stated on 5 January in the Council [2185th meeting].

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

122. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have not been at all surprised by the hostile statements against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan made by representatives of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bloc, and by China, which has been described by the former Commander of this bloc as the sixteenth member of that organization. It is the right of every country to recognize or not to recognize the Government or régime that has been established in Afghanistan. That is an internal affair of each country, and each country must decide for itself.



123. Our country was not recognized by the United States for 16 years. That did not alter anything. We lived, we built, we overcame our difficulties, we strengthened our socialist régime, we became a strong State guaranteeing world peace. Nothing will happen to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan or its Government because some do not want to recognize it; it will not suffer because of that.

124. I repeat: there is nothing surprising in the statements we have heard. They are one more demonstration of the hostile policies of those States *vis-à-vis* the Afghan people and its decision to build a new life and consolidate the gains achieved by the April revolution of 1978.

125. I am not going to talk about what is being done against Afghanistan by people who want to "help" it. We shall simply take note of the statements that have been made.

126. Let us now hear the representative of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call upon the representative of Afghanistan.

128. Mr. SAHAK (Afghanistan) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to greet you, the representative of the German Democratic Republic, a country with which the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan enjoys close bonds of friendship and co-operation, in the post of President of the Council. I should like to thank you for allowing me to address the Council.

129. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan fully supports the initiative that has been taken by the Islamic States in calling for an urgent meeting of the Council to examine the extremely serious situation obtaining in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. The Government and people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are linked with the Arab peoples by close cultural, historical and religious bonds, and they staunchly support their just struggle for the full elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression.

130. The Government and people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan express their solidarity with the fraternal Arab people of Palestine valiantly fighting for the fulfilment of their inalienable rights under the guidance of their sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization. As was stressed in the policy statement made by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on 1 January 1980 [S/13734, annex I], Afghanistan

"... expands its fraternal and Islamic ties with non-aligned, Islamic and Arab nations and their working peoples and decisively supports the liberation movements of the heroic people of Palestine."

131. Afghanistan believes that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be reached only if all Israeli occupation troops are unconditionally withdrawn from the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, and if the national rights of the Palestinian people, which have been trampled underfoot, including their right to create their own national State, are restored to them. We are convinced that the Palestinian problem is at the core of the whole Middle East question and, until it is resolved, a just and lasting peace in that region cannot be attained. Therefore any hope of settling the Middle East conflict by flouting the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab Palestinian people, behind their backs and without participation by their legitimate representatives, is unrealistic and doomed to failure.

132. The Camp David agreements and the so-called peace treaty between Israel and Egypt run counter to the interests and rights of the Palestinian and Arab peoples and violate the relevant United Nations resolutions and the decisions taken by the non-aligned movement. Therefore we cannot agree with the assertions to the effect that a separate peace treaty brings us any closer to lasting peace in the Middle East. As the facts show, that treaty has only encouraged the Israeli aggressors further to entrench their positions in the occupied Arab territories with a view to their ultimate annexation. In this respect I should like to thank the members of the Council Commission for having provided an objective and thorough report which shows how Israel is seizing Arab lands and annexing them.

133. As we see clearly from the report, since the matter was taken up by the Council in the summer of last year, Israel, far from abandoning, has in fact further expanded its illegal policies of creating settlements on the Arab lands it has expropriated. Recently, according to information supplied by the Commission, the Israeli occupation forces confiscated more than 40,000 dunums of private Arab land in order to build Israeli settlements in the West Bank. Israel is intensively implementing a plan whereby 46 new settlements will be constructed in the next few years. The Israeli authorities have seized natural resources, including water resources, in the occupied territories, thus depriving the Arab inhabitants of the wherewithal for maintaining life.

134. All this shows that Israel is pursuing a systematic planned policy of colonization and annexation of the expropriated Arab lands and that the expropriation of Arab lands is accompanied by arrests, expulsions and other forms of mass repression by the Israeli occupation authorities against the indigenous Arab population. Obviously, the aim of Israel's policies is to change the legal status, the geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories.

135. The United Nations has many times roundly condemned the policies and practices of the Israeli

authorities in the occupied Arab territories and demanded the complete liberation of those territories. Afghanistan fully supports those decisions. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Afghanistan actively advocates the speedy implementation of the recommendations of that Committee, which would permit the satisfaction of the legitimate demands of the long-suffering people of Palestine and enable them to return to their national homeland.

136. As a participant in the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana, Afghanistan supported the Political Declaration<sup>4</sup> that was adopted there, in which the Conference noted with deep concern that since the signing of the Camp David accords between Egypt, Israel and the United States, Israel has intensified its policy of confiscating Palestinian lands in the occupied territories, establishing Zionist settlements and installing new military posts, in addition to annexing Jerusalem and turning it into a Jewish city. The Conference condemned Israel and demanded the halting of that policy, the immediate dismantling of existing settlements and the restoration of the Arab character of Jerusalem, in compliance with resolution 452 (1979) of the Council.

137. But Israel continues its gross violation of the Charter, the principles of international law and the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Israel's actions are an open defiance of the international community.

138. The delegation of Afghanistan vigorously condemns the acts of provocation by the Israeli authorities against the vital interests and basic rights of the Arabs and Palestinians, as well as their disdain for the religious feelings of Moslems, and considers that the policy and practices of Israel in the occupied Arab and Palestinian lands constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

139. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan expresses the hope that the Council will carry out the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter and take all necessary measures to prevent the annexation of Arab lands by Israel and to preserve the vital interests of the Arab peoples from encroachment by the Israeli aggressors and their protectors and thus to promote the establishment of lasting peace and security in the Middle East.

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

141. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): Allow me, Sir, to associate myself with previous speakers in expressing my pleasure at seeing you serving as President of the Council for this month. It is especially pleasing for me

to convey my congratulations to you, Mr. President, since our two countries enjoy the best of relations.

142. I should also like to extend my deep appreciation to all the Council members for granting my delegation the opportunity to take part in the debate.

143. Once again the Council has convened to deal with an issue that increasingly seems to expand in scope in spite of varied efforts on the part of the international community to deal with it forthrightly and justly. We are speaking of the continuing Israeli policy of annexing Arab lands, as manifested by a number of decisions over the past six months to allow Israeli citizens to purchase land in the occupied West Bank and Gaza and to expand existing settlements in the West Bank. This latest series of actions culminated, early in February, in a decision by the Israeli Cabinet to support the settlement by Israeli citizens in the Arab town of Al-Khalil.

144. In the decision on Al-Khalil, the international community has been presented with the latest example of Israel's true intentions, and therefore it is opportune for the Council to be taking up the situation in the occupied Arab territories in response to two requests, one from the delegation of Jordan and the other from the delegation of Morocco, acting on behalf of the 42 members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

145. The latest Israeli decision is not only a manifestation of its defiance of the authority of the Council and the expressed wishes of the international community, but also another step in a long series aimed at annexing and colonizing the West Bank. This act is clearly in contravention of resolution 452 (1979), which

*"Calls upon the Government and people of Israel to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem"*.

146. The Israeli action has had the further effect of imposing severe hardship and suffering on the Palestinian inhabitants. Israel's exploitation of the water resources of the occupied territories has had a detrimental effect on local farming. The Israeli occupation has also led to violations of the human rights of the Palestinian inhabitants and the uprooting of those people from their lands.

147. The second report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) sets forth in a striking manner Israel's illegal actions in the occupied territories and calls attention to Israel's continued refusal to co-operate with the Commission. The Commission succinctly states the motive behind that refusal, when in paragraph 46 of its report it says that Israel is still pursuing its systematic and relentless process of colonization of the occupied territories and



that this is evidenced by the stated policy of constructing additional settlements and by the expansion of others already in existence.

148. The majority of the Council members have always spoken out strongly against Israeli practices and policies aimed at changing the physical, cultural, demographic and religious character of the occupied Arab territories. Now, with the new decision on Al-Khalil, the international community, through the Council, must seek concrete and effective measures to expedite the termination of the illegal Israeli presence in the Arab territories. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the international community, particularly the Security Council, should follow closely developments in the occupied territories, since the process of colonization of those territories will not only jeopardize the very survival of the Palestinian people in their homeland, but will also lead to a deterioration of the existing fragile situation in the region.

149. As the Ambassador of Morocco stated five days ago [2199th meeting], the policy of Israel can only lead to a further deterioration of the situation in the occupied Arab territories and is also a violation of the rules of international law as well as an affront to the dignity of the Islamic community as a whole.

150. It is the considered view of my delegation that the Council should take the necessary steps to put an end to this grave situation and to prevent Israel from further violating the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the situation related to the settlements in the Arab territories occupied for the last 13 years, and request the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces of occupation from those territories.

151. A policy of annexation and installation of more settlements will definitely not advance the cause of peace in the Middle East. A policy of subjugation of the people of the West Bank and Gaza is not the way to achieve the peace that Israel claims it is seeking. Such policies, if anything, increase the threat not only to peace in the region but also to greater global peace as well. A lasting peace can be brought about only by Israel's withdrawal from the occupied lands and by the Palestinian people's exercise of their right to self-determination and to their own homeland. Any solution must also entail Israel's withdrawal from Jerusalem and the termination of its actions aimed at changing the status of that city.

152. This proposal for solving the situation in the Middle East, as representatives here know, has been repeated *ad infinitum* these past years in the Council and elsewhere. But truly, this remains the only solution that will ensure lasting peace in the region.

153. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, to whom I give the floor.

154. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): It was sickening, indeed, for me—as it must have been for all who believe in international law and justice—to hear the foremost self-confessed aggressor and enemy of mankind, not only of the Palestinians or the Arab world or the African continent (in collaboration with racist South Africa) speak about aggression, having been itself engaged in aggression for the last 13 years on end.

155. Not satiated with their crimes and plunder or with four fifths of occupied Palestine under the premeditated and notorious Delep plan—and preempting the resolution of 1947 by which the United Nations would have created a Palestinian Arab State far larger than the West Bank, a State that would have dwarfed Jerusalem and Gaza—Israel has today, this afternoon, through its representative before the Council, conceded and publicly declared its determination to seize, retain and colonize the whole of the occupied territories on the spurious grounds of security.

156. Representatives must all have heard of the stockpile and arsenal of nuclear armaments that tiny Israel, this poor Israel, has been accumulating by means most foul—in every sense—over the years, as a calculated policy starting in 1950, and not by accident. It was done by design as far back as 1950, when Ben Gurion established his Atomic Energy Commission with instructions to go ahead with the development of atomic energy. And yet it wants to retain the tiny remnant that remains of the Palestinian homeland on grounds of security. Poor Israel! It makes one cry.

157. A few days ago I read a despatch published in *Ha'aretz*, the Israeli newspaper. That report stated that the Begin Government and the Knesset would shortly decide to apply Israeli laws to all the occupied territories, having done so in Jerusalem on 22 June 1967. The only difference between the Israeli Government and the Knesset was the question of who should take the initiative. The problem had not been resolved until today. Evidently both Begin and the Knesset have decided to assign to the Israeli representative the task of announcing Israel's long-predetermined design to annex the whole of the occupied territories. He has declared it officially and publicly today. We were convinced of it all along. Our people there had been telling us all along: "Do not expect anything; they are determined to take it over".

158. In a statement to the Council I said that, instead of trying to reconcile the irreconcilable, the Israeli representative should tell the Council what his Government's designs and plans were. He obliged this afternoon by making his announcement. I respectfully urge the Council to show the serious and deep concern about this Israeli announcement which should be shown. That announcement today marks the formal turning point. I say "formal" because the turning point had actually already been reached. This is a watershed in the history of our region and of the entire

world, and in the history of the United Nations. Down with General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III)! Down with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973)! Well, we shall act and react accordingly. Henceforth we shall behave accordingly.

159. Our peoples are adamant in their determination to turn their eyes away from alleged dangers from beyond our region and to look at real and imminent dangers. We know who is determined to bring about our perdition. We are aware of this every day and every night. No amount of diversionary propaganda will blur our vision or shake our conviction.

160. The colonizing and annexationist policies and practices of racist and exclusivist Israel have been exhaustively discussed. They are fully comprehended. We have had the privilege of presenting to each member of the Council a dossier demonstrating the magnitude of Israeli colonization. I repeat, therefore, that all of this is fully comprehended, notwithstanding the Israeli representative's obstructionist and diversionary tactics in reading out abusive and irrelevant attacks—prepared in advance—against each and every member of the Council, against any State which deplores Israeli illegitimacy and violations of all the rules and precepts of international law, as well as of Council decisions.

161. Israel evidently is determined to use a gun-silencer on any statements and considered judgements which reveal and lay bare their foul deeds. And we hear all these statements from the spokesman of the so-called foremost democracy in the Middle East—a phrase which we constantly read in the mass media, which Israel controls.

162. Israel continues to carry out its acts of national genocide against the Palestinian people and their very existence. And yet we are expected to sing its infallibility and its glory—its infamous glory—as a racist State.

163. Does the Israeli representative seriously think that his silencer—censorship—can silence the indomitable Governments, peoples and statesmen that make up the overwhelming majority of mankind? Does he seriously think that he can delude the members of this Council, with their great intelligence and powers of discernment? What a tragedy that a Government like that of Israel should live in such a make-believe world, especially when it is dealing with so formidable a body as the Security Council!

164. The Israeli representative has already felt the sting resulting from his cavalier and abusive way of dealing with the Council. The statements of the past few days have certainly made that clear. His aides have, I am sure, already entered these statements in their computerized files of abuse of Member States.

165. The real questions of which the Security Council is seized are the following.

166. The figure for colonized land has jumped from 27.1 per cent to 31.4 per cent of the total area of Jerusalem and the rest of the West Bank. And this is an ongoing process, relentless and self-confessed. If the Israeli representative disputes this awesome figure—and it is an objective, not a subjective evaluation, resulting from what is right there on the landscape—all he has to do is admit the Council Commission and allow it to ascertain, on the scene, who is right and who is wrong.

167. The representative of the racists has maligned the members of the Commission. As a matter of fact, my delegation is convinced that, while the Commission did a most commendable job, it did not do the total job. That is not the fault of the Commission itself. It was unable to do the total job because it was denied access to scene of the crime, where it could have seen for itself what has been happening. We ourselves are at fault because we did not present all the available data and evidence in time for the Commission to include it in its report. Therefore, what appears in the report, commendable and truthful as it is, is a great understatement of what is actually going on. That observation is not intended in any way to denigrate the integrity of the Commission's report. All I am saying is that, while we blame our adversary for refusing to admit the Commission to the occupied territories, we blame ourselves also for not updating the information in time and informing the Commission that the colonization figure has jumped from 27.1 per cent to 31.4 per cent.

168. The same kind of strangulation is taking place in regard to the water and other meagre resources upon which depend, in the broadest sense of the world, the lives and livelihood of the Palestinian people in their homeland and in their exile.

169. The Israeli representative has referred to the Springs of Auja. Now, the Springs of Auja have been a source of water for thousands of years. It is true that every once in a while, when there is a drought, there is a decline in the water supply. But that in no way affects the basic information that has been given to the Council by its Commission on how much water the Israeli usurpers have been taking from the West Bank for the use of Israeli settlements, as well as from Palestinian land occupied by Israel since 1948. It is true that this year we have had floods all over. Even the dry valleys are overflowing. The level of the Dead Sea has risen by 1.2 metres—which represents an increase of 1.2 million cubic metres in the volume. But that does not absolve the Israelis of their crime of stealing the basic water resources of the West Bank. What will happen over the next six or seven years? Drought? Starvation? Emigration?

170. The "grand jury" of the world community, represented by the Council, has commendably and categorically voiced its conclusions and convictions. But that very same world community, not just the

victimized Palestinian people, is awaiting the verdict and its application. Nothing short of the application of Chapter VII of the Charter will tell the Israeli aggressors that enough is enough. We are not going to accept our own obliteration. It must be borne in mind that 31 per cent of the occupied territories has already been colonized and we have been stacking up resolutions, year after year, month after month, to no avail. It is time that we thought of human beings, of a people faced with destruction.

171. On many occasions in the past the verdict has consisted largely of condemnations. We deeply appreciate those condemnations, because at least they show the great and high integrity of the membership of the Council. But the present situation cannot be remedied by further repetition of censure and condemnation. If the Council is to remain a viable instrument of peace—as was intended under the Charter—the only answer is unhesitatingly to apply the powers vested in it by the Charter. Either we mean business or we regard the Council as a debating society. God forbid! If that cannot be done, then I sincerely advise all aggrieved peoples throughout the world to look elsewhere for their salvation.

172. I want to assure the representative of the Israeli aggressors and racists that, should our struggle last for decades or 100 years, we shall continue this struggle by all possible means, notwithstanding Israel's accumulation of atomic arsenals—which, to state a banal fact, is not an Israeli monopoly.

173. The Palestinians will return to their hallowed lands, in spite of Israeli fanaticism and United States blind support with tens of billions of dollars over the past three decades. We shall see to it that that happens, for otherwise life would not be worth living.

174. We vehemently reject the so-called self-rule plan, which is intended merely to subjugate and eventually obliterate the Palestinian people in their ancestral homeland.

175. If Israel's kingdom lasted for 70 or 80 years, the Palestinian presence has lasted for thousands of years. Let the Israeli fanatics never forget that fact. If for a few score years Jerusalem was the capital of Israel—from 70 to 80 years—Jerusalem has for thousands of years been more precious than a capital; it has always been our soul, our legacy, our eternal city, the focal point of our spiritual existence and our historical past. It was founded by Jebusite Palestinian Arabs some 5,000 years ago. Inscriptions found recently on three tablets unearthed at Ebla, in north Syria, refer to Arab Jerusalem as Ola Salema, the name which primitive Hebrew tribes adopted when they infiltrated that golden city.

176. Today, acts of destruction and desecration are continuing unabated, as the maps that we have distributed to the members of the Council show. The

entire Al-Haram Al-Sharif area, sacred to 900 million adherents of the Islamic faith, has been undermined by digging to a great depth, endangering its very foundations. The holy Al-Ibrahimi Sanctuary in Al-Khalil (Hebron) has virtually been converted into a synagogue. This intolerable situation will surely come to an end, because it is unjust and in flagrant violation of international law.

177. I need not go into all the other petty distortions and irrelevancies which the Israeli representative has tried to present to the Council.

178. I take this opportunity to apologize for the length of my third statement before the Council, in which I have described, with abbreviation but in some detail, the lands, the locations, the areas and all the misdeeds that Israel has perpetrated over the past years.

179. I reserve my right to make a more detailed statement later on.

180. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

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

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

182. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): Allow me at the outset to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for allowing me an opportunity to express myself on the issue before the Council, despite the length—often unwarranted—of the present debate. Indeed, Mr. President, the patience and wisdom with which you have guided the deliberations are worthy of the highest appreciation.

183. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere congratulations and my country's appreciation for the tremendous work accomplished by the Council Commission and, in particular, by its Chairman, Ambassador Mathias.

184. I did not want to add to the length of the debate, which the Arab Group had agreed to keep restricted in the interest both of dignity and of economy. However, since my country has been mentioned more than once, I feel compelled to clarify a few points without

this necessarily being an exercise of the right of reply, since I do not intend to enter into any useless polemics on issues that are not on the agenda now before the Council and which have been used as pretexts to evade the real issue.

185. My first point deals with the consequences of Israeli practices in the West Bank for the Lebanese situation. By its determination to deny the Palestinians legitimate national rights, Israel is creating a Palestinian Diaspora in many parts of the Arab world but more particularly in Lebanon. Everything Israel is doing seems to be aimed at forcing the Palestinians in Lebanon to become established there not as a temporary Diaspora—a people in exile—but as people living in some sort of substitute homeland. We know that the Palestinians reject that as strongly as we do. We also know that both the Lebanese and the Palestinians are thoroughly convinced and united in their belief that there can be no peace in the Middle East that does not recognize the Palestinians' inalienable right to return to their country. Indeed, there can be no peace in the Middle East without the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian State on Palestinian soil.

186. My second point, which stems directly from the first, is that Israeli practices in the West Bank are part and parcel of a general Israeli policy which, as a minority of one, Israel follows towards the United Nations in every respect.

187. Though there is yet no Israeli settlement in southern Lebanon, Israel has been continually defying Council resolutions concerning southern Lebanon and also constantly seeking to raise issues that fall exclusively within the domain of relations between Lebanon and its brother Arab countries. Not only has Israel prevented the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon from discharging its mandate but it has also twisted the very objectives of resolution 425 (1978) in a manner that prevents the Force from being the instrument of the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty. In Israel's view, the Force must become—and probably is—Israel's other line of defence against so-called threats to its security, whereas Israel itself has been and still is the invader. Through occupation by proxy, Israel is creating in southern Lebanon an instrument of destabilization which has prevented the legitimate Government from exercising its authority and reactivating, in accordance with Council resolutions, the Armistice Agreement which would re-establish the international rule of law and order on our borders.

188. Such action by Israel has created the objective conditions that will ultimately lead to the south's being amputated from the Lebanese body politic and part of that south being granted the dignity of being an accessory to Israeli strategic imperatives. This is a situation that the Lebanese Government and people, and more particularly the people of the south, refuse and will oppose by every possible means.

189. Such is our rejection of the situation that we sometimes wonder how much longer the Council will tolerate the maintenance of a United Nations peace-keeping force, created under the auspices of the Council, to perform not the duty assigned to it by international law but probably the very opposite. Constantly harassed and often treated as an enemy, the Force is gradually being transformed by Israel into what Israel wants it to be, namely, a *de facto* defence of its occupation of my country.

190. I want to conclude by saying that, when the Security Council

“Calls upon the Government and people of Israel to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories” [resolution 452 (1979)],

it is not so alone as the representative of Israel makes it appear.

191. It is reassuring that, while the Council's debates have not been reported by the media and have hardly been noticed, *The New York Times* should this very morning have published a letter to the editor under the title “How Most Israelis Feel about the West Bank”. In that letter, two articles of *The Jerusalem Post* are quoted. The first, by Mr. Abba Eban, says:

“Among all the concessions that could improve the national position without any sacrifice of national interest, the most urgent is the abandonment of ‘settlement’ projects in the populated Arab areas which squander the nation's resources at home and its dignity abroad without the slightest service to any authentic Zionist purpose.”

The other article, by Mr. Ian Black, speaks more specifically of the settlement in Arab Hebron, saying that it could “derail the autonomy talks, destroy the chances of a durable peace and deepen the already yawning chasm between the two peoples”.

192. We are keen to see that the chances of a durable peace should be preserved and enhanced. But we think that Israel's determination to pursue its present course will only be conducive to more tragedies and, indeed, to another war. My country, which has been a casualty of war, refuses, as do the Palestinians, to become a casualty of peace as well.

193. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

194. For several years now the policies of Israel in the occupied Arab territories have been discussed in United Nations bodies. Many documents condemn these policies and call upon Tel Aviv again and again finally to heed reason and halt its aggressive actions

against the Arab people of Palestine and the populations in the territories of neighbouring States that have been occupied by the Israeli occupationist forces.

195. It is with profound concern and natural human anxiety that we hear about and read reports of more and more cases of terrorist confiscation of Palestinian property and the planned changes in the demographic structure of these regions. The evidence contained in the reports of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) is absolutely irrefutable. The systematic ousting of the Arab population is the avowed aim of Israel's occupationist policies. Related to that are the recent decisions taken by the Government of Israel, which are such that even their closest ally has publicly declared that it officially rejects them.

196. No one in the world can endorse the position adopted by the Israeli annexationists. It has been and continues to be decisively refuted in the Security Council as well. Therefore, one can say quite definitely that the aggressive policies of the ruling circles of Israel are short-sighted.

197. The following question is often raised. What is it that makes it possible for Israel to violate the basic principles of the United Nations for such a long time and in such an aggressive manner? One of the fundamental reasons for the continuing and even growing threat to peace and security in the Middle East was pointed out by the representative of Kuwait in his address to the Council on 19 July last, when he said:

"What encourages Israel is the fact that the Security Council is unable to face up to the challenge Israel's policy poses. Because Israel knows that sanctions against it cannot even be contemplated, owing to the protection it gets primarily from our friends in the United States, it has indulged in a policy of territorial expansion." [2157th meeting, para. 25.]

198. The fact that the Israeli aggressor has for decades been protected, financed and equipped with the most sophisticated weapons by United States imperialism is well known to the world community, far beyond the confines of the area of the Middle East. At a time when the forces of peace throughout the world had been doing a great deal over a period of several years for détente and for the improvement of international relations, back in 1977 the ruling circles in the United States openly deviated from the policy of achieving a comprehensive, just and peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

199. The Israeli extremists hope that, behind the screen of the military hysteria spread by influential forces in the United States, they can intensify their actions in the Middle East. The Camp David accords ostensibly serve the cause of peace, but their true significance for the peoples of the Middle East is becoming increasingly clear. Those agreements have

been constantly exacerbating the situation from the very day they were concluded.

200. The representative of Jordan by adducing many facts, convincingly corroborated the evidence of the terrorist colonial policies of Israel in the occupied territories contained in the report of the Council Commission. Taking refuge behind the Camp David accords and demagoguery about so-called autonomy, Israel is establishing further settlements and continuing to expel the indigenous Palestinian population from its lands. Together with the usual purchasing and selling methods of the capitalist market economies, methods of forcible expulsion and expropriation are also being used. The so-called autonomy for the population has been invented so as to perpetuate Israeli occupation. The policies of colonialism are no mere chance phenomena. They are an inherent component part of the implementation of a policy of global imperialism to ensure domination in the Middle East.

201. In this respect, the recent Conference of Arab States noted the ominous increase of tension by imperialist forces and condemned the quest for military bases. The German Democratic Republic fully shares the concern of the Arab States, especially since practically at the very same time as imperialist troops were increasing their military presence in the Middle East, a serious attack on peace in Europe was taking place with the adoption of the decision by the Council of NATO to produce and station United States medium-range missiles in Europe, a decision that would thus present a new military threat for the Middle East region as well. The missiles intended for southern Europe can be launched directly at targets in the Middle East.

202. These adventuristic plans are contrary to the overall aspirations of peoples for détente, security, the right to make sovereign decisions regarding their own affairs and they further complicate a comprehensive and lasting peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The solidarity of all Arab, Islamic and non-aligned countries is necessary to rebuff the new imperialist threat in the Middle East.

203. Much has been said about peace and people continue to talk about it. One is entitled to ask, however, what sort of peace we are talking about. Is it the so-called peace whereby the Israeli occupying forces are allowed to deprive the inhabitants of the occupied territories of their means of livelihood and to carry out cold-blooded annexation, or are we talking about genuine peace, which would allow people to exercise their right of self-determination, including the right to establish their own sovereign State?

204. We reject the unjust peace of the occupiers and we advocate a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic calls for an unconditional withdrawal by Israel to its borders before the 1967 war, as well as participation

on an equal footing for the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the sole and authentic representative of the Arab people of Palestine, in all negotiations to bring about a just settlement of the Middle East conflict.

205. As in the past, so in the future, the Arab peoples in their just struggle can confidently count on the solidarity of the German Democratic Republic. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, on a State visit to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, stated the following on this subject:

"We actively support the right of Arab peoples and States freely to choose their future and to take their natural resources under their sovereign control. We respect the cultural and historical achievements and humanistic principles of Islam and value the contribution by the Islamic States to the cause of peace."

206. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports decisive measures to implement the Council resolution on this subject, which were advocated by the Sixth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned States in Havana. We are in favour of extending the mandate of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979).

207. I shall now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Security Council.

208. The representative of Algeria has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

209. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I thank you for allowing the delegation of Algeria to speak again. We had not intended to speak a second time. I can assure you that my delegation does not intend to delay the conclusion of the work of the Council; my statement will be very brief.

210. The Algerian delegation believes that the aspects of the problem submitted to the Council for consideration are very clear. I mentioned them here yesterday [2201st meeting]. In general terms, they are the following: first, the behaviour, which has been unanimously condemned, of the Zionist entity in the occupied Arab territories and the process of intensifying the settlements in those territories, which are the logical outcome of the Camp David and Washington agreements; secondly, the inadequacy of the Camp David accords and the Washington treaty in the search for a solution to the Palestinian problem; thirdly, the question of Palestine, which is at the very heart of the Middle East crisis; and fourthly, the posi-

tion of the Algerian Government, which is contained in the record of yesterday's Council meeting.

211. For its part, the Algerian delegation expects specific responses to be made and decisions to be taken by the Council to find a solution to the situation, which is increasingly a cause for concern. My delegation would be careful not to acquiesce in a sterile policy or subject our exchanges of views to a fallacious procedure aimed not at settling the matter but at diverting the attention of the members of the Council to marginal questions. In the view of the Algerian delegation we must retain a sense of responsibility in this chamber where dignity and sobriety must be equally maintained. Before concluding I should like to say that the Zionist delegate has by his astonishing remarks before the Council once again succeeded in closing the ranks against him. By his statements he has given us a clear image of the entity he represents.

212. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Portugal has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I call upon him.

213. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): The Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) has done its utmost, in carrying out its mandate, to obtain co-operation from the Government of Israel, and I had the honour to emphasize in the Council why and for what purpose we sought it. As we know all too well, we were denied that co-operation. That fact alone makes any allegations that may be formulated by the representative of Israel on this subject completely valueless. We reject them. The Commission's report will be judged by the Council, and that judgement will be sufficient for us.

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

215. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): The Camp David accords have been cited as the beginning of a new cycle. But not only do they deny the Palestinian the right to return to his home and property; also by virtue of those accords, the Palestinian is denied a burial place in his country.

216. This morning I had a call from an American citizen in Brooklyn. He spoke a few words in Arabic, and then he continued in English. A very long time ago his father emigrated from Al-Mara'a Al-Sharqiyah, near Jerusalem. He died a couple of days ago. Reading in his will that his last desire and will was that he be buried in his village, his children called on the Israeli Consul General and asked for permission to transfer the remains. They were denied that permission, and they were told that if they so desired they could transfer the remains to Amman and apply for the admission of the body from Amman.

217. It turns out that that same family lost another relative, again another American citizen, three years ago, and they transferred the body via Amman. But upon their arrival at the bridge, the coffin was opened and the body was desecrated—for security reasons.

218. The son of the deceased asked me what he could do. You know what it means to grant a human being's last desire and will. So I suggested that since he is an American citizen, the best thing for him to do would be to reach the State Department and ask them to intervene. Just a little while ago I received word that even the State Department had turned him down. They would not intervene on behalf of an American citizen whose last desire was to be buried in his own country. So not only do the Camp David accords deny the living the right to return; they also deny the right of the dead to be buried in their own country, on their own property. I thought I would bring that to the attention of the Council. The bereaved family is in a fix; they do not know what to do.

219. The item we are discussing here is "The situation in the occupied Arab territories". That very title reveals that we are dealing with an illegal occupation and, consequently, with the applicability to such territories of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949<sup>5</sup>. The basic issue is occupation and the subsequent derivatives. One such derivative is the racist Zionist settlement policy that has placed the Israeli Government in a minority of one. Again, the issue is the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied by Israel. The issue before us is not merely the extent of the damage; it is the damage itself.

220. Of course Israel must have had a reason for denying the Commission admission to the territories to investigate. It must have had a reason to reject Security Council resolutions. But, believe me, crimes cannot be permanently hidden. And the reason is simple. There is an inherent tendency in the Zionist doctrine to infringe on the rights of others, to perpetrate crimes against humanity, and to survive, like a leech, on the blood of its victims. And, furthermore, in this case there is the certainty that the Zionists receive moral, or rather immoral, and financial and military support from the Government of the United States. One must not exclude the military support.

221. After all, this is an election year, and we have witnessed all the contenders, especially the incumbent, capitalizing on their denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, in the hope that they can gain a few more votes, moral values notwithstanding. We just talk about moral values; we see the Statue of Liberty, or whatever it is. When learning history we are taught that there are moral values, but when we face reality it is entirely different. The destiny, the future and the fate of 4 million Palestinians is being

used as a commodity to buy votes in the electoral campaign. They tell us this is an election year. I ask you: in the United States what year is not an election year, what day is not a day for electioneering?

222. The Commission was denied permission to carry out the task assigned to it by the Council. The resolution was rejected. But, of course, the other day Ambassador McHenry was visiting my country under occupation, and I think that he heard about Hebron and I understand that he expressed a desire to talk to the Mayor of Hebron. Hebron was about half an hour's drive or so away, but that was denied even to Ambassador McHenry. So not only are the Palestinian people under occupation taken as hostages, but they are kept in seclusion in solitary cells.

223. We know that in the United States Congress there are many decent people, and some of them have now suggested to their Government that all the aid it gives to Israel should be cut by an amount equivalent to that utilized by Israel in the settlements. We know the destiny of that move, of course. But anyway it was really nice and I should like to express my appreciation of the fact that there are people in the United States Congress who are opposed to that policy of Israel. And they are not only in Congress; the United States Department of State, on 8 February 1979, sent a report to the Committees on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives in which—Mr. Mathias might be happy to learn—the United States Department of State said:

"Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories has adversely affected the livelihood of some Arab residents, particularly through expropriation of lands for individual settlements. Arab residents have found it difficult to challenge land expropriation, partly because most settlements are first established as paramilitary installations. Expropriation for such settlements is thus justified initially on military or security grounds, even though most have been transferred to civilians over time."

The report continues:

"Many existing settlements continue to grow steadily both in size, through further expropriations, and in population."

Here I may comment that this is what we call the "creeping" thing. Furthermore, the report says:

"A further problem results from the exploitation of a part of the West Bank's limited water resources for the use of Israeli settlements, which in some cases caused Arab wells to dry up and has had detrimental effects on Arab agriculture."

I wonder whether the experts in the Department of State are also big liars or just do not know what they are talking about.



224. What has happened in Hebron, has, of course, ramifications. According to the *Agence France-Presse* of today's date, 27 February:

"Tension mounted today in the West Bank town of Halhoul with local residents charging that the vandals who last night shattered the windows of over 40 cars were from a nearby Jewish settlement.

"Early this morning"—that is, 27 February—"Israeli troops"—not police or security forces, but troops, and maybe paratroopers; who knows?—"reportedly resorted to tear gas to disperse the angry Arab population while the mayors of neighbouring Arab towns, including Fahd Qawasma, hurried to Halhoul.

"Mr. Qawasma"—who was denied permission to respond to your kind invitation—"described tonight's incident as a further step in intimidation by Jewish annexationist movements."

225. The situation is really tense and demands immediate action by the Council. I am sure that the Secretary-General must have received a copy of a

telegram sent by the mayors because I learnt that telegrams were also sent to him concerning the situation. But the situation is really tense and might lead to further confrontation and bloodshed and, as was stated here, there is but one way of remedying it. The remedy lies in Israel's immediate withdrawal from all the occupied territories because under occupation resistance is engendered, and that resistance means bloodshed. So I think that the Council should shoulder its responsibilities for defending, protecting or maintaining international peace and security by eliminating a cause of trouble that might lead to confrontation.

*The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. II, annex 20.

<sup>2</sup> See S/13872, distributed on 2 April 1980.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2nd meeting.

<sup>4</sup> A/34/452, annex, sect. I.

<sup>5</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.