



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

**1995<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 28 MARCH 1977

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1995) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East (S/12290 and Corr.1) . . . . .	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.

## 1995th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 28 March 1977, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Andrew YOUNG  
(United States of America).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Benin, Canada, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1995)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East (S/12290 and Corr.1)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

**Report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East (S/12290 and Corr.1)**

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Security Council at its 1993rd meeting, I invite the representatives of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization to take places at the Council table, and the representatives of Egypt, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. C. Herzog (Israel) and Mr. Z. L. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table; Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. H. Nuseibeh (Jordan) and Mr. M. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I have just received a letter from the representative of Yemen in which he asks to be invited to

participate in the discussion of the question now before the Security Council. I propose, if I hear no objection, that the Council agree to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the usual practice and in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and of rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

3. I invite the representative of Yemen to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever he wishes to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. A. Sallam (Yemen) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

4. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

5. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Sir, allow me first of all to express to you my delegation's good wishes on the occasion of your presidency of the Security Council. It is right and fitting that the great democracy which you represent should be represented by so distinguished a person and so outstanding and effective a champion of the dignity of man.

6. I take this opportunity to express to my Romanian colleague my sincerest condolences on the tragic loss of life and the destruction that have beset his country.

7. This is but another of the futile time-consuming discussions which have been imposed upon the Security Council by Egypt over the past year. Not one of these debates has moved the Middle East even one inch towards peace. On the contrary, they have merely given a platform to the purveyors of intransigence to deliver themselves once again of the inevitable repetitive diatribe to which we have become so accustomed. It is a repetitious, boring, abrasive and counter-productive exercise, which is an insult to the intelligence of the members of the Council.

8. It is furthermore, a classic example of an attempt by the Arab States to subordinate all the institutions in the United Nations to their narrow aims. Look at what has happened to the specialized agencies, which are being diverted from their essential human purpose by the introduction of irrelevant Arab-sponsored resolutions. Only last week we saw what happened when, at Mar del Plata, a conference on water resources—a subject in which Israel is

the most advanced country in the world and is helping many other countries on various continents—was turned again into a political arena for the inevitable resolutions condemning Israel.

9. I must say that the convening of this meeting raises questions vital to the Council itself, and certainly raises grave misgivings as to the behaviour of the Egyptian delegation.

10. First of all, it seems to me relevant for the Security Council to begin to address itself anew to the criteria for the convening of the Council. It seems—with the greatest respect—that the members of the Council have begun to allow this body to deteriorate into a futile debating society, a process which is thus watering down the importance of what should be the most important forum on the international scene.

11. On the face of it, there is nothing in the Charter which would indicate that the Council should be convened at this juncture. Indeed, the reverse is the case. According to Article 35, any Member can bring any dispute to the attention of the Council, provided it

“might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security”.

12. At this particular time, it is difficult to argue that the present stage of the Middle East problem conflict fits the foregoing conditions. The best proof lies in the Secretary-General's report, which is the pretext for the debate. It is noteworthy that nowhere in that report does the Secretary-General call for a Security Council debate to discuss these complex and delicate questions. Indeed, in his concluding paragraph [*S/12290 and Corr.1, para. 23*], he states his intention to continue his contacts with the parties and the two Co-Chairmen and undertakes to inform the Council of further developments. And, indeed, the Secretary-General, in pursuance of his efforts, has been in touch with the parties, as I can personally testify. But it seems to me that, in his report, the Secretary-General consciously avoided any suggestion that a debate was called for.

13. A few weeks ago, it became known at a social occasion that Egypt wanted the Council to hold an early meeting to discuss the Secretary-General's report. That fact, I gather, was published in the *New York Post* on Saturday, 12 March, before even the Secretary-General and members of the Council were informed about it. That request apparently aroused the criticism of some of our African colleagues—and rightly so—since they were concerned that a debate such as this could infringe on the time allocated to the *apartheid* debate.

14. At that point the Egyptians apparently had second thoughts about their move, and, on the morning of Tuesday, 15 March, astounded everyone by dropping their request for a Council meeting as casually as they had made it in the first place. After which, also on 15 March, the Egyptian representative sent a letter to the President of the

Council, confirming his Government's view on the need to hold such a meeting as soon as possible.

15. On 21 March [*1988th meeting*], the Egyptian representative inscribed his name on the list of speakers in the *apartheid* debate, even before the Chairman of the Arab Group, who spoke the next morning, 22 March [*1989th meeting*]. Ambassador Meguid launched an unbridled attack against Israel, replete with falsehoods and false innuendoes, and thus, in accordance with his normal practice, once again endeavoured to turn a discussion of the greatest importance to our African colleagues into a barren vitriolic Middle East debate. It is unbelievable that a debate of importance to the African countries cannot take place without certain Arab delegations invariably trying to inject extraneous issues into it in order to assert themselves.

16. I have desisted so far from reacting to the falsehoods uttered by the Egyptian representative, in deference to specific appeals which we received from our African colleagues, who left no doubt whatsoever in our minds as to their feelings about the behaviour of the Egyptian representative in this matter.

17. Last Wednesday, 23 March, the Egyptian representative submitted a letter [*S/12306*] in which he requested a Security Council meeting. There is no urgency whatsoever; there is no danger of an imminent conflict. And yet, two days after the submission of the letter, a meeting was hurriedly convened—a meeting that everybody in the Council, almost without exception, considers superfluous and unnecessary. One can only conclude, with no small measure of regret, that the Security Council is at the beck and call of Egypt: to do what it wants, against the better judgement of the members of the Council, most of whom are known to think that a Middle East debate at this stage is inopportune; to ignore other Council business and allow Egypt to impose itself on the Council while it is in the midst of an important debate of concern to most United Nations Member States; and to do so in the face of the Charter and in what amounts to an obvious attempt to disregard the clearly expressed views of the Secretary-General. As usual, the Council is operating as an instrument of Egyptian inter-Arab policy. After all, what could be a more convenient vehicle than the Security Council for the pursuance of Egypt's Byzantine game of one-upmanship over its Arab colleagues, who, as we are all aware here, have not been over-enthusiastic about this debate either. Or, as has been suggested in certain circles in the Middle East, is it being used as a diversion in the face of growing internal social and economic problems in Egypt?

18. The question that must pose itself to the members of the Council is for how long this Council is to be a pawn in the game of Egyptian inter-Arab or domestic policy. Just consider the record of the past year. Indeed, when one examines it, one is constrained to ask why Egypt should at least not have the good grace to finance the operation of the Council. The Council, brought into existence as a supreme body for the purpose of maintaining peace in the world, is being converted into nothing more than a political yo-yo to be activated at the whim of the Egyptian Government.

19. The volative and apparently contradictory instructions that the representative of Egypt has been receiving from Cairo may well be somewhat embarrassing. We must sympathize with him in what is obviously a difficult situation. All of us here have at least one problem in common: foreign ministries that make decisions and give instructions which, on occasion, may well run counter to our better instincts. Who knows? They may be right. But we here are engaged in something far more serious than the idiosyncracies of Egyptian inter-Arab policy or domestic requirements arising out of the internal problems of Egypt.

20. The Middle East is in a delicate period which can produce positive moves. The Secretary-General has visited the area and has had very important discussions and exchanges of views on which he has reported. The Secretary of State of the United States has concluded his visit to the area and is now discussing the Middle East, *inter alia*, with the Soviet leadership. The Israeli Prime Minister has been to Washington, while Arab leaders will now meet the President of the United States. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Genscher, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France have been visiting the area. Indeed our friend Mr. de Guiringaud, the French Foreign Minister, will be visiting Israel this week. Chairman Brezhnev has expressed the opinion that, "judging by everything, the resumption of the Geneva Conference is gradually becoming an ever more realistic matter". General elections are scheduled in Israel for 17 May, and some of the main problems at issue are among those on which Israelis, Jews and Arabs, will vote; for in Israel, let me remind my Arab colleagues, the decision lies with the people, Jews and Arabs alike. So one is constrained to ask, having regard to the extreme delicacy of a situation which requires the most careful and judicious approach today, what in heaven is the purpose of this debate today? Why this recurrent name calling and undignified invective, which can only have the result of strengthening the voices of intransigence on all sides and silencing the voices of moderation? Perhaps that is indeed the purpose of this debate. And we have not heard the end of it. I am to be followed by the Syrian representative, and we have just heard that others have inscribed their names. We all know what is in store for us: the same old cracked record. For what purpose? Will it move us one inch closer to peace? It will not. It can only have an adverse effect.

21. I regret that I have, as usual, to spend valuable time refuting false allegations which are inevitably produced by the Arab representatives. That those allegations are false is evident to all those who visit Israel, a free and open society. It is evident to my colleagues here who have had the opportunity to be there of late. But that minor consideration never deters my Arab colleagues. As is their wont, they stumble over the truth, pick themselves up and proceed as if nothing untoward had occurred. It is an insult to this body. They are talking about facts that are known to everybody who wants to know the real facts.

22. We were, for instance, regaled at great length by Mr. Meguid with a description of conditions in Israeli prisons. This is the latest ploy in the Arab propaganda effort. Occurrences in the West Bank invariably coincide with the opening of any Security Council meeting. An

analysis of all the Council meetings over the past years will reveal the fact that events in the West Bank are not unrelated to the convening of those meetings. Let me make it quite clear that all prisoners referred to are criminals who have been found guilty in open court after having received a fair trial. Presuming on the liberal Israeli approach inherent in our society, they have begun, as part of a co-ordinated political effort, to demand the right to become unionized—believe it or not—to organize themselves in prison. It was against the Government of Israel's refusal to permit that that they engaged in the strike. The leaders of the strike are prisoners who all belonged to Arab terrorist organizations and were tried and convicted of the murder of civilians—primarily, incidentally, Arab and Bedouin men and women in Gaza—in pursuance of a brutal campaign of terror which they mounted in the early 1970s. Every one of them was found guilty, as I stated, in open court with full benefit of trial and lawyers of their own choice.

23. The Council has been reduced to a forum for the Arab delegations which wish to turn the demands of common murderers in jail into a political stratagem. I can but repeat the question I previously put to my Arab colleagues. What would you prefer us to do? Keep those murderers in gaol, which must seem like Utopia to the average Arab prisoner in a gaol in an Arab country, or string them up publicly as was done at Damascus recently after a 12-minute trial, in which the judge announced publicly that there was not even enough time for coffee, or accord them the fate of their fellow terrorists in the PLO who were apprehended only recently at Cairo and at Amman, namely, death by hanging?

24. On this issue which has been highlighted so much by the Arab spokesmen, let me quote a comparatively recent article by the distinguished Colin Legum in *The Observer* of London:

"Israel is one of the few countries which allow the International Red Cross access to all their political prisoners on a routine basis. The Red Cross keeps a special team in the country for this purpose. The Israel agreement amounts to accepting international supervision of their prisons. Their visits are on a weekly basis, and prisoners can talk to them without any wardens being present. So anything disagreeable would find its place in the Red Cross reports."

Legum says he read through four years of reports of the Red Cross but found no complaints "of violence in prisons". He goes on: "Israelis can claim credit for not having executed a single convicted terrorist despite strong public pressures." Legum concludes:

"Because Israel insists that its own society should be judged by the world's highest standards, it is much more likely to be traduced than other countries where the lot of political prisoners and the rule of law are very much below its own standards."

Furthermore, a Red Cross statement of 30 January 1977 does complain of overcrowding in prisons, but contains no allegations of torture, improper arrests, brutality and so on,

such as were made by Mr. Meguid. The following quotation is from the United States State Department report on human rights in Israel and the territories, as part of its human rights reporting on all countries:

“Reports of the use of actual torture during interrogations have not been substantiated. As regards prison conditions in the territories, a recent International Red Cross inspection found that prisoners under Israeli control are living in satisfactory conditions.”

25. Ambassador Meguid has had the effrontery to talk about human rights. It is not for him to do that. He represents a country which has little in common with human rights as we understand them. At previous meetings of the Council, I described the terrifying conditions under Egyptian rule which existed in Gaza, quoting almost entirely from Arab evidence. It is no accident that the greatest hatred in the Gaza Strip today is reserved for the former Egyptian rulers.

26. And what about Egypt itself? I have read Mustapha Amin's "My First Year in Prison" which describes the stark and brutal horror of Egyptian prisons and the torture applied there—this by a distinguished Egyptian who was the editor of a leading newspaper. I have before me here descriptions of the brutal repression of hungry workers in Egypt in January. That and the repression of students and workers, which has been widely reported, surely do not give Mr. Meguid any standing whatsoever on the issue of human rights. Let me remind him that we heartily endorse President Carter's assertion that "no Member [of the United Nations] can avoid its responsibilities to review and to speak when torture or unwarranted deprivation of freedom occurs in any part of the world". If we have our failings—and what society does not?—you can rest assured that they will be exposed by a free press, of which Mr. Meguid can then make liberal use. Yes, it is time we turned our attention to the problem of human rights in the Arab world.

27. Mr. Meguid bewails the fact that now, after a quarter of a century, Arab refugees are still languishing in tents and camps. Is he not ashamed to admit that? During the Middle East conflict, 800,000 Jewish refugees were driven out of their homes in Arab lands in which they had lived for over 2,000 years. They had become central elements in the culture, commerce and public life of those countries. What happened to them? They were cared for by the Jewish people throughout the world. They were transported, housed, re-educated and turned into useful citizens: 600,000 in Israel and 200,000 elsewhere. During that period, 500,000 Arab refugees, we hear, have remained in camps. And what has the Arab world done? Nothing except to continue in the most inhumane manner to maintain them in those subhuman conditions as political pawns, while their wealthier Arab brethren are purchasing hotels in London and choice real estate in the United States or throwing away petrodollars in the gambling centres of the world.

28. A major exchange of population in the Middle East has occurred, and the sooner we realize it the better. It is sobering indeed to reflect that one day's oil production in

the Arab States would suffice to resolve the entire Arab refugee problem. And yet this human tragedy is allowed to continue so that Mr. Meguid and his colleagues can make speeches about it in the Security Council and try to gain some political mileage therefrom.

29. Israel has provided a homeland for the Jewish refugees driven out of the Arab lands, and it was indeed welcoming to note what in effect is President Carter's confirmation of Israel's stand over the years: namely, that the exact way to solve the problem of a homeland for the Palestinian refugees is one that concerns first the Arab countries.

30. To turn to the statement of my Jordanian colleague, Mr. Nuseibeh: he objected at length to an Israeli Tourist Office advertisement which he had had distributed, depicting the city of Jerusalem with the Mosque of Omar, which he called "the first Qibla of Islam" [1993rd meeting, para. 69]. It is not for me to correct his knowledge of Islamic history, but I had always understood the Ka'aba at Mecca to be the first Qibla of Islam, with the Haram Esh-Sharif at Jerusalem ranking third in importance after the mosques of Mecca and Medina. Be that as it may, I can only say how delighted I should have been had the Jordanian authorities, during the years in which they occupied Jerusalem, attempted to attract tourists to the area by advertisements depicting Jewish Holy Places. Alas, they had nothing to show but the ruins of 34 of the 35 Jewish houses of worship that had graced the Old City of Jerusalem for centuries until wantonly destroyed by the Jordanian authorities, nothing but the ashes of hundreds of Scrolls of the Law, reverently preserved for generations until plundered and burnt by the Jordanian authorities, nothing but the rubble of 38,000 out of 50,000 gravestones in the ancient Jewish burial ground on the Mount of Olives, tombstones torn up, profaned, broken into pieces, used as flagstones, steps and building materials for Jordanian army camps. For seven centuries, since 1267, the Hurva synagogue had stood as a landmark in Jerusalem. Unfortunately, it was featured on no Jordanian tourist advertisement, having been totally destroyed at the behest of the authorities.

31. I respectfully submit that the representative of a Government whose contribution to the preservation of the Holy Places and to the tourist trade of Jerusalem is symbolized by wholesale destruction of Jewish Holy Places, by the building of a large unsightly hotel on the Mount of Olives, and the cutting of an asphalt access road through the middle of an ancient Jewish cemetery, has no right to criticize Israel in regard to the Holy Places for the "genocide of an authentic civilization" [ibid.], as Mr. Nuseibeh put it.

32. For the 19 years that Jordanian authorities controlled East Jerusalem, Jews were forbidden access to the Western Wall of the ancient Temple, the holiest shrine of Judaism. Now, thousands of Moslem tourists from all the Arab countries, including Jordan, visit Jerusalem every year and pray both at the Al Aqsa Mosque and at the Dome of the Rock. In the words of Tawfiq Mahmoud Asaliya, Qadi of Jaffa and Jerusalem:

“How good it would be if those who have heard unfounded rumours of desecration and interference . . .

could come to witness the peace and tranquility which prevail in this Holy Place during the prayers that are regularly held there.”

33. Of course, we present Jerusalem as it is today as a matter of pride. What nation would not be proud of what we have done in Jerusalem after centuries of neglect and discrimination? Jerusalem is today an open city, open to all its citizens, Jews, Moslems and Christians, and to members of all faiths from all nations: it is open even to those who claim to be Israel's enemies. To date, millions of tourists from all over the world, including from hostile Arab States, have visited Jerusalem and have enjoyed freedom of access to and worship at their respective Holy Places.

34. But Jerusalem is more than a conglomeration of Holy Places. It is a city, a living and breathing entity, a human community engaged in all the traffic and commerce of everyday life. It is a home for some quarter of a million Jews, 62,000 Moslems and 11,500 Christians of all denominations: Armenians, Copts, Orthodox, Latins, Roman Catholics, Protestants and so forth. To all those people, Jerusalem is a city in which they live and work, raise families and acquire their education. The unique and the common are deeply mingled in the life of the people of Jerusalem, and it is the first time in history that Jerusalem has reached such a level of harmony and peaceful coexistence amongst its various communities. During the past 2,000 years, the city of Jerusalem has not known a more enlightened administration than that of today, dedicated to the principles of human tolerance and peaceful coexistence between the various communities which comprise the human mosaic of that unique, immortal and beautiful city.

35. We are proud of Jerusalem and all it stands for. We are proud of the trust we hold in respect of the two other great religions in our capital city. We are proud of the manner in which we carry out that trust before history. It is all there in the open for you to see, and that is why we invite the world to come and see.

36. As for Mr. Nuseibeh's proposal about a monitoring team, let me reject it out of hand. We have had too many committees, commissions, monitors and observers. All these are excuses to bypass the main problem, namely, that of sitting down face to face and negotiating for peace. If you want to monitor in the Middle East in areas where people are denied human rights, in places such as Syria where a small Jewish community is virtually in prison, or in Iraq where the Kurdish minority is rapidly being extinguished, go ahead. I can let you have a full list. Our problem is no longer one of monitoring: the problem today is one of talking about peace.

37. Ambassador Meguid falsely asserted that Israel, in the General Assembly, had opposed the peace process in the Middle East itself. On that occasion representatives will recall that Israel took the unusual step of introducing a draft resolution in the Assembly, the operative paragraph of which read as follows:

“Calls on Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic to reconvene without delay at the Peace

Conference on the Middle East under the co-chairmanship of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order to resume negotiations without prior conditions on the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East as called for in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973.”<sup>1</sup>

As members will recall, a number of countries, under Arab prompting, moved to torpedo that draft resolution.

38. Israel rejected out of hand and continues to reject resolution 31/62 of 1976 and will not be a party at any stage to any moves arising out of that resolution. We are not bound by it in any way. We rejected the resolution because its purpose was to change the ground rules of the Geneva Peace Conference, erode its central position in the negotiating process, substitute in effect the Security Council for the Geneva Conference and substitute a dictated settlement for direct negotiations between the parties. That was a subtle Arab move to persevere in an attempt to impose a solution. It has not succeeded in the past and, as far as we are concerned, it will not succeed in the future.

39. Let me make it quite clear: we represent at least 50 per cent of the problem and we will not be dictated to. The only resolution on which moves towards peace and the Geneva Peace Conference can be based is Security Council resolution 338 (1973), which was adopted unanimously in the Council and was then accepted by both sides to the conflict. Furthermore, in the interim and disengagement agreements which we signed with the Governments of Egypt and Syria, both sides undertook in their respective agreements that resolution 338 (1973) would form the basis for negotiations in the future. The Governments of Egypt and Syria appended their signatures, as did the Government of Israel, to those agreements.

40. Let me reiterate once again what was made quite clear to the Secretary-General during his visit to Israel, namely, that Israel was prepared for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference at any time with the participants of the original Conference of December 1973. The Secretary-General was told—and this still holds good—that the fact of imminent elections in Israel did not have to be a consideration. We shall go to the Conference without any preconditions whatsoever. We reject any such preconditions as are being proposed in various public statements today. Such preconditions include also the question of participation. Let me remind the Council that the Arab States which joined us at Geneva in 1973 did so at that time without any preconditions as to participation. The PLO existed then. Yet the Arab States did not make its participation a precondition.

41. As far as that participation is concerned, we have made it perfectly clear that, while we recognize the importance of the Palestinian Arab issue and, indeed, will insist that it be dealt with and are prepared for the participation of Palestinian Arabs from the West Bank in the Jordanian delegation, we will not countenance sitting at a table with an organization which only last week at the

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 29, document A/31/L.24.

Palestine National Council reaffirmed that its purpose was the destruction of the State of Israel.

42. It was not by accident that the Secretary-General in his report described "the attitude of the PLO toward Israel as reflected in the Palestine National Charter" as "among the key issues where adjustments of attitude would have an importance bearing on the prospects of success of the Conference" [S/12290 and Corr.1, para. 20].

43. The policy of the PLO is a matter of record. It is one based on the most brutal terrorism, in the pursuit of which attacks have been made upon innocent people throughout the world, including unsuspecting women and children. It is the PLO which has brought misery, murder and assassination to the area of the Middle East and introduced terrorism as a kind of international idiom, terrorism which affects innocent people wherever they may be.

44. The PLO is governed by the Palestinian Covenant of 1964, as amended in 1968 and as reconfirmed only last week at Cairo. In article 6, it in effect calls for the expulsion of the bulk of the Jewish population. In article 15, it calls for the elimination of Zionism. In article 19, it calls in effect for the destruction of the State of Israel. In article 20, it makes the preposterous assertion that "the claim of a historical or spiritual tie between Jews and Palestine does not tally with historical realities". And yet there are countries that expect us to agree to sit down with an organization whose basic creed and main tenet of faith is the destruction of our State and people and which declares emphatically, in article 21 of the self-same Covenant, that it "rejects all plans that aim at the settlement of the Palestine issue", that is, any plan which falls short of the destruction of Israel.

45. I ask the members of the Council: is there any self-respecting country here or anywhere which would agree to treat with a body whose sole declared purpose was to destroy it and whose aim was to obtain concessions that would make its destruction so much easier?

46. As for the attitude of the PLO, let us hear Farouk Kaddoumi, the chief political officer of the PLO:

"There are two [initial] phases to our return. The first phase to the 1967 lines, and the second to the 1948 lines... The third stage is the democratic state of Palestine. So we are fighting for these three stages."

That is from *Newsweek* of 14 March, a few days ago. Here one has spelled out with stark candour the authoritative programme of the PLO: the destruction of Israel by stages.

47. And if anybody was continuing to indulge in wishful thinking, the Palestine National Council only last week dispelled such doubts. By a vote of 194 to 13—the 13 thought that the resolution was not extreme enough—the PLO National Council voted for a continuation of "the armed struggle" against Israel and rejected recognition of the State of Israel or the signing of a peace agreement. It reiterated the rejection of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as a basis for peace and negotiation while invoking impliedly General Assembly resolution

3236 (XXIX) as a possible basis. That resolution 3236 (XXIX) was described by Yasser Arafat to the Lebanese newspaper *Al-Balagh* in the following words: "This resolution comprises the liquidation of Zionist existence."

48. If there were still any doubts as to the attitude of the PLO, they voted to escalate the military, political and economic struggle against Israel and against any form of peace with Israel.

49. There is no other example in the world of an organization calling for the destruction of a nation and a people.

50. One of the more popular misconceptions today is that there was a moderate element in the PLO which tried to bring about a change but was outvoted by the extremists. Nothing is further from the truth. True, there are moderates and extremists in the PLO, but they are identical in their attitude towards Israel or towards a change in the Palestinian Covenant. There is a popular fallacy which maintains that there is a debate in the PLO on the basic approach to Israel. In that debate the moderates agree, as it were, to some form of coexistence with Israel, while the extremists oppose such coexistence. This is completely and absolutely untrue. The negation of Israel's right to exist is a principle accepted by all grouping within the PLO. That is the main theme in the Palestinian Covenant which the Palestine National Council reaffirmed this week. Not one delegate to the National Council raised even the slightest kind of doubt as to that thesis. The division between extremists and moderates relates to secondary issues, to tactics and to modes of operation.

51. The extremists emphasize the importance of the armed struggle and maintain that participation in the Geneva Conference or acquiescence in interim agreements can lead to a cessation of the struggle against Israel and thereby to a continuance of the existence of Israel. Those extremists criticize the PLO surrender to Syria. They oppose discussions with Jordan which run counter to the traditional PLO stand, which calls for the removal of the present Jordanian leadership and the Royal Hashemite House, and opposes contacts of any form with Israelis.

52. As opposed to them, the moderates are willing to adopt a political approach as a tactic, on condition that such an approach will lead ultimately to the destruction of Israel. Thus the decision of the Palestine National Council was in the spirit of the so-called moderates. The "moderate" approach, for example, rejects resolution 242 (1967), because it recognizes Israel's right to exist and refers to resolution 3236 (XXIX) which, according to the PLO, is a formula for the destruction of Israel.

53. The Palestinian Covenant not only was not changed; on the contrary, the Council reaffirmed the Covenant and declared that all resolutions were based on it. Thus, in fact, nothing changed so far as the approach of the PLO concerned.

54. Mr. Nuseibeh asked what I would say if he proposed that Israel be represented at peace negotiations by Mr. Peres in place of Mr. Rabin or by Mr. Uri Avneri in place of



Mr. Begin. A good question, which if I were to answer it might conceivably create certain problems for me. But seriously, none of the gentlemen that Mr. Nuseibeh referred to has ever called for the destruction of an Arab State or an Arab people. It must be obvious to all here why we object and continue to object to negotiations with the PLO or to sitting down with its representatives at Geneva. The PLO, I point out to Mr. Nuseibeh, has not concealed the hideous fate that it would mete out to the State and people of Israel, and indeed to the present régime in Jordan—to judge by Farouk Kaddoumi in the Beirut weekly *As Sayad* last year to the effect that the PLO demands a political and military presence in Jordan, an objective which, in his opinion, would necessitate a change of régime in Jordan.

55. And just to make sure that the record is straight: The Palestine National Council issued on 20 March 1977 a political communiqué which, *inter alia*, stated the following:

“1. . . . The Council therefore emphasizes its opposition to this resolution [*Security Council resolution 242 (1967)*] and its refusal to negotiate on the basis of it in the Arab and the international arena . . .

“4. The Council emphasizes the position of the PLO which opposes all forms of American settlements of capitulation . . .

“9. The Council . . . has resolved to act for the liberation of all the occupied Arab lands . . . and restoring the permanent national rights of the Palestinian nation without peace [with Israel] or recognition [of Israel].”

I must add that the political communiqué was not without its measure of macabre humour, emphasizing its insistence on “the right of the Palestinian revolution to exist on the soil of sister Lebanon”. Sister Lebanon in paragraph 6 becomes, incidentally, a “heroic brother” in paragraph 7, in which the Council “emphasizes the steadfast insistence of the PLO on the unity of [the Lebanese] soil, its security and independence” and goes on to say how proud the Council is of what it calls “this [the Lebanese] heroic nation’s support of the PLO”. The Palestine National Council obviously pays scant attention to the very moving descriptions by the Lebanese representative to the General Assembly of events in Lebanon.

56. As representatives in this Council are by now aware, we have never denied the problems which exist. We have always striven to negotiate their solution. Israel’s approach to the problem facing us is neither a facile one nor is it based on slogans. It is a problem which exercises the entire population of Israel. Because we are the only free country in the region, ours is the only country in which a variety of solutions has been proposed in public discussions. Similarly, the Arab population that lives with us is the only Arab population in the Middle East which is free to discuss and debate openly and disagree and propose varying solutions. The problem affects our very existence and we do not approach it in the facile and superficial manner which characterizes the approach of so many who discuss it.

57. The tragedy in the Middle East is that Israel is the only country in which a free, open and frank discussion on the tortured issues facing us is possible. Mr. Meguid can quote from our election debate—the debate of a free and open society. Unfortunately, there is no such free and open debate on those issues in the Arab society. But on one point there is no debate or discussion in Israel, namely, that there is no alternative to direct face-to-face negotiations with the States that are our neighbours if we are to achieve peace, a real peace.

58. My Foreign Minister made it quite clear to the Secretary-General, as he had done previously to the General Assembly, that we would insist that a solution for the Palestinian Arab problem be the subject of discussion in negotiations. Eighty per cent of 2.8 million Palestinian Arabs are citizens of either the Kingdom of Jordan, holding Jordanian passports, or of Israel, holding Israeli passports, and 80 per cent of the territory of Mandatory Palestine is at present the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The Government of Israel has gone on record to reiterate its belief that the ultimate solution of the Palestine Arab problem must lie within the context of a peace agreement between Israel and Jordan.

59. Of late the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference have clarified their respective approaches to various aspects of the Middle Eastern problem.

60. President Carter’s basic approach to the importance of direct negotiations was enunciated by him as follows: “We should attempt to promote direct negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbours”. At his news conference only a few days ago on 10 March, President Carter stated: “The Arab nations, the Israeli nation have to agree on permanent and recognized borders”. The emphasis in his words was on negotiation and agreement. When addressing himself to the nature of peace which is the crux of the problem, he stated:

“I think that what Israel would like to have is what we would like to have: a termination of belligerence towards Israel by her neighbours; a recognition of Israel’s right to exist—the right to exist in peace; the opening up of borders with free trade, tourist travel, cultural exchange between Israel and her neighbours. In other words, a stabilization of the situation in the Middle East without a constant threat to Israel’s existence by her neighbours.”

Or as President Carter put it in the remarks he made at Clinton, Massachusetts on 16 March 1977:

“Israel has to have secure borders. Israel’s right to exist means that over months and years, the borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours must be opened up to travel, tourism, social exchange and trade. That is the first prerequisite of peace.”

61. Similarly, the other Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference has addressed himself to the problem. We have noted the speech by Chairman Leonid Brezhnev to the sixteenth Congress of Trade Unions in Moscow on 21 March. We take cognizance of his statement that “the Conference at Geneva, of course, is not an end in itself. Fruitful and

just results of its work are the main thing". We welcome the fact that the Government of the Soviet Union has gone on record in acknowledging that "the drawing up of peace terms in all their details is primarily a matter for the conflicting sides themselves".

62. The fact that the Co-Chairmen of the Conference recognize the centrality of the principle of negotiation between the parties is of the greatest significance. I should, however, add that this welcome Soviet acknowledgement of the principle of free negotiations between the parties would appear to be somewhat irreconcilable with pre-conditions for the final document on peace which the Soviet statement sets out in advance of such negotiations, in particular on issues which divide the parties and which are vital to Israel's security, such as the borders or the proposal for the establishment of a further State in addition to Jordan on our eastern border, a proposition which Israel has declared to be unacceptable and which is unacceptable not only to the State of Israel in our area. It is not my intention to give a detailed reaction to Chairman Brezhnev's remarks. However, it did seem appropriate to clarify a few relevant points on this occasion.

63. It is encouraging to see that gradually there is growing acceptance of Israel's contention that the main problem facing us today is the nature of peace. Therein lies the crux of the problem and, until that is spelled out, no real, meaningful advance can be made.

64. President Sadat of Egypt has assured Western visitors that he is ready for peace with Israel. If he is sincerely prepared for peace with Israel, why does he not make it? Israel's prime ministers have declared on countless occasions, over the years, that they are prepared to meet him to negotiate a settlement. If he is ready for peace, why has President Sadat not accepted this challenge? Why are his overtures limited to visiting Congressmen and newsmen?

65. The grim truth is that the Arab States refuse to negotiate face to face with Israel because that would involve an acknowledgement of Israel's right to exist. Indeed, this situation is mirrored here in this very room, in this building. The persistent refusal of the Arab representatives to meet and talk with the representative of Israel is more illustrative than anything else of their basic approach. Until they graduate from that puerile form of behaviour and overcome their mutual suspicions and fears, that act alone will continue to be indicative of their true approach, more than any speeches they may make. Until the Arab States agree to sit down and negotiate with us face to face, there can really be no resolution of the Israel-Arab conflict.

66. A policy that does not recognize that the crux of the problem is the Arab refusal to recognize Israel's right to exist must fail. A policy that does not insist on face-to-face negotiations in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) cannot succeed. There can be palliatives. But without going to the root of the problem and calling the Arab bluff on this issue, there can be no overall solution. True Arab policy is not reflected by the soothing blandishments uttered by President Sadat to gullible visitors whose support he solicits, but rather by the endless barren diatribe of threats, hate and intransigence

that we hear daily at the United Nations from every Arab representative, led, incidentally, by the Egyptians in violation of an agreement they concluded with Israel and the United States of America, only a year and a half ago.

67. When we talk about peace we mean peace. As Prime Minister Rabin stated to the Knesset on his return from the United States only a few days ago:

"Israel saw and continues to see 'peace' as a real peace. There can be no overall agreement which is not based on a peace treaty expressing peace as it is accepted in international practice and as it is translated into reality on the level of relations among nations. For us, real peace means the ending of the state of war, with all its legal and practical implications. But this is not enough, for it also means the building of a relationship of peace based on cultural ties, open borders and the exchange of information, the movement of people and trade and so forth. Naturally this also means diplomatic relations."

68. That is our aim. For this purpose we are prepared to come to the negotiating table. The process will of necessity be a long and difficult one. But one thing is quite clear: that process will not be helped one iota by the barren debates that we are being subjected to at the whim of the Egyptian representative to this Organization. Our position is crystal clear: we are prepared to negotiate today, tomorrow. We are prepared for compromise. We are prepared to go to Geneva to a reconvening of the Peace Conference with the original participants. We see the main problem to be a clear definition of the nature of peace. We are not prepared to negotiate with those who call for our destruction because we have no intention of committing national suicide.

69. In the past no advance has ever been made in our conflict without negotiation and no negotiation has taken place without some form of advance being made. Let us therefore stop all this talk and begin to negotiate face to face on a basis of mutual respect and dignity. Let us abandon these futile debates and leave behind us the bitterness and division which they must of necessity engender. The path to peace lies only through negotiation, not through the rhetoric which characterizes the debates on the Middle East in this chamber.

70. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

71. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, it was my great privilege to address the Council under your presidency a few days ago, during the debate on the question of South Africa. I am equally honoured to do the same today, in the discussion of the situation in the Middle East and the report of the Secretary-General [*S/12290 and Corr.1*] on his recent visit to the region and his consultations with the parties directly concerned about the Peace Conference on the Middle East.

72. In all candour and sincerity, I consider it a good omen that the two problems of the Middle East and South Africa should come up for consideration at almost the same time

while you are presiding over the discussions of the Council. Your reputation as a staunch defender of civil and human rights and as a sympathizer with the plight of the oppressed peoples in southern Africa preceded your arrival to represent your great country at the United Nations. In view of the striking resemblance and similarity between the two situations, one cannot but nourish the hope that after thorough acquaintance with the details of the Middle East problem, you and your country will give the plight of the Palestinian people the same understanding and sympathy you have accorded the plight of their African brothers.

73. It is encouraging indeed to witness today a slow but steady return to the concept of morality in the foreign policies of certain big Powers. The peoples of the third world have suffered too long from the immolation of their human and political rights on the altar of the greedy interests and colonialist designs of the great Powers. Any reaffirmation of the principles of human rights, justice and morality will therefore be in their favour and to their benefit. But to be really just and moral, one should not apply principles relating to human rights and dignity in a discriminatory or selective manner. The voice of a few dissidents in one place should not be louder to certain ears than the voice of an entire people oppressed in another.

74. The problem the Security Council is discussing today is one of the most striking examples of such a case. It is the case of an entire population condemned for nearly 30 years to dispersion, oppression and denial of the most elementary human and national rights.

75. The conflict in the Middle East is the direct outcome of the uprooting of that population, the Palestinian people, from the territory on which that people had lived continuously throughout centuries. Since the creation of Israel, 3.5 million Palestinians have lived in distress and misery, either under the yoke of Zionist occupation or in refugee camps scattered in the neighbouring Arab countries. The only crime of those Palestinians is that they happen to be Moslems or Christians, not Jews. One does not need to exert much effort in order to prove that were those 3.5 million human beings of the Jewish faith, they would have been permitted to remain in their homes, towns and villages, since Jews of all races and nationalities are being ingathered from the four corners of the world to settle in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories under the racist discriminatory banner of the exclusively Jewish State.

76. I do not, of course, intend at present to enter into a detailed history of the tragedy of Palestine. The chapters of that tragedy have repeatedly been enacted in the theatre of this Organization since its very creation. What it is important to stress right now is that the territories invaded during Israel's latest war of aggression on 5 June 1967 are now approaching the tenth anniversary of their falling under the yoke of Zionist occupation.

77. The persistent Israeli occupation of the territories of the Palestinian people and of two other Arab countries Members of the United Nations is a continued act of aggression under the Charter and according to all principles of international law.

78. It is a real tragedy that the United Nations should for three decades remain indifferent in the face of constant defiance by one of its Members, especially when that Member happens to be the only one among the 147 Members whose admission to the membership of the Organization was subject to its observance of and respect for two General Assembly resolutions relating specifically to the right of the Palestinian people to have its own independent State in Palestine and the right of the Palestine refugees to return to their homes and property.

79. Not only has Israel violated and is still violating those two basic resolutions—one of which, namely General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, constitutes the only legal basis, according to the United Nations, for Israel's existence—but it has also violated and constantly defied more than 200 resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the questions of Palestine and the Middle East in the last 30 years including the resolution so often cited by the Zionists yet never implemented: Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

80. The Security Council of course bears the greatest share of the blame for the continuation of this dangerous state of affairs. In closing its eyes to what has been going on for so many years in the Middle East, and in ignoring its responsibilities under the Charter to put an end to a very dangerous situation that has been threatening international peace and security throughout the last three decades, the Council has failed in its duty and has harmed both its credibility as the main international organ for the maintenance of international peace and security as well as the reputation of the United Nations as the defender of the basic human rights of all peoples and the determined saviour of mankind from the scourges of war and aggression.

81. The General Assembly at its last three sessions adopted a number of important resolutions relating to the national rights of the Palestinian people and its participation on an equal footing in all international efforts aimed at the establishment of peace in the region, as well as to the basic elements of such a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

82. In its resolution 31/62 of 9 December 1976, the General Assembly called for the early convening of the Peace Conference on the Middle East and requested the Secretary-General to resume contacts with all parties to the conflict as well as with the Co-Chairmen of the Conference, in accordance with his initiative of 1 April 1976 [*S/12210 of 18 October 1976, para. 8*], and to submit a report to the Security Council on the results of his contacts. It is in accordance with that resolution that the Council is now meeting in order to consider the Secretary-General's report in document S/12290 and Corr.1

83. My delegation would like, first of all, to pay a warm tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his tireless efforts and utmost devotion to the cause of justice and peace in the Middle East. The Secretary-General, who has never hesitated to visit the region whenever he has felt it necessary in order to help reduce the tension, consult with the parties or promote the momentum towards peace,

indeed deserves the title of "pilgrim of peace". I should like, on behalf of my Government, to express to him Syria's deep appreciation and support for his endeavours in the service of international peace and security.

84. Unfortunately, the efforts of the Secretary-General—as can be understood from his report—have not succeeded in overcoming Israel's intransigence and arrogance. As a matter of fact, Israel was the only party which did not welcome the visit of the Secretary-General and which tried to sabotage his efforts even before his arrival at Jerusalem. That is not surprising, of course, from a régime which has managed to accumulate, during its 28 years of membership, a number of condemnations probably larger than the entire number of condemnations issued by the Organization to all the other Members put together.

85. Israel, in fact, leads that small minority of countries and régimes that have tried always to discredit the United Nations in an attempt to minimize the impact of the world Organization's censure of their violations and aggressive policies. It is extremely heartening in this connexion, Mr. President, to see the Chief Executive of your great country, President Carter, reaffirming through his visit to the United Nations and his address to its Members the confidence and faith placed by the overwhelming majority of nations in the world Organization, in spite of the constantly negative attitude of racist and aggressive régimes.

86. The report of the Secretary-General on his visit to the Middle East between 31 January and 12 February 1977 makes evident Israel's obstinacy and intractability, in contrast to Arab goodwill and flexibility: Israel is not prepared to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization as the representative of the Palestinians and objects to its participation in the Peace Conference on an equal footing with the other parties; Israel, while pretending it is ready to attend the Conference immediately, negates that very possibility by imposing the condition that the Conference be convened on the same basis as that of the phase of December 1973; Israel insists that Security Council resolution 338 (1973) is the only basis on which the Conference can be convened, ignoring all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly since the adoption of that resolution, including resolution 31/62, which is the basis of the present discussion of the Council and was supported overwhelmingly by 122 Members; Israel insists that the negotiations should take place within the Geneva framework, on a Government-to-Government basis, according to the specific issue involved, again ignoring the fact that the problem of the Middle East is indivisible; Israel tries once again to confine the objectives of the Peace Conference to "limited arrangements", instead of the comprehensive settlement everyone else is working for, claiming that the present circumstances do not favour such a comprehensive solution.

87. The bitter fact is that Israel is not interested in peace and does not even want the Peace Conference to be convened. Israel of course claims that the opposite is true and expresses its readiness to attend the Conference immediately. But, at the same time, it imposes several impossible conditions which it knows, and indeed hopes, the Arabs would not and could not accept. Otherwise, how can one justify Israel's ridiculous and persistent objection

to the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the Conference, when everybody admits today—including Israel's closest allies—that no peaceful solution to the problem of the Middle East is possible in the absence of the Palestinians and without a just and satisfactory solution to their problem?

88. Israel attempts to justify its objections to the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, claiming that the PLO does not recognize the existence of Israel, does not accept Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and is nothing but a terrorist organization which wants to destroy the State of Israel.

89. It is true that the PLO does not recognize the existence of Israel. But does Israel recognize the existence of the PLO? Or does Israel recognize even the existence of the Palestinian people itself? It is true, also, that the PLO does not accept resolution 242 (1967). But why should the Palestinians accept a resolution which ignores their very existence and does not refer to them except as miserable refugees?

90. What is not true is Israel's description of the PLO as a terrorist organization. For who is the real terrorist? The alien who occupies your territory, disperses your people and causes your fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, daughters and sons to become desperate refugees twice in a lifetime, or the indigenous inhabitant who carries the weapons, in spite of his limited resources and possibilities, in defence of his land and human rights? Israel, which was established solely through terror and aggression, should be the last to speak about terror or terrorism.

91. Even if we wanted to put aside all those considerations, is not the mere fact that the PLO is ready to participate in the Peace Conference on the Middle East, in which Israel is one of the parties, an important concession on the part of the PLO in pursuit of a just and lasting peace? It is quite unfortunate that in response to the moderation of the PLO and the constructive reference in the latest political declaration of the Palestine National Council, concerning the right of the PLO to participate in all international conferences, forums and efforts dealing with the problem of Palestine and the Arab-Zionist conflict, on an independent and equal basis, the Prime Minister of Israel again had nothing to say about the PLO except the following: "the only place where we would meet with the Palestine Liberation Organization is on the battlefield".

92. Why is Israel obstructing all efforts towards peace in this irresponsible manner? The answer is clear and simple. Israel does not want peace, because peace means that it has to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories. The expansionist designs of the Zionist régime are no secret any longer. Israel is playing for time and it needs that time very badly in order to consolidate its grip on Arab land, establish more settlements and place the world before more faits accomplis.

93. The establishment of Jewish settlements on Arab land is proceeding feverishly with the encouragement and under the protection of the Israeli authorities. The number of settlements which have been established up to this date in

the West Bank, Gaza, Sinai and the Golan is not published, of course, but it is certain that it has exceeded 115. Radio Jerusalem broadcast in English, on 21 January 1977, that the Jewish Agency plans to set up 17 new settlements in Galilee over the next five years, and that it plans 41 new settlements for the rest of the country in the same period.

94. Earlier this month, the Israeli Ministerial Committee for Settlement Affairs decided to permit the extremist group, Gush Emunim, to establish a nucleus settlement in Mashah in Western Samaria. The Zionist leaders do not hide the real aim behind the implantation of all those settlements in the occupied Arab territories, in violation of the United Nations Charter, the fourth Geneva Convention<sup>2</sup> and the principles of international law. Mr. Yigal Allon, Israel's Foreign Minister, declared last 28 December, at the end of a tour of the Jordan Valley settlements:

"The settlements in the Jordan Rift Valley and on the Mountain Ridge serve us as a lever in the political struggle over making the future map of the State of Israel."

He also said:

"Although I would like there to be more settlements, without any bounds at all, I am certainly pleased with the defended areas we have in our new settlements to date, whether on the Golan Heights or in the Jordan Rift Valley or on the Ridge, or whether in the Judean desert and Gush Etzion or the Rafah approaches and the Elath Gulf area as far as Ofira."

This was broadcast on Tel Aviv radio in Hebrew on 28 December 1976.

95. The Zionists try always to justify their territorial expansion by the so-called theory of "strategic depth", whereby the usurped Arab territories are needed to protect Jewish settlements and Israel's population centres. But the irony is that as soon as the Israelis occupy a new piece of territory, they hasten to establish on that territory new Jewish settlements. The new settlements need then, in their turn, more territorial buffers to create new "strategic depth", and when the additional territorial barriers are obtained, new settlements are established, and so on.

96. The Jewish magazine *Israel Digest* referred to this Zionist expansionist strategy in its issue of 24 May 1974. Taking the Golan as an example, it said:

"... the Golan was needed as a buffer between Israel and Syria. Once communities were established there, it no longer acted as a buffer. The Golan itself then required a buffer."

97. The prolonged occupation of the Arab territories and the long oppression of the Arab inhabitants of those territories are creating a very serious situation which, if not handled swiftly and justly by the Security Council, might lead to a dangerous explosion in the whole region.

<sup>2</sup> Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

98. The Zionist authorities are persisting in their repressive measures against the Arab population. More than 30,000 Palestinians have been imprisoned since 1967 under the Defence (Emergency) Regulation, which was enacted by the British during the Mandate and is still in force in the occupied territories. Some 4,500 Arabs are still in prison under the pretext of "security" and about 400 of them are serving life terms.

99. Israeli prisons are overcrowded with "security prisoners". The Arab detainees are tortured, beaten, underfed and humiliated in Zionist gaols. This inhuman treatment of the Arab detainees has led them to declare a hunger strike, which is now entering its fourth month. The condition of those thousands of hunger strikers is becoming more and more critical, especially in the prison at Ashkelon, where one of the political prisoners died last January during the hunger strike.

100. Demonstrations of anger and protest against the Zionist occupier are now a daily happening in Nablus, Ramallah, Jenin, El-Khalil and Tulkarm and many other parts of the occupied Arab territories. The Zionist soldiers suppress those legitimate demonstrations with extreme brutality and hatred. Mr. William Farrell, correspondent of *The New York Times*, reported only last Friday the following:

"A recent protest in Ramallah, involving students at a teacher-training center operated by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, resulted in injuries to 17 men in their 20s and has raised questions about the conduct of the Israeli military."

Mr. Farrell quotes one of those victims of Israeli brutality, 20-year-old student Iyad Abdul Latif Husein Zahen, who said in an interview:

"They hit us with sticks and with their shoes and their guns. One soldier caught my hair and put my head on the ground and put his shoe on my mouth. They broke our watches and told us to say 'Thank you'. They ordered us to curse Mohammed and they put our belts around our necks and pulled us to the right and to the left. They told us 'You are not boys, you are donkeys, and the demonstrations are not helping your problems'."

Mr. Farrell says that the account of that Arab student was corroborated by others and by the Chief of Internal Medicine at Augusta Victoria Hospital, who said that the students

"suffered from broken bones, broken teeth, wrist wounds suffered when their watches were smashed, and cross-hatched back bruises apparently caused by clubbings".

101. Mr. Michael Newlin, the United States Consul-General at Jerusalem, was criticized in the Knesset on 9 March 1977 by the Israeli Foreign Minister, Mr. Yigal Allon, for his promise to intervene on behalf of 400 hunger-striking Arab security prisoners in Ashkelon prison, and it was said that this "did not accord" with his "status and functions". The families of the Arab detainees came in January to Mr. Newlin asking for United States interven-

tion. The Consul-General listened to their plight and promised to study the affair and transmit his findings to the United States Embassy at Tel Aviv. Mr. Newlin promised to act in unison with other foreign consuls in Jerusalem on behalf of a just solution to the prisoners' problems in accordance with the Geneva Convention. That noble humanitarian effort was too much for the Israeli authorities to bear, because they did not like to hear any question raised about their inhuman behaviour, even by the representative of a friendly country. But that did not prevent the United States State Department from criticizing Israel's treatment of the Arabs in the occupied territories. According to the Israeli newspaper *Al-Quds* of 14 March 1977, the State Department report states that Israel violated the Geneva Convention by deporting Arab citizens and by applying unnecessarily hard measures to demonstrators. According to the Israeli daily which is published in Arabic, the report also criticizes the law of return that is applicable to Jews all over the world, while the Arabs are deprived of the right to return to their homes and land.

102. Occupation of the territories of others by force is an affront to the human dignity of those who are subjected to the yoke of such occupation. The mere fact of being compelled to live under alien occupation is in itself a flagrant denial of basic human rights: the right to independence, the right to self-determination and the right to national identity and sovereignty. That is why the United Nations definition of aggression [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX)*] considers any military occupation, even temporary, an act of aggression.

103. The Zionist type of occupation, like the South African type, is particularly brutal and dangerous, because it involves "settler colonialism" and aims, through creeping annexation, to usurp the legitimate ownership of the land and to replace those rightful owners by alien settlers brought in from far-away countries under the racist banner of religious exclusivism.

104. Jewish settlements are proliferating in the occupied Arab territories like smallpox eruptions on the face of a helpless child. A mere look at the map of the region is sufficient to unmask the real designs of the Zionist settlers' colonialist régime, which is striving to swallow the whole or at least the bulk of the occupied Arab territories.

105. Every day which passes permits the Zionist occupiers to create new facts, establish new settlements and carry out further steps in their endeavour to alter the demographic and physical nature of the occupied territories. The international community cannot therefore remain idle in the face of such a situation. Any relaxation in the efforts to restore peace and justice in the area would undoubtedly lead to greater dangers for world peace and security as a whole. The Secretary-General was right when he affirmed in his report:

"there is, I believe, an increasing consciousness in the area that an opportunity now exists to resume negotiations in a meaningful way and that, if this opportunity is not seized, there are grave dangers that the situation will deteriorate once again, with incalculable consequences

not only for the Middle East but for the international community as a whole" [*S/12290 and Corr.1, para. 19*].

106. In its attempt to delay the process of peace in order to gain time for the implementation of its expansionist plans, Israel invokes all sorts of conditions and preconditions and various other obstacles designed to prevent the convening of the Peace Conference on the Middle East or at least to delay it for the longest possible time. Israel likes to interpret, for instance, the term "secure and recognized boundaries", which was used in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), as meaning solely secure and recognized boundaries for Israel, or as authorizing Israel to annex Arab territory as a means of ensuring its own security. What Israel tries to ignore is that resolution 242 (1967) advocated "secure and recognized boundaries" for every State in the region and not Israel alone. Israel forgets also that all the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) come under the basic principle emphasized in the preamble of that resolution: the principle of "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war".

107. Israel must understand that in this era of advanced military technology and sophisticated instruments of modern warfare, even in the conventional field, it is naïve to rely on geographical positions or territorial barriers. The concept of "secure boundaries" as such is interpreted has been completely shattered since the first hours of the October 1973 war, and it was hoped that Israel would have benefited from the lesson. As a matter of fact, before the October 1973 war, Israel was in full control of both the Suez Canal and the Golan Heights; but that did not prevent the Egyptian and Syrian armed forces, in their endeavour to liberate their occupied territories, from overcoming those important strategic barriers and recapturing them from the Israeli occupiers.

108. Boundaries cannot be "secure" unless they are "recognized" and they cannot be "recognized" unless they are just and not imposed by the weight of aggression. The same is true for that innovation the term "defensible borders". The only "defensible borders" are morally defensible borders. The Arab countries will never cede even an inch of their territories to the Zionist occupier, under whatever name or guise, whether to provide "defensible borders" or "defence lines" or any other innovation. The Arab countries, while reaffirming their unreserved support for a peaceful and just solution, will not tolerate any hampering of their sovereignty.

109. The road to peace is clear and well defined. It is evident that the only obstacles to peace are Israel's refusal to evacuate the Arab territories and its persistent violation of the national rights of the Palestinian people, particularly their right to political independence, repatriation, self-determination and a State of their own in their own territory.

110. It is tragic that the Zionists, who speak tirelessly and without interruption about their right to recognition and existence, attempt themselves to deny that right to others, especially when those others happen to be their innocent victims. The tragedy in the Middle East today is caused not

by the denial of the Jews' right to exist but rather by the denial of the Palestinian people's right to existence.

111. A just and honourable solution to the Middle East conflict is not lacking; what is lacking rather is the sincere and honest application of such a solution by Israel in a spirit of goodwill and with peaceful intentions. Once Israel withdrew its forces from all the occupied Arab territories, once the Palestinian people were enabled to exercise their national rights within a State of their own and in their own land in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and its relevant resolutions, there would remain no reason for conflict in the region, and it would be possible then for all countries and peoples of the Middle East to live in peace and harmony.

112. Israel should cease its procedural and tactical manoeuvres and, by showing its co-operation, permit the Peace Conference to start its work as soon as possible. The Security Council, as the main United Nations organ entrusted with the task of maintaining international peace and security, must act in order to defuse the tense and dangerous situation prevailing in the region. The Council must find the ways and means to translate into specific measures the recommendation of the Secretary-General in his report:

“we must maintain the movement towards peaceful negotiation for a just and lasting settlement and, specifically, intensify our search for means through which the Peace Conference on the Middle East can be convened at the earliest possible date” [*ibid.*, para. 22].

113. The Security Council must reiterate its call upon Israel to stop its violations and its expansionist policy in the occupied Arab territories, to cease the establishment of Jewish settlements and to dismantle what it has already established in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention and the principles of international law, to release all Arab “security” prisoners and to improve the conditions of detention of those who are still in Israeli gaols, pending their speedy release.

114. The Security Council should affirm the national rights of the Palestinian people to independence, self-determination and an independent State of their own on their own soil in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

115. Will the Security Council fulfil these tasks which are incumbent upon it by virtue of its responsibilities under the Charter or will it be content, once again, with the mere taking of notes or a surrender to moral paralysis while the Middle East is on the brink of catastrophe?

116. Before I began my statement, the representative of the Zionist régime addressed the Council and, as usual, uttered a set of lies and fabrications against the Arab countries in general and against the representatives who had addressed the Council earlier.

117. It is not my responsibility to answer for the representatives of Egypt and Jordan, but I should like, with

your permission, Mr. President, to make the following few comments on what the Zionist representative said.

118. Again, we have the representative of Israel wondering why the Security Council is meeting and wasting its time and, very ironically, proposing that Egypt should pay the cost of the meetings of the Security Council, because it is Egypt or some other Arab countries which are calling for the Council meetings. According to the mentality of the occupier, of course, the United Nations main organ responsible for peace and security has nothing to do with what is going on in a case of aggression committed by an aggressor. For the occupier and the aggressor, the Council should close its eyes as usual, and should not meet to discuss that situation. The Israeli aggressor speaks about normal conditions in the Middle East, as if there were no occupation, as if there were no human rights being violated, as if the prisons of Israel were not overcrowded with Arab prisoners, and he is wondering why the Council is meeting to discuss the situation.

119. I think the party which should pay the costs of all these meetings of the Security Council, and of all the other organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, is the aggressor, Israel which, by its crime, by its aggressive occupation of the Arab territories for more than 10 years now, has made it necessary for the United Nations to show concern, and for the Council to meet time and again in order to discuss its crimes and aggressive policies.

120. The second attempt the Zionist representative made was, as usual, to try to create a misunderstanding between the Arabs and the Africans. He forgets that our African brothers consider the question of Palestine as their own problem, in exactly the same manner as the Arab peoples consider the questions of the liberation of South Africa and other countries in southern Africa as their own cause. I do not have to remind the Zionist representative of the Political Declaration of the Afro-Arab Summit Conference to which I referred during my previous statement in the discussion on the question of South Africa [1991st meeting]. But I would just like to refer to that Declaration of the Conference. The Afro-Arab Summit Conference, fully convinced that the causes of Palestine, the Middle East, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa were Afro-Arab causes, decided:

“to extend its total support to the peoples struggling against the racist and Zionist régimes and to the frontline States bordering confrontation zones for their assistance to the national liberation struggle” [S/12298, annex, para. 10].

121. It is really ironic to hear the representative of Israel showing concern about the time wasted at the expense of the discussion on the question of South Africa, as if Israel were one of the opponents of the system of *apartheid* in South Africa. It is known now to everyone that Israel is the first ally of the racist régime of South Africa. Israel's record on all the resolutions and during all the discussions on the *apartheid* régime in South Africa is self-explanatory.

122. The last comment I should like to make is that the representative of the Zionist régime even tried to distort

what was said by the Secretary-General in his report. If I understood it well, he said [*para. 42 above*]:

“It was not by accident that the Secretary-General in his report described ‘the attitude of the PLO toward Israel, as reflected in the Palestine National Charter’ as ‘among the key issues where adjustments of attitude would have an important bearing on the prospects of success of the Conference’.”

A mere look at the report proves that the representative of the Zionist régime is trying to distort what was stated by the Secretary-General. I have the report in front of me and this is what the Secretary-General said:

“Obviously, the attitude of the PLO toward Israel, as reflected in the Palestine National Charter (formerly called the Covenant), the attitude”—I stress this—“of Israel toward the PLO and the nature and context of the Palestinian entity in a future settlement are among the key issues where adjustments of attitude would have an important bearing on the prospects of success of the Conference.” [*S/12290 and Corr. 1, para. 20.*]

The Zionist representative forgot everything about the negative attitude of Israel towards the PLO and only remembered the attitude of the PLO towards Israel.

123. Those are only a few examples of what came to mind after listening to the representative of the Zionist régime for a few minutes. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to reserve the right to make fuller comments on what he fabricated and said during his statement.

124. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, on whom I now call.

125. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, let me assure you, first of all, that my people have full confidence and trust in the United Nations. We have good reasons to justify our confidence, and our trust is not misplaced. Thanks to its deliberations, and fruitful deliberations at that, many oppressed peoples have attained their freedom and gained independence, and are now full Members sharing with the other Members the responsibility of bringing about justice and peace. We are certain that today’s deliberations, under your able and prudent stewardship, will bring us nearer to our goal: the attainment of justice and peace.

126. The Security Council meets today to consider the situation in the Middle East and the report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East.

127. At this juncture, it would be prudent of us to consider the report of the Secretary-General and also resolution 31/62. It was in pursuance of that resolution that the Secretary-General undertook the important tasks of initial consultations with the representatives of the parties concerned and of the two Co-Chairmen. At the invitation of the Government of Egypt and after consulta-

tions with all the parties concerned, the Secretary-General decided to visit the region.

128. From the first paragraph of the report it is evident that the Government of Egypt took the initiative—an initiative which reflects the sincere and determined desire of that Government to initiate the implementation of a General Assembly resolution for the convening of a peace conference.

129. Before I go into further detail, let us consider how resolution 31/62 came into being. On 7 December 1976, the General Assembly was considering the item “The situation in the Middle East”. The Secretary-General had then presented a report in document A/31/270-S/12210,<sup>3</sup> which was to be read jointly with his report on the item “Question of Palestine”,<sup>4</sup> for the Secretary-General stated in paragraph 2 of the latter report that:

“The implementation of that resolution [*resolution 3375 (XXX)*] is of course closely connected with the efforts undertaken within the framework of the United Nations towards a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. These efforts are described in a report which the Secretary-General submitted on 18 October 1976 in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 3414 (XXX). . . .”

130. What I am trying to clarify here is that the Secretary-General was acting in pursuance of General Assembly resolutions 3375 (XXX) and 3414 (XXX).

131. The Secretary-General was requested, *inter alia*, to follow up the implementation of resolution 3414 (XXX), paragraph 4 of which reads as follows:

“Requests the Security Council, in the exercise of its responsibilities under the Charter, to take all . . . measures for the speedy implementation, according to an appropriate time-table, of all relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council aiming at the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region through a comprehensive settlement, worked out with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, and within the framework of the United Nations, which ensures complete Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories as well as full recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and the attainment of those rights.”

The Secretary-General was further requested to follow up the implementation of resolution 3375 (XXX), paragraph 2 of which reads as follows:

“Calls for the invitation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East which are held under the auspices of the United Nations, on an equal footing with other parties, on the basis of resolution 3236 (XXIX).”

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1976.*

<sup>4</sup> A/31/271.



132. The Secretary-General was only carrying out a task assigned to him by the General Assembly, requesting him

“To resume contacts with all the parties to the conflict and the Co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East, in accordance with his initiative of 1 April 1976, in preparation for the early convening of the Peace Conference on the Middle East” [resolution 31/62].

133. Thus it is very clear from the foregoing that the Secretary-General was to resume contacts with all the parties to the conflict—and the Palestinian people is a party to the conflict. As a matter of fact, the General Assembly has decided that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the Middle East problem and has considered that the Palestinian people is a principal party to the question of Palestine. But what do we read in the Secretary-General’s report? Paragraph 4 says:

“The most immediate difficulty is the question of participation. The position of the Arab States is that the PLO should be invited to participate in any future meetings of the Peace Conference on the Middle East. The position of the Israeli Government is that the Conference should be convened on the original basis . . . The Arab Governments maintain that the PLO is the only legitimate representative of the Palestinians. Israel, on the other hand, is not prepared to recognize the PLO as the representative of the Palestinians.”

134. It is not the position of the Arab States only that the PLO is the representative of the Palestinian people and should participate; it is the will of the international community; it is a decision of the General Assembly. The Palestine Liberation Organization wishes to assert here that the obstacles planted to obstruct the mission of the Secretary-General are only concrete manifestations of the determination of Tel Aviv and its supporters to undermine any efforts undertaken in the framework of the United Nations with the aim of securing and achieving peace.

135. In several instances, the Secretary-General makes it plain that he found a clear determination among all the parties to make a serious effort for peace. We do believe that and hope that the Council will too. But we wish to reiterate here that the manoeuvring to obstruct the current efforts on the pretext of participation is only too clear. Tel Aviv and its supporters are determined to disregard the relevant United Nations resolutions and impose their will. According to Tel Aviv, the only field of discussion and negotiation with the Palestinians is the battlefield. Let me quote here what the Jewish Telegraphic Agency stated in its daily bulletin of 21 March last:

“Israeli officials regard the 15-point programme adopted yesterday in Cairo by the Palestine National Council as confirmation that the policy of no contacts whatsoever with the PLO is the only possible way. Premier Yitzhak Rabin declared on a radio interview last night that ‘even when the so-called moderates win support for their line, the terror organizations remain dominant and no dialogue can be held with them . . . The only meeting with them is on the battlefield’.”

136. The Secretary-General undertook a mission to prepare for a peace conference and not for war. Yitzhak Rabin’s aim is war and not peace and, consequently, the mission of the Secretary-General must fail. The Secretary-General’s mission and Rabin’s aims are diametrically opposed.

137. I attended the Palestine National Council meeting, where 293 Palestinians were present from all geographic points on this earth and representing all ideological trends and walks of life—just like any other people. The Palestinians under Israeli occupation could not participate, for the price of their participation meant prevention from returning home—just another of the denials of human rights. Were the Zionist forces of occupation concerned that our brothers would tell us and the world under what conditions they lived or were the Zionist authorities of occupation conscious of the fact that those Palestinians would demand further escalation of the struggle in all aspects to end the prolonged occupation and its ramifications? Or did the Zionists fear the divulgence of the great secret that the Palestinians were, living in a so-called paradise, as the Zionists claim?

138. But our valiant brothers did manage to communicate with us. Hundreds of letters of support and identification with our struggle, clearly bearing the names and addresses of the petitioners, did find their way to the meeting of the Palestine National Council. Our brothers appealed for an escalation of efforts by the PLO to end the misery of their existence under the army boots and bayonets of the forces of occupation.

139. The Council has just been told of alleged desecration of Jewish sites and so on. Let me quote the experience of Father Loffreda and Father Corbo who have been conducting some archaeological research in the Holy Land. Father Loffreda says:

“Again, I am digging and meditating my way through the centuries. I find myself thinking of how this Jesus was only one solitary figure far back in the distance of time, speaking to the illiterate and the impoverished. Why is his message still alive and vital today after all this time? It is a very powerful question. It is filled with the force of God, I think.”

The reporter states:

“Last month, Father Loffreda lay down in the path of a snorting Israeli Army bulldozer in an effort to preserve a relic of time.

“Years back, he and Father Corbo had dug through the ruins of an ancient, lost church built on the site where Jesus was said to have delivered his Sermon on the Mount, a spot close by Capernaum in the foothills sloping down to Galilee.

“The Israeli Army said it needed to knock down more than half the ruins of the ancient church in order to widen a road that would carry additional troops north to the uncertain borders of Lebanon. The Fathers Loffreda and Corbo protested through official channels. The Army moved in to roll over the church ruins with a bulldozer.

"This church was here before the Crusades. It was mentioned in the writings of some of Christianity's earliest pilgrims to the Holy Land. It was built by unknown monks at the end of the fourth century, some 1,600 years ago. The Army said it must knock it down to keep peace. 'Peace', fumes Father Loffreda, 'Peace with soldiers, guns, tanks and bulldozers. Peace at the price of a 1,600-year-old church.'"

The reporter continues:

"So he lay down in front of the bulldozer, this son of a shoemaker who had grown into an archaeologist-priest. He lay down in front of the Israeli Army and said the bulldozer would have to churn over his stocky, peasant body in order to crush the ancient church ruins. 'They went away', he says. 'We thought we had won. But then, several days later, they came back when we were not there. With several passes by the bulldozer, they did what the centuries could not. Half the church had vanished into time. I wept', he adds, 'quietly and without shame'."

140. On 10 March, on the eve of the meeting of the Palestine National Council, we addressed the following letter to the Secretary-General concerning the fate of our people under occupation:

"I am instructed by the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization to call to your attention the potentially explosive situation prevailing in the cities of Ramallah and Al-Birah in occupied Palestine.

"This situation follows four days during which Palestinians have conducted demonstrations of solidarity with their fellow Palestinians, the political prisoners who are engaged in a hunger strike to protest the abominable conditions in the jails of the forces of occupation.

"To suppress the demonstrations, the Zionist police have committed brutal acts of violence. They have opened fire at the demonstrators and have beaten the demonstrators with heavy clubs. These savage practices have resulted, so far, in injuries to seventeen Palestinian students, twelve of whom are still hospitalized, several with broken bones, including fractured skulls. Sixty-four Palestinians have been detained by the forces of occupation.

"I am instructed, furthermore, to ask for your immediate intervention with a view to eliminating one of the main causes of the circumstances described above, namely, the prolonged and illegal occupation."

141. My people, the Palestinian people, is aware of the Zionist design to eliminate our presence in our homeland. Herzl suggested spicing us across the border, but Koenig used a very proper term, he found "a final solution" to the Palestinian problem. We all recall with horror what the words "final solution" meant to the Nazis and their victims.

142. Let me quote one of the 15 points of the Political Declaration of the Palestine National Council. It is relevant and reads:

"Bearing in mind the important achievements accomplished on the Arab and international levels since the

twelfth session, as reviewed in the political report submitted by the Executive Committee, the Palestine National Council decides the following:

"A. To affirm the right of the PLO to participate in all international conferences, forums and efforts dealing with the problem of Palestine and the Arab-Zionist conflict on an independent and equal footing, on the basis of United Nations General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) for the fulfilment of our national inalienable rights, which have been recognized by the General Assembly since 1974 and particularly in that resolution;

"B. To declare that any settlement or agreement affecting the rights of the Palestinian people and reached in its absence is null and void."

143. Does the Palestinian people deserve to receive the Hitlerite reply from Yitzhak Rabin: "I shall only meet you on the battlefield"?

144. It is clear from the report that Tel Aviv wants to make history and the march of time go backwards. In paragraph 8 of his report, the Secretary-General says:

"the Government of Israel insists that this [*Security Council resolution 338 (1973)*] is the only basis on which the Conference can legitimately be convened."

Are we correct in interpreting that Israeli diatribe as saying that the resolutions of the General Assembly are not a legitimate basis for a peace conference, when Israel owes its very existence and presence here today to a General Assembly resolution?

145. Tel Aviv knew very well that the Secretary-General was undertaking his visit pursuant to a General Assembly resolution. Although his visit was "unwelcome"—and I use the official description used by Tel Aviv—yet he was received.

146. The Palestine National Council pronounced the opinion of the Palestinians on Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which is the basis of resolution 338 (1973). Point 1 of the 15-point Declaration just adopted by the Palestine National Council reads:

"The problem of Palestine is the essence and origin of the Arab-Zionist conflict. Resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council ignores the national rights of the Palestinian people and its inalienable right to its homeland. The Council therefore reiterates both its rejection of this resolution and its refusal to deal with it on the Arab level as well as internationally."

147. That should not have surprised anyone here. On 12 January 1976, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, member of the Executive Committee of the PLO and head of the Political Department, stated the following before the Council [*1870th meeting*]:

"In June 1967, Israel launched its next aggression and occupied what remained of Palestine, as well as Sinai and the Golan. The Security Council met to study the Middle

East crisis but ignored the heart and essence of the conflict, namely, the question of Palestine. It issued its resolution 242 (1967), which addressed itself to the so-called 'Middle East crisis'. That resolution dealt neither with the Palestine question nor with the national rights of the Palestinian people to independence and sovereignty.

"Since then it has become commonplace to speak of the 'Middle East crisis', with the intent of camouflaging, obscuring and evading the essential question, which is the question of Palestine. This was the reason for our people's rejection of that resolution, which compounded the errors and the injustice instead of confronting them, and for our rejection of the cease-fire and, finally, for our determination to carry out our armed struggle.

"We resumed our armed struggle on 1 January 1965, when our people despaired of peacefully restoring their national rights and sovereignty, and declared that armed struggle was the only means to achieve the liberation of our homeland and attain our national rights.

"We are more aware of and experienced with our Zionist opponent. We know its expansionist objectives which are based on its racist, backward ideology. We warned all concerned that Israel would ignore and try to subvert any United Nations resolutions limiting its colonialism and expansionism. Although some of the States of the region committed themselves to resolution 242 (1967), Israel ignored it, as it had ignored prior resolutions. Thus, another war in the Middle East became inevitable to compel Israel to evacuate its occupation forces from Arab lands; hence the 1973 war.

"Subsequently, the Security Council met and adopted resolution 338 (1973) which, like its predecessor, was devoid of any reference to the question of Palestine and ignored the national rights of our people. Our people rejected it, because its intention was to deal only with the effects of the 1967 aggression against the Arab States. It in no way referred to our national rights or to our existence in Palestine prior to 1967. Additionally, that resolution asked the Arab States to recognize the boundaries of a State established in a land which, originally and according to the principles of international law, was the property of the Palestinian people. It is surprising and shocking that the Arab States should be asked to recognize an entity which contravenes even resolution 181 (II), on the basis of which it was established, and notwithstanding the damage done by this resolution to the rights of the Palestinian people.

"Did the Security Council forget, when it adopted resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), that Egypt, Syria and Jordan were in a state of war with Israel before June 1967 and before October 1973, a state of war which had prevailed since 1948 and which was caused by the serious Zionist-imperialist attempt to liquidate the existence of Palestine and its national inalienable rights to independence and sovereignty? Was the Council unaware of the fact that the armistice lines of 1949 were military and not political? Was the Council unaware of the fact that Israel had earlier occupied more than 60 per cent of the land of the Palestinian Arab State for which the

United Nations called in the partition resolution—resolution 181 (II)—on the basis of which Israel was accepted as a Member of the Organization? Was the Council unaware that this earlier aggression and occupation prevented the Palestinian people from exercising its right to self-determination and establishing its independent State in its homeland?"

148. In rejecting resolution 242 (1967), the Palestine Liberation Organization has further taken into consideration the following statement made before the Council on 26 January 1976 [1879th meeting] by the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Richard:

"When I spoke in the Council on 15 January [1873rd meeting] I pointed out that this debate offered a great opportunity to move the negotiations for a Middle East settlement forward, but that it also conferred upon us the responsibility not to imperil the very negotiations we were trying to help. I reminded the Council then that of the three main elements or requirements for a settlement—which have, I may add, been acknowledged by almost every member of the Council who has spoken in this debate—two formed the basic principles of resolution 242 (1967) which, together with resolution 338 (1973), had become established as a widely accepted foundation for a settlement.

"I added, however, that my Government had recognized, like many other Governments, that these resolutions were deficient and that they did not take account of the third element—the essential part which Palestinian interests must play in any settlement. I therefore suggested that the Council should recognize that third principle: the need to take account of the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to express their national identity."

I wish to repeat what Mr. Richard said, namely, that many other Governments recognized that resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) were deficient.

149. The Palestine Liberation Organization has also taken into serious and responsible consideration the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands, Mr. van der Stoep, on behalf of the nine members of the European Community before the General Assembly on 28 September 1976, when he said:

"I should like to emphasize that a solution of the conflict in the Middle East will be possible only if the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to give effective expression to its national identity is translated into fact."<sup>5</sup>

150. The Secretary-General tells us in paragraph 16 of his report that "In Mr. Vance's talks, the principal substantive issues were agreed to be the nature of peace, withdrawal/territorial boundary questions and a settlement of the Palestinian problem".

<sup>5</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 7th meeting, para. 50.

151. A spokesman for the State Department of the United States, Mr. Saunders, told the United States Senate in 1975:

“In many ways the Palestinian dimension of the Arab-Israeli conflict is the heart of that conflict. . . . The issue is not whether Palestinian interests should be expressed in a final settlement, but how. There will be no peace unless an answer is found.”

152. The settlement of the Palestinian problem can be achieved only when the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, as defined in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), are recognized and attained. To this end the General Assembly has already endorsed a programme in its resolution 31/20. After expressing its gratitude to the President and members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Palestine National Council decided to consider the recommendations of the report of the Committee<sup>6</sup> as a positive step towards the attainment of our inalienable rights, and consequently of peace in the area and in the world.

153. We have trust in the United Nations and confidence that justice will be done and peace attained. The programme to enable us to exercise our inalienable rights is a constructive and positive step to help to bring both justice and peace. It only needs the Council's consideration and adoption.

154. Finally, permit me to read out point 11 of the 15-point Political Declaration made at the end of the meeting of the Palestine National Council on 20 March:

“The Palestine National Council decides to pursue the struggle to regain the national rights of our people, first and foremost of which are the right to return, the right to exercise self-determination and the right to establish its own national independent State over its national soil.”

155. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I first of all convey to you the most cordial congratulations of the Romanian delegation on your appointment as Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations and on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I should like to extend to you our most sincere wishes for success in your important office and to express our conviction that under your guidance the Council will effectively discharge its responsibilities. You may be sure that my delegation will give you every support.

156. I wish also to express our gratitude to the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. James Murray, who presided over the Council with so much distinction and effectiveness last month.

157. May I express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, as well as to the other speakers who have expressed their sympathy for my country and my people, who were gravely affected by the disastrous earthquake which claimed many victims and caused tremendous physical damage. My

delegation was moved by those expressions of human solidarity and I shall not fail to transmit them to my Government.

158. In taking up this debate, the Security Council is simply expressing the concern felt in the Middle East and throughout the world regarding the need to establish a just and lasting peace in that part of the world, the peoples of which have suffered much during the last three decades. In fact, the Middle East conflict is a dangerous hotbed of tension and a permanent threat to international peace and security, for the maintenance of which the Council has a special responsibility.

159. The contacts and consultations, as well as the positions adopted by those concerned during the last three months, permit us to say that present conditions are more favourable than those of the past for the initiation of an active political and diplomatic process to establish peace in the Middle East. In this regard we are encouraged by the recent statements and positions of the leaders of the parties concerned. They emphasize trends and points of view that are more realistic, a more receptive spirit and political will on the part of the parties and other States to act to find a definitive solution to the fundamental problems still pending.

160. The President of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, referring to the possibilities of peace in the Middle East region, recently stated:

“We believe that, under present international circumstances, more sustained efforts are needed so that this year we may attain if not a final solution at least important progress towards a just and lasting peace.”

161. In the report he has submitted to us, the Secretary-General has also reached the conclusion that there is now a possibility of resuming real negotiations and that, whatever the difficulties, no opportunity that makes possible the resumption of the talks should be missed. We completely agree with him when, in paragraph 22 of his report, he says:

“It is vital that we catch the prevailing spirit of moderation and realism before it evaporates and assist the parties to channel that spirit into the arduous process of negotiation.”

162. We believe it is now our task and that of the Council to help the parties to begin negotiations, whether bilateral or multilateral, within the framework of an international conference and thus to find a way leading to a negotiated, just and lasting peace.

163. That brings me to the question of convening the Conference, because the consultations held at the beginning of this year were on this subject. According to General Assembly resolution 31/62, it was the Secretary-General's task

“To resume contacts with all the parties to the conflict and the Co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East, in accordance with his initiative of 1 April

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 5.

1976, in preparation for the early convening of the Peace Conference on the Middle East.”

164. I should like to congratulate the Secretary-General on the active manner in which he has discharged that duty and tell him how much we appreciate his devoted efforts to clear the way for the Peace Conference. We are encouraged by the assessment in paragraph 18 of his report to the effect that “all concerned are earnestly desirous of moving toward a negotiated settlement”. Of that there can be no doubt. It follows that

“the immediate problem in reconvening the Peace Conference is the participation of the PLO and the representation of the interests and rights of the Palestinian people” [S/12290 and Corr.1, para. 20].

165. It is Romania’s firm conviction that one of the conditions for the success of the Peace Conference is the participation of all the parties concerned, and thus that of the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. There is no longer any doubt that settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people should and will be an integral part of the global and definitive solution of the Middle East conflict. There is no doubt that it is in the fundamental interests of all parties to the conflict and in the interests of the lasting peace we seek for that area that the representatives of the Palestinian people should participate actively, on a footing of equality, in the negotiating procedures and in the arrangements arrived at. We believe it is time for each party to the conflict to prove in deeds its desire for peace, while recognizing the political realities of the region and acting in accordance with them.

166. It is hardly necessary to demonstrate that, because of its ramifications and implications, the Middle East conflict is a problem which concerns the entire community of nations. We have complete confidence in the ability of the peoples of the region to find the means to reach a settlement and solve the conflict, but experience shows that they need active and persevering support from all States interested in establishing a just and lasting peace in the region. We believe that the United Nations offers the best framework for manifestation of that support. At the same time we are convinced of the necessity of intensifying the concerted action of all States so as permanently to eliminate the source of tension and conflict.

167. Hence, the role of the Council—the aim of this debate—should be to encourage the continuous process of diligently seeking the path towards peace. This time we are meeting round this table to tell all those concerned that they must proceed to the negotiating table to find an overall and final settlement. In our view, the Council must make an urgent appeal to all the parties to the conflict and to all States to act resolutely to ensure the urgent convening of the Peace Conference, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including, therefore, the representatives of the Palestinian people. Furthermore, the Council should request the Secretary-General to remain in contact with the parties to the conflict and with the States concerned and to inform the Council of developments regarding the convening of the Conference. We believe that,

depending on the development of the contacts and consultations, which will certainly continue, the Security Council could re-examine the question of convening the Conference, in order to adopt the necessary measures.

168. As is known, my country is keenly interested in a final political settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. We believe that the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East should facilitate the free and independent development of all the countries and peoples of that region, in accordance with their basic aspirations and their own interests and those of the other peoples. Romania believes that if peace in the Middle East is to be just and lasting, the solutions that will be negotiated must be based on Israel’s withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied during the 1967 war, on recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish its own State, and on the need to ensure the existence, territorial integrity and right to free and independent development of all the States of the region, without exception.

169. The attainment of that major objective—the establishment of peace in the Middle East—requires the encouragement and development of the positive processes that have been undertaken, as well as the active contribution of all the elements concerned in the establishment of the conditions necessary for an overall solution of all the pending problems. We believe that the present debate can end with positive results likely to encourage and accelerate the process of the political settlement of the Middle East problems. To discharge the role conferred on it by the Charter, the Security Council must remain actively seized of this problem, in order closely to follow and observe that process and the diplomatic efforts under way and, whenever possible, to allow new ideas to crystallize and adequate solutions to be explored.

170. The delegation of Romania appeals to the representatives of the parties concerned to demonstrate a constructive spirit, realism and political will, so that the present debate may lead to progress towards the attainment of the objectives of peace and justice in the Middle East.

171. We express our firm conviction that the obstacles in the way of the resumption of peace negotiations can be removed and that the conflict can be solved peacefully by the combined efforts of all States—first and foremost, of course, the peoples directly concerned.

172. Romania intends to continue actively to contribute to the search for peace in the Middle East and to support all the efforts towards a negotiated political settlement of this conflict, in order that a peace may be established that will enable the peoples of the region to live without the threat of war, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and friendly co-operation.

173. Mr. BARTON (Canada): I should like, first, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The manner in which you have discharged these heavy duties over the past few days is abundant proof of the humane and other leading qualities which have made you so highly respected

in your own country and which, we are confident, will enable the Council to pursue new and progressive policies.

174. May I also express our gratitude to our colleague James Murray who, with great style and humour, conducted our deliberations during the month of February.

175. Mr. President, since you have urged Council members and other participants in this debate to refrain from lengthy statements, and also because of the lateness of the hour, I shall be as brief as possible, limiting my remarks to the primary purpose of this series of meetings, that is, consideration of the Secretary-General's report concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East.

176. I should like, through you, to convey to the Secretary-General my Government's deep appreciation for his unremitting efforts in the search for peace and stability in that long-troubled area of the world. The report he has presented to the Council is proof of his strong commitment to seeking appropriate and viable solutions to a most complex series of problems, and it is a clear, lucid exposé both of the difficulties still in our path and of the opportunities for ultimate success. We commend him for his report and assure him of our full co-operation.

177. It is clear that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remains the fundamental basis for any viable peace settlement. It is also clear that all elements of that resolution must be implemented: there must be negotiations, there must be withdrawal from occupied territories, and all States in the region must be confident that they will be able to live in peace behind secure and recognized borders. I would stress that resolution 242 (1967) emphasizes at the same time the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and "the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security". Clearly, such a peace settlement will also have to take due account of the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians, if it is to be viable.

178. This new 30-year war which has affected the Middle East region continues to pose a threat to international peace as escalation and great-Power confrontation remain distinct possibilities. It is therefore as urgent as ever to move rapidly towards the reconvening of the Peace Conference. We are encouraged by the indications given by the Secretary-General and others that new opportunities exist for such movement and we hope that, in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary-General, all sides will take steps, in a true spirit of accommodation, to modify their attitudes towards one another in such a way as to permit movement.

179. Negotiation between the parties concerned as called for by Security Council resolution 338 (1973) is the surest route to the restoration of peace and tranquillity to the area. The complexity of the problems is such that we should not delude ourselves by expecting success overnight; but the first step must be taken at Geneva as soon as possible.

180. We earnestly hope that recent events and statements do not mean a hardening of positions. We are encouraged

by the fact that the countries of the region are led by men who are both statesmanlike and moderate and who recognize the urgent need for peace.

181. In conclusion, I should simply like to state that it is the considered view of the Canadian Government that the Council should refrain at this crucial juncture from prejudging difficult issues which can be resolved only by negotiations, or from unnecessarily reiterating positions which, in present circumstances, could have an effect opposite to that which we all desire. Instead, in our view we should concentrate on proclaiming in the most solemn manner the necessity for all parties concerned to gather around the Geneva conference table, and we should stop at that point.

182. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, may I be allowed, before I proceed to discuss the substance of the matter before the Council, to transmit to you on behalf of the Soviet delegation our hearty congratulations and our best wishes for success in the performance of your lofty and responsible duties as President of the Security Council for this month? In your country, you have acquired a reputation as an energetic, broad-minded political figure and I am sure that your new colleagues at the United Nations will be happy to co-operate with you for the benefit of our common endeavours to strengthen international security. I take this opportunity to express the hope that the relations between our two countries, and also within the United Nations, will show further positive development.

183. I also wish to pay a tribute to your predecessor in the presidency, Mr. James Murray, who so ably and efficiently guided our work last month, and who even temporarily achieved some punctuality in the work of the Council.

184. It was with a feeling of great bitterness that the Soviet people learned about the calamity which has afflicted the Socialist Republic of Rómania, the powerful earthquake which has caused so many human victims and so much destruction. I should like, in this connexion, to extend to Ambassador Datcu and, through him, to the entire fraternal Romanian people, our sincere sympathy and our wishes for the speedy elimination of all the consequences of that calamity.

185. The Security Council has now begun consideration of the situation in the Middle East in the light of the report of the Secretary-General. This is a report on the results of his contacts with all the parties in the region directly concerned and with the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. The Secretary-General conducted those contacts in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/62 for the purpose of convening the Conference as speedily as possible.

186. As is well known, one of those parties directly interested is in fact the Arab people of Palestine, whose sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, has been invited to participate in the discussion which is now unfolding. The Soviet Union has consistently supported the equal participation in the Peace Conference

of the Palestinian Arab people as represented by the PLO. It is perfectly obvious that no decision of the Conference affecting the destiny of the Palestinians can be adopted without them, let alone against them.

187. The results of the Secretary-General's talks, which are reflected in his report, and also the latest events in the Middle East and around that area, confirm once again that the situation in that region, as before, is very serious and fraught with consequences which may be very dangerous to the cause of peace. That is why the elimination of the hotbed of tension in the Middle East, which has been created by the Israeli aggression, continues to be an important task of all States which sincerely wish for the establishment of a just and stable peace in that region.

188. The Soviet Union, for its part, has been making every effort to contribute to a just and stable settlement in the Middle East. The Soviet proposals regarding comprehensive settlement of that problem and the convening of the Peace Conference to that end are well known to all. They met with broad international recognition as realistic, well-balanced proposals opening clear prospects for the achievement of such a settlement.

189. Judging by everything that is happening, it becomes more and more clear that the resumption of the work of the Geneva Conference is a realistic possibility. In these conditions, even though the elaboration of peace terms in all their details is primarily the task of the parties to the conflict, the Soviet Union, as Co-Chairman of the Conference and as a State situated in a region in the immediate vicinity of the conflict, felt it appropriate to express *in extenso* its views on the main principles of and directions which must be taken by a future settlement. The position of principle of the Soviet Union on such a settlement was set forth specifically in the speech delivered by Comrade Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at the sixteenth Congress of the Trade Unions of the USSR in Moscow on 21 March of this year.

190. It may be summarized as follows: we feel that the final document, or documents, of the Geneva Conference must be based on the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and on the right of all States of that region to an independent existence and to security. Of course, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab people must be secured, and they include its right to self-determination and to the creation of its own State. We believe that, unquestionably, the peace documents must provide for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967. Such a withdrawal could take place not immediately but by stages over, let us say, a number of months, with clear-cut deadlines. There must be a distinct determination of the boundary lines between Israel and its Arab neighbours parties to the conflict. Those boundaries must be declared final and inviolate.

191. We proceed from the premise that from the moment of completion of the withdrawal of Israeli troops, the state of war between Israel and the Arab States parties to the conflict will cease, and relations of peace will be instituted. At that time, all parties will undertake to respect the

sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability and political independence of each and every one of them, and to settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

192. On both sides of the boundaries which will be set, it would be possible—with the concurrence, of course, of the relevant States—to create demilitarized zones without any one-sided advantages for any State. Within such zones, for a clearly defined period, either United Nations emergency forces or United Nations observers could be deployed.

193. It is obvious that the final documents of the Conference must also contain provisions on free passage for all ships of all countries, including Israel, after the cessation of the state of war, through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran, as well as a declaration by Egypt on the passage of ships through the Suez Canal, which in its entirety is under its sovereignty.

194. The implementation of the conditions for a peaceful settlement could, in our view, be guaranteed—if this is indeed desired by the parties to the agreement—by the Security Council and possibly also by individual States such as, for example, the Soviet Union, the United States, France and the United Kingdom. The States which offered such guarantees could have their own observers within the United Nations contingents in the appropriate zones.

195. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has also confirmed that, in connexion with a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, the relevant States could also consider the question of co-operation and assistance to be given to efforts to halt the arms race in that region.

196. We believe that the views expressed by Comrade Brezhnev, reflecting the principles involved in and the direction to be taken by a possible settlement in the Middle East, will be seriously studied by the parties to the conflict and by other interested parties, and this will help to break the deadlock in the whole effort for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

197. I would express the hope that the consideration in the Security Council of the situation in the Middle East, in connexion with the report of the Secretary-General, will indeed serve a useful purpose. It will certainly draw the attention of the world community to the very important situation in the Middle East, which is fraught with so many consequences for the cause of peace. This discussion must make a very definite contribution to the cause of achieving a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, contribute to the speedy convening of the Geneva Peace Conference and foster the production of just and fruitful results from the work of that Conference. This can be achieved if the discussion in the Council unfolds on the basis of an approach of principle to the substance of the problem of the Middle East and to the means of resolving it equitably.

198. The experience of recent years has shown that realistic movement towards the achievement of a just and genuine peace in the Middle East requires a resumption of the work of the Geneva Conference, the international machinery specifically created for that purpose. The Soviet

Union is convinced that it is necessary to continue and intensify our efforts so as to make it possible to resume the work of the Conference at an early date, in order to achieve a comprehensive settlement on the basis of justice for all.

199. We note the very useful efforts which have been and are being undertaken by the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him under the decisions of the United Nations. At the same time, we recognize that special responsibility for the resumption of the work of the Geneva Conference certainly rests with its Co-Chairmen. Being one of the Co-Chairmen of that Conference, the Soviet Union will continue its active efforts to convene the Conference and help it to carry out its work in a constructive and businesslike manner.

200. In the view of the Soviet delegation, the Security Council, in the context of the present consideration of the question of the situation in the Middle East, would be acting very properly if it stressed the need to continue and intensify efforts to achieve a comprehensive settlement in that region and the earliest possible convening of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East.

201. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Egypt has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table.

202. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Please accept my apologies for the fact that I am forced to use my right of reply.

203. The Israeli representative understandably expresses his outrage at the fact that the members of the Council have decided to convene to discuss the situation in the Middle East. In fact, the members of the Council, conscious of their responsibilities, undertook that initiative in conformity with General Assembly resolution 31/62. The decision was not imposed by Egypt, as the Israeli representative claims. That is an insult to the members of the Council, but it is traditional behaviour on the part of Israel towards everyone who does not agree with it 100 per cent. It is no secret that Egypt was of the same opinion as the Council and considered that the General Assembly resolution was very clear on the need for a meeting of the Council to debate the situation in the area in the light of the report of the Secretary-General. Of course, Israel, which opposed that resolution concerning the Peace Conference, would have preferred the Council never to meet, simply because such a meeting would expose its opposition to the Conference and to the peace process itself. Does the Israeli representative imply here that the members of the Council are not sovereign countries but mere agents of a foreign Power? This is certainly a picture of what Israel would prefer: that other countries should obey its orders and condone its oppression or finance its expansion.

204. I could understand the severe embarrassment and discomfort of the Israeli representative when I spoke about the growing relationship between his country and the racist régime of South Africa. That growing relationship, especially in the military field, which neither of the two régimes denies—in fact they boast about it—is a crime against all Africa and not only against the people of South Africa. If

the Israeli representative is really ashamed about this relationship, I challenge him to stand here and deny it or declare that his country will have no relations in future with the racist régime of South Africa. But of course he will never do that, because those relations are based on mutual benefit and the exchange of co-operation in the field of killing innocent people, plundering natural resources and, most horrifying of all, co-operation in the nuclear field. No wonder Israel has not yet signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

205. With such reckless co-operation, both régimes could easily engulf both Africa and the Middle East in a nuclear holocaust. I address these remarks also to those who work to stop the spread of nuclear arms in the world. So I cannot understand whom the Israeli representative is trying to fool. Is it the African States whose heads of State condemned this co-operation at the Afro-Arab Summit Conference Meeting only two weeks ago? I do not think so. The representative of Israel had better not speak on behalf of African States who abhor the policies of his country and have condemned it on many occasions. Certainly, to his dismay, the historic Afro-Arab Summit Conference Meeting at Cairo was a total success.

206. The Israeli representative speaks about differences in the Arab world, but I think the best answer to him is the presence here in the Council of the representatives of the confrontation States, namely, Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization. So trying to play on Arab differences is futile; he has tried it before and failed.

207. The Israeli representative speaks about the economic difficulties facing Egypt. Yes, we admit to having economic difficulties. But this is mainly because of Israeli aggressions and conquests during the last 30 years. It is very strange indeed that such an argument should come from a representative of a country which, since its establishment, has lived on outside donations and reparations, or from plunder of the properties of the people of the area; a country in which currency devaluation is a monthly routine, a country ridden with economic scandals, a country with the highest debt rate in the world, a country with a 35 per cent inflation rate, a country whose citizens are fleeing the sinking ship in spite of all the Zionist indoctrination. So the Israeli representative should be the last one to speak about other countries' difficulties, and particularly about Egypt.

208. The Israeli representative tried, further, to convince the world of the validity of what his Government terms the benevolent occupation or the best occupation in history. I think the whole world now recognizes the brutalities that the new Nazis of the Middle East are committing against the innocent inhabitants of the occupied territories. The world press is full of articles by correspondents who witness the daily Israeli routine of repression, and the representative of Syria has just mentioned some of them. But, to me, one was particularly symptomatic. I just read about it in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 11 March 1977. The article was written by an Israeli who witnessed those brutalities and regretted it. The name of the gentleman is Mr. Nadav Carmel-Katz, living in St. Paul, Minnesota. He is



an Israeli soldier, residing now in the United States, who said that he witnessed with his own eyes similar and even worse cases of Israeli violations of human rights. He described how the Israeli authorities levelled a Palestinian refugee camp in the West Bank and how the commander of his unit in Sinai shot an old man to death. When Mr. Katz questioned the first of those incidents, his commander said "We suspect they are saboteurs, and besides, they are Arabs". In the second case, his commander answered "The man is an Arab. What do you care?"

209. Unfortunately, it seems that there are only a few who do care about human rights in the occupied Arab territories. It is now incumbent on those who champion the cause of human rights all over the world not to pick and choose and neglect the fate of hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the occupied territories. The human rights cause is indivisible. It is very sad indeed that those who suffered so much in Europe at the hands of the Nazis should now be turning out to be the neo-Nazis of the Middle East.

210. The Israeli representative chose to cite the report of the United States Department of State on human rights, which I now have before me. But I shall only make a very short reference here to that report, which was published in the Israeli newspapers as if it were a medal of honour bestowed on Israel. The report charged, in the words of an Israeli paper, that Israeli authorities had used excessive force in quelling demonstrations, had razed houses, had violated article 49 of the Geneva Convention by summarily expelling residents, and had held the prisoners without filing specific charges. We then find the Israeli representatives here boasting about the humane and legal system of his country. But the Israeli paper said that it expected that the report would be criticized by Israel, which has maintained that its occupation is the most benevolent in history. The Israeli representative here has certainly disappointed this paper, and I suggest that he send a letter to the paper, disclaiming any criticism of the report since he cited it here in the Council.

211. In one of the citations made by the representative of Israel in the statement he just delivered, he says [*see para. 24 above*]:

"As regards prison conditions in the territories, a recent International Red Cross inspection found that prisoners under Israeli control are living in satisfactory conditions."

This is what the Israeli representative said in his speech. But let us look at the full text of the reference in the report of the State Department. On page 39 of the report, the following is said:

"A recent International Red Cross inspection of prison conditions reports a total prison population for all areas under Israeli control of 3,000-4,000 people, living under satisfactory conditions."

So the Israeli representative simply dropped the number of prisoners in the Israeli prisons. Therefore, even in his citation he was dishonest.

212. The Israeli representative made clear today his country's refusal to have justice rendered to the main party to the conflict, namely, the Palestinian people. I can assure him that there will be no peace in the area if his country persists in that policy. And it will have to bear all the serious consequences of that reckless policy. The Arab countries will not hesitate to use all their resources to liberate their lands, and peace will never be on Israeli expansionist terms.

213. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Jordan has asked to be allowed 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.

214. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I am fully aware that the Council has been holding two marathon meetings today, and I therefore beg the members' indulgence in allowing me to say a few words. I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible.

215. As the Council will recall, the thrust and the basic theme which underlay my entire statement before the Council last Friday [*1993rd meeting*] was a call to the Council, and particularly to the two Co-Chairmen, to strive for the earliest convening of the Peace Conference. It is therefore baffling to me—as it must be to the Council—to hear the representative of Israel denounce my modest proposal for a monitoring team to be selected from three of its members as an attempt to avoid face-to-face talks. Ambassador Herzog should have concocted a better excuse for refusing any monitoring of what is literally the devouring of the occupied territories. It is too naïve to be believed even by the Israeli representative himself. I had assumed—perhaps optimistically—that the procedural obstacles might be overcome, but, judging by past experience, I think the negotiating process could take a long time, during which the basic premises upon which a just and lasting solution is predicated could be seriously if not definitively undermined. This is the reason why I had suggested an interim monitoring commission.

216. I fully realize that there is a committee established by the General Assembly to cover practically identical ground. That committee will continue to function under its mandate, even though it has been denied admission to the occupied territories by the Israeli occupation authorities. The commission which my delegation is suggesting would be a Security Council commission and in no way would supplant the General Assembly committee.

217. If Israel believes that what we are telling the United Nations about the occupied territories and their people is a pack of fabrications, here is a chance—a golden chance—for it to prove us wrong, not by rhetoric and abuse but by facts and figures from sources which by no stretch of the imagination could be regarded as hostile to Israel.

218. What the whole thing boils down to is this: Does Israel want peace or does it prefer to absorb and colonize the occupied territories? We shall not come crawling on our bellies begging for peace with injustice and dishonour. If the Israelis think we shall, then one must assume that they still do not know us or that they do not want to know us.

219. I said on a previous occasion: Let us not turn a struggle of decades into a terrible struggle of generations.

220. If Israel considers a Security Council commission unwelcome, let it solemnly declare before the Council that it will accept a moratorium on sequestrations, imprisonments, torture and all the other misdeeds which it has been perpetrating for an entire decade. The people of the occupied territories, who are victims of such acts, have no dearth of information as to what is going on and they have the means of informing the Council.

221. I shall try to reply as briefly as possible to some of the remarks made by Ambassador Herzog. For example, he said that the Arab countries were using or abusing the organs of the United Nations for their own ends. This sounds a sour note in the ears of our people. I suppose that this is the only thing on which both his people and mine are in agreement, because our people are asking: "Has the United Nations done anything to achieve our redemption in the past 30 years? Has it returned a single refugee? Has it implemented a single resolution?" Why is it that we so often ask the Security Council to meet? It is because the Council has so far proved impotent and inoperative. And, incidentally, the Council is not meeting this evening at the behest of Egypt. It is meeting because a General Assembly resolution requested it to consider the report of the Secretary-General. The financing of any additional costs should, I think, be borne by the Government of Israel and not by its victims.

222. The representative of Israel has referred to a denial of the right to form unions as the reason for the hunger strikes which are so frequently taking place in the occupied territories. I do not want to open a whole book, because we have literally volumes on what is happening in Israeli prisons in the occupied territories. I shall simply answer that this is not true. There are reasons for those hunger strikes. I mentioned in my statement last Friday how much space was being allotted to each prisoner in an Israeli gaol. And those persons are prisoners of conscience; they are not criminals.

223. The representative of Israel said that the Jews were driven out of the Arab countries. I know for certain—and I wish to assure the Council—that the Jews of the Arab world were honoured citizens and that they were enticed and intimidated into going to Israel after its creation in 1948 and into living in the homes of the dispersed and expelled Palestinians. I know the story exactly because I lived through it. We did not drive the Jews out of the Arab countries. In fact, the Arab States are willing today to welcome back any Arab Jews with open arms, if they choose to come.

224. My next remarks concern a very peripheral issue and I can excuse Ambassador Herzog for his mistake. He refuted my statement that the Haram Esh-Sharif was the first Qibla of Islam. It is the first Qibla of Islam. What he was probably referring to was that it ranks as the third mosque in the Moslem world, but it is the first Qibla of Islam. However, this is something I would forgive him for not knowing.

225. Israel's representative referred to the destruction of synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem. If we had wanted to destroy synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem, we would have done so during 14 centuries of Arab rule. As a matter of fact, it was the Arabs and the Moslems—and not any other nation—who invited the Jews to come back to Jerusalem for worship and pilgrimages. What happened to some of the synagogues—and, incidentally, there were not 34; there were four major synagogues in the Old City—was that the Israelis, almost 1,000 of the Irgun organization of those days, infiltrated the area against the express and strong opposition of the inhabitants of the Jewish Quarter. They literally turned the Jewish Quarter into a battlefield, and that is how some of those synagogues were destroyed, a fact which we most regretfully admit. It was the result of door-to-door fighting and not our fault. It was because the Israeli command decided to turn the Jewish Quarter into a battlefield.

226. The representative of Israel also said that, for the first time in history, Jerusalem had become a booming tourist centre. I should like to remind him very, very briefly that the people of Jerusalem have throughout their history lived on revenues and incomes derived from tourism, from the pilgrims. In the past we called them "pilgrims", not tourists. Jerusalem was always an open city for anybody who wanted to worship and pray. As a matter of fact, just before the occupation of the West Bank and Jerusalem on 5 June 1967, the tourist industry was booming beyond anybody's dreams.

227. The representative of Israel tried to impress the Council with what he said was the most tolerant of occupations and attitudes towards the different religions and their followers. May I explain here what tolerance means in our understanding and our history. I am sure representatives know the greatness—or shall I say the humility—of the Khalif Omar 14 centuries ago when he vehemently refused, when the time for prayer came, to say his prayers in the premises of the Holy Sepulchre lest the more ignorant in later times and generations might trespass on its Christian holiness. To this day nobody has trespassed on the Holy Sepulchre. There is a very small, modest mosque adjacent to the Holy Sepulchre called the Mosque of Omar and, regrettably, it is sometimes confused with the Dome of the Rock. It is not the Dome of the Rock. The Dome of the Rock is something quite different from the Mosque of Omar, which is a very small place close to the Holy Sepulchre where the Khalif Omar decided to say his prayers when he categorically refused to say his prayers inside the Holy Sepulchre.

228. The representative of Israel said that the Arab States and the Palestinians were taking up the time of the Security Council in discussing this problem. I wish to assure him that the vast majority of our people spend almost 90 per cent of their time discussing nothing other than this problem, because it touches upon their very survival. They do not know what their future will be; they do not know what the future of their offspring will be. Therefore, when we request a meeting of the Council, it is because we want to overcome this intolerable situation for a whole people.

229. Ambassador Herzog has said that eastern Jordan constituted 80 per cent of Palestine and should be a homeland for the Palestinians. Does the Israeli Ambassador here suggest the obliteration of yet another people and another sovereign State, namely, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan? Is his suggestion that the Palestinians should forgo their Palestinian soil and settle to the east of the river? I hope I am mistaken in my understanding of the connotations of what he has said, but that is really what is meant when he says that 80 per cent of Palestine is Jordan. It means: let us dump the Palestinians into eastern Jordan. It means that there is some plan of aggression against the sovereignty and people of Jordan.

230. Finally, it is the Security Council which must see to it that its resolutions are carried out and which must not permit one single recalcitrant Member of the United Nations to undermine not only peace and justice but also the very foundations of the organization, the conscience of mankind and the guardian of its peace.

231. I know that various draft resolutions floating around reiterate the kind of consensus statement to which we have become accustomed over the past decade. But I hope that the Secretary-General has put us at the crossroads. He has told us in so many words that we are now facing an impasse, and, if I understand him correctly, he is requesting the Council to take a decision, to move forward towards convening the Conference. If we merely take note of the Secretary-General's report and stop there, there can never be a peace conference at Geneva or elsewhere. It is the duty of the Council to see to it that the impasse is broken. If the Council does not do it, who will?

232. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that Israel has reserved its right of reply, but as nobody has asked for the floor at this time, I declare the meeting closed.

*The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.*

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

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

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

**1996<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 29 MARCH 1977

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1996) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The question of South Africa: Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295) .	1