

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

UN/53/1000

OCT 2 1986

UN/53/1000

2127th MEETING: 15 MARCH 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2127).....	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115)	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.

2127th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 15 March 1979, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Leslie O. HARRIMAN (Nigeria).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2127)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115)

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Viet Nam, as well as the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table and Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. Hussien (Somalia), Mr. Sahloul (Sudan), Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam), Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Qatar and the German Democratic Republic in which they ask to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jamal (Qatar) and Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Qatar, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.
4. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar): Sir, allow me at the outset to extend to you my most sincere congratulations on your assumption of the important post of President of the Security Council for this month. Your personal record as a concerned and devoted militant against racism and racial discrimination, as well as Nigeria's leading role in upholding the principles of self-determination and freedom in southern Africa and the rest of the world, make you the ideal person to lead the present debate on the rights of Palestinians to life and freedom in the light of Israel's creeping annexation of their homeland and attempts at their physical elimination.

5. I also wish to extend my respects to Ambassador Abdalla Bishara of Kuwait, President of the Council throughout the turbulent month of February, whose dedication and experienced leadership were instrumental in resolving successfully the items presented to the Council.

6. We find ourselves today discussing a problem to which we have already devoted much time and attention, and over which we have always found basic agreement among the members of the Council, permanent and non-permanent alike, but which even now is still in dire need of resolution: namely, the threat to international peace and security arising from the serious situation in the occupied Arab territories, and the desecration by Israel of the holy shrines in Jerusalem.

7. Eleven years ago, when the Israeli authorities decided to annex the city of Jerusalem and embark on a deliberate plan aimed at erasing the Islamic and Arab status of the city, the Security Council responded with a unanimous and resounding rejection of any Israeli claim to the Holy City.

Ever since that time, the Israeli occupation authorities have been actively following a process of emasculation and colonization in the Holy City in outright contempt of the principles and precepts of international law and the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, and in clear violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.¹ Israel has been helped and encouraged to do so by the solidarity shown to it by one of the permanent members of the Security Council which, while calling the occupation illegal and an obstacle to peace, provides Israel with the financial and military assistance necessary to maintain an army of occupation over territories conquered by aggression.

8. The misdeeds of the Zionist State at Jerusalem, though appalling in and of themselves, have to be seen in conjunction with the barbaric record Israel has forged for itself in the totality of the Palestinian homeland, as well as in the Syrian and Egyptian occupied territories. In the West Bank alone, Israel has implanted so far 76 settlements, where over 90,000 Israeli settlers live. Those settlements have been established on some 350,000 dunums of land confiscated from their rightful owners. To make room for those settlements, whole Arab townships had to be destroyed, their Arab owners evicted.

9. The barbarism of Israeli actions such as the use of mass reprisals and collective punishment against innocent civilians upon each sign of opposition, has been unprecedented in modern history. The inhabitants of the occupied territories have been subjected to all forms of brutalities and atrocities, which have recently given rise to waves of shock and dismay even among some of its closest friends. Recent reports based on official United States Department of State documents confirm numerous cases of sadistic torture and inhuman treatment in a pattern that clearly refutes the claims of the Government of Israel that such practices are only isolated incidents.

10. There is a limit to the patience of the Palestinian people living under brutal Israeli occupation, and to the tolerance of the Islamic States whose 800 million adherents to the Islamic faith are determined to exert their utmost to restore the Islamic and Arab status of Jerusalem. Time for discussion and negotiation may be running out, as new faits accomplis are being created every day. Every new Israeli budget and government decision opens new avenues for building more colonies and enlarging existing ones, which are not only incompatible with the concept of a comprehensive peace but rule out any possibility for even limited settlements, exposing the arrogant nature of Israel, whose quest for peace is only a ploy to gain time for its ever-growing encroachment on Arab lands.

11. The acceleration of the systematic practices of the Israeli authorities designed to alter and eventually erase the religious, historical and national character of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the occupied Arab territories has reached alarming proportions and has compelled my Government to address this meeting of the Council, in the hope of its taking prompt and effective action for the complete withdrawal of Israel from all of the occupied Arab lands, espe-

cially Jerusalem, and the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, in accordance with all relevant United Nations resolutions.

12. In this connexion, and in view of Israel's attempts to move all foreign embassies to the Holy City of Jerusalem and make it its capital, we should like to state that the position of the State of Qatar is that compliance with Israel's request is considered as an act of aggression against our belief in the Arab character of the city of Jerusalem, and a desecration of its Islamic holy shrines, which shall not be allowed to pass unredeemed.

13. Finally, I should like to call on the Security Council to shoulder its responsibility, strongly condemn Israel for its aggression, and make use of all the instruments provided by the Charter, including Chapter VII, to secure Israel's compliance with its resolutions. The proposals presented so far by representatives who have preceded me have been neither unreasonable nor unrealistic. They include a moratorium on further Israeli colonization and expropriation of Arab lands and a commission to investigate the situation on the spot.

14. We trust that the Council will keep its credibility as an instrument for world peace and security and will adopt a resolution embodying the spirit of the above-mentioned proposals.

15. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): Mr. President, may I reiterate once again our appreciation of your determined efforts to steer the course of this Council during this crucial period of converging crises. You have conducted our affairs capably, coolly, with infinite tact, patience and skill, and deserve our unstinted admiration. We are grateful to you and we pledge you our fullest co-operation.

16. For the last two months, the Council has been seized of issues that challenge the very viability and rationale of the United Nations. At stake are fundamental principles of international law that bind our global society, principles that enjoin respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States, the non-use of force or threat of its use, the non-interference or non-intervention in the affairs of States, the cardinal injunction against the acquisition of territory by force and the call to settle international disputes peacefully. Those principles are the quintessence of the norms and rules that govern any civilized society. They are reflected in one way or another in every constitution in the world, written or unwritten, national or international. Bangladesh has consistently supported the convening of the Council in order to deal with situations in which such violations are manifest, to expose them and to pursue remedial action notwithstanding the diktat of so-called harsh political realities.

17. While the Council strives to grapple with challenges immediately at hand, it cannot ignore with equanimity an issue of which it has been seized for over 11 years and in which its credibility to fulfil its responsibility as the primary organ entrusted with the maintenance of peace and security has been all but eroded.

18. It is in this context that Bangladesh has welcomed Jordan's request to consider the situation in the occupied

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

Arab territories, for this item embodies in all its integral components the denial, rejection and violation of every principle embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the flagrant disregard and indiscriminate flouting of the wishes of its Members. It stands as a testimony to the ineffectiveness of the will of the international community and particularly the will of the Council.

19. Two years have elapsed since the Council specifically considered this item and decided through its consensus statement on 11 November 1976, "to keep the situation under constant attention with a view to meeting again should circumstances require" [1969th meeting]. Jordan's request, therefore, is a timely reminder to remove the bushel so that the light on this issue can shine forth. The 42 States members of the Islamic Conference, including Bangladesh, have unreservedly endorsed this request. Their unanimous declaration on the subject is now before the Council [S/13145].

20. The fundamental basis of Bangladesh's concern and anxiety is rooted in the obvious fact, that, in law, occupation can at most be a limited and provisional situation, a temporary phenomenon. Israel has remained in these lands for a full 11 years. It has been systematically taking measures of a permanent nature in pursuit of a policy totally incompatible with its obligations under the Charter and as an occupying Power.

21. The maintenance of the present *status quo* is untenable. It is illegal, being based on the unacceptable premise of occupation by conquest. Even more than that, it is immoral, inhuman and unjust and is an open invitation to confrontation and continuing conflict.

22. *Ex post facto* rationalization predicated on security interests or claims of legitimacy derived from some ancient biblical link to a so-called homeland can have dangerous and unpredictable consequences. Attempts to legalize such conquest through transactions for purchase of land, through payment of compensation or through acquisition by other apparently normal means, cannot be recognized with even a minimum degree of validity, in a situation of occupation by armed might. Any recognition of any one of these premises would inevitably and radically change the map of the world. Such claims constitute a dangerously volatile precedent. It would nullify the fundamental Charter injunction prohibiting the aggressor from enjoying the fruits of aggression and would inevitably open the door to international anarchy.

23. Israel's continued justification of its occupation on security grounds has arbitrarily converted an exception into a rule of conduct—it negates the letter and spirit of The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of Land Warfare, and the Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, not to mention numerous resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, which have repeatedly reaffirmed their applicability to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

24. The measures now being taken by the occupying Power no longer appear to be even remotely relevant to security considerations. They are pointedly directed towards

a larger, premeditated design within a defined perspective, specifically, a deliberate policy of expansionism, a policy that is now evident and which was manifest from the very moment of Israel's occupation. The execution of this intent is tantamount to nothing less than a latter-day colonialism with all the ills that characterize that abhorrent manifestation.

25. The issues at stake, therefore, no longer conform to the simple factor of denial of human rights, though this is obviously manifest and escalating daily, but impinge directly on the political plane. As has been repeatedly stressed by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the fundamental violation of human rights lies in the very fact of occupation.

26. Proof positive of Israel's policy of deliberate annexation is the encouragement, sanction and urgency given to the establishment of agricultural, industrial and residential settlements as part of a long-term blueprint for a network of such settlements. The ultimate aim is the permanent establishment of some 2 million Israeli immigrants, the encirclement and containment of the existing Palestinian residents and division and annexation in perpetuity of substantial areas of the occupied Arab territories and, particularly, its most viable natural resources.

27. The representative of Jordan has unambiguously demonstrated the dimension of these designs in his statement and through the presentation of elaborate documentary evidence and maps. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has also demonstrated with visual aids the extent of Israeli aims. The reports of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories have supplemented this information in graphic detail. It is not surprising that these have been corroborated not only by objective and impeccable sources outside the region but also by official records and statements of the highest government authorities in Israel itself. They constitute a telling indictment of Israel. The statements of every single speaker who preceded us are singular in their unanimity of views on Israel's illegal presence and actions.

28. The deteriorating situation in these territories cannot be wished away by the sympathizers with Israel. The drive to encourage Zionist settler-immigrants, the refusal to allow a graduated and phased return of persons driven out by the 1967 hostilities, and the expulsion, evacuation, deportation, displacement and transfer of Arab inhabitants thereafter are real. The confiscation and expropriation of Arab property and other more covert property transactions continue unabated. They are too well documented to be shrouded under the blanket rationalization of spurious security requirements. They cannot conceal Israel's appetite for expansionism and they constitute ample testimony of its plan to establish permanent domination. It is also evident that the policies pursued by Israel against the indigenous inhabitants are complementary and supportive of this aim; the main purpose of this policy is to demoralize the civilian population by facing it constantly with the reality of being a people under military subjugation. Thus mass arrests, administrative detentions, ill-treatment, harassment, intima-

tion, reprisals and torture are common occurrences that continue to escalate openly or in subtly covert ways. Meanwhile, long-term plans to exploit the natural resources, particularly the water-table of the northern West Bank and other scarce resources—plans already well under way—constitute an even more dangerous element of deprivation.

29. Perhaps the most heinous aspect of Israel's policy, which compounds the totality of its illegal political and unhumanitarian acts in the occupied territories, is its attempts to alter the status of Jerusalem, to Judaize and annex it. As the representative of Egypt so aptly characterized it:

“... what the Council is considering today transcends all man-made geographical and political boundaries. The Council's actions, deliberations or inactions will affect profoundly not only the fate of a whole people, but also the deep religious feelings and the spiritual heritage of hundreds of millions of Moslems and Christians across all continents.” [2123rd meeting, para. 140.]

30. These Israeli attempts have aroused moral indignation and deep resentment throughout the globe. Jerusalem symbolizes the birthplace of three of the world's greatest religions, embracing the spiritual and intellectual contributions of more than two thirds of mankind. It remains a permanent monument to the coexistence, unity and tolerance of timeless generations. The retention of the historic and religious legacy of the holy places, their preservation from despoilment and desecration, their accessibility to pilgrims from all over the globe, were a charge that was fulfilled over the ages by the indigenous Palestinian citizens of Jerusalem both Moslem and Christian. They constituted the universally recognized sentinels of these historic sites. Israel is now attempting to displace them and squeeze them out of their timeless role. Not satisfied with that, Israel also seeks indiscriminately to interfere with religious freedoms and practices, desecrating and despoiling holy books, relics and places of worship, converting ancient and holy mosques into synagogues, pillaging archaeological and cultural property of infinite spiritual and material value. Those are not isolated instances; they fall within a well-established pattern of persistent violations.

31. Politically, Israel—as has been elaborated before—seeks to cordon off and dissect Jerusalem through a concentric circle of settlements nothing short of battlements. Its planned encroachment directed at outright annexation is well documented and scarcely concealed by the Israelis themselves in their systematic pursuit of Judaization—culturally and politically. It is further incontrovertibly evidenced by media reports that the Knesset early this year has approved special draft legislation that will commit all foreign diplomats to transfer their main offices to the capital of Jerusalem. That would constitute the final seal on the legitimization of conquest.

32. Bangladesh whole-heartedly endorses the impassioned address made by the Patriarch of the Antioch Orthodox Church at the Lahore Islamic summit, which was quoted *in extenso* by the representatives of both Lebanon [*ibid.*, paras. 161 and 162] and Jordan [2124th meeting, para. 140]. It aptly sums up the emotions of the majority of

the world's people. One paragraph in particular deserves repetition:

“The continuity of the tradition which the Palestinians have kept as a cherished trust is an imperative call—a call for a Jerusalem delivered, which will be again the home of its people. For to us the preservation of stones, be they sacred shrines, cannot be more important than the living presence of people.”

33. The Council cannot but be aware of the explosive dangers implicit in this situation. For more than a decade it has been adopting resolutions on the question, in the wake of the consistent pressure of the world community embodied in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly. These resolutions have repeatedly expressed the Council's grave anxiety over the serious deterioration in the occupied territories, called upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the indigenous inhabitants and to facilitate the safe return of those who fled in 1967, affirmed the validity and applicability of international conventions and called for the strict compliance by Israel with their provisions, particularly to rescind measures taken which had altered their demographic composition, legal and cultural status and geographic character, strongly deplored the establishment of settlements, declaring that such measures, which had no legal validity and could not prejudice the outcome of efforts to achieve peace, constituted an obstacle to peace.

34. Concerning Jerusalem, which was an integral component of any peace settlement, the Council has also repeatedly laid down that all legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon and transfer of population which tend to change the legal status of the city, were invalid and could not change that status. It has again and again urgently called on Israel to rescind all such measures and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tended to change the status of Jerusalem. The Council further recognized that any act of profanation of the holy places, religious buildings and sites or any encouragement of or connivance in such acts might endanger peace and security.

35. The Council's call has been clear-cut and unequivocal. Israel's response has been non-compliance, rejection and defiance. It has sought to skirt its obvious illegality by levelling irrelevant countercharges against individual Member States, while at the same time accusing the United Nations as a whole of a “hypnotic and totally irrational fixation with Israel”. The end result has been impasse and circumvention. The United Nations has churned out paper resolutions while Israel has systematically accomplished a virtual fait accompli—a *de facto* annexation of the fruits of its aggression.

36. Bangladesh condemns the continuation of Israel's military occupation and systematic deprivation of the national rights of the Arab population. We reject Israeli measures to Judaize and absorb those Arab territories by insidious accretion. Its semantic duplicity has been exposed. Coexistence with the Arabs has become a euphemism for Jewish domination. Armed subjugation cannot assume the mantle of a war of liberation, nor can so-called defence requirements be converted arbitrarily into historic justification for

annexation. Economic betterment is no excuse for permanent deprivation of the inalienable rights of ownership. The current of humanitarianism that has sympathized with the plight of world Jewry throughout history is being eroded in the face of Israeli arrogance. Today Israel seeks retribution for the injustices perpetrated on the Jewish people from time immemorial by others at the expense of the Palestinian and Arab peoples, which are least responsible for their perpetration. Justice, law and humanity demand the reversal of Israel's actions and attitudes. Hopes for peace will remain ephemeral in the absence of such a reversal.

37. Bangladesh's stand on this question is unequivocal. It is based not on political expediency or solidarity but in our conviction of the rightness of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. It is embedded in our enduring commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples struggling to free themselves from bondage and colonialism in all its forms and to express their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom, political independence and national sovereignty. It is rooted in the ideals of tolerance, the right of all peoples to determine their own destiny without coercion or restraint, and the conviction that men and women of all races, irrespective of political, ideological or religious beliefs, can live together in friendship and harmony.

38. Bangladesh is committed to strive for a comprehensive, lasting and durable peace in the Middle East. We believe, however, that for peace to endure, it must be based on justice, and justice demands the undoing of acts contrary to international law, to the norms and principles enshrined in the Charter and to the exercise of fundamental human rights in full freedom. To that end Bangladesh has consistently supported a lasting settlement that would ensure: first, vacation of all territories occupied by Israel; secondly, restoration of the status of holy Jerusalem under Arab sovereignty; and, thirdly, restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and a State of their own.

39. We believe that strictures and criticisms should not be directed at the United Nations to mute its voice in the search for peace, justice and a lasting settlement. It would be a grave dereliction of duty on the part of the Security Council were it to ignore its obligations under the Charter and its responsibility to ensure the rights and aspirations of the peoples of the occupied territories. The Council must take action beyond mere reaffirmation of its past resolutions. It must move forward to the realization of the basic elements of a just and lasting peace. Bangladesh supports the Jordanian proposal for the establishment of a Council commission to investigate the situation in the Arab territories as a useful step in that direction. We remain committed to peace in this most beleaguered of the world's regions—but a peace that is just and enduring in the interests of the peoples of that region and the world as a whole.

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

41. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, permit me to express my gratitude to you and all the other members of the

Council for the opportunity afforded the German Democratic Republic to address the Council. My delegation has the honour of congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, and we should like to express the hope that the Council, under your skilful leadership, will take decisions on the questions on its agenda that will promote the halting of the aggression in the Middle East.

42. It is a particular pleasure for me to remark that you recently visited the capital of the German Democratic Republic and had some useful meetings there with leading representatives of the German Democratic Republic. You were able to witness on the spot the aspiration of my people to do everything in their power to promote the elimination of colonialism and racism.

43. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic has acquainted itself in detail with the situation in the Middle East. We have been following with great concern the constantly expanding Israeli aggression and colonization of Arab territories. We have heard and read of Israeli practices in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and we have read and heard how most flagrantly they have been flouting the norms of international law, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

44. Reports and documentary evidence submitted to the Security Council have confirmed our misgivings in connexion with the fact that what is happening in the Middle East is entirely contradictory to what, a few days ago, a speaker here called "the peace process". In spite of more than 200 resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council regarding the settlement of the Middle East problem, in spite of world public opinion, which calls for the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, Israel is pursuing a policy of deliberately depriving the Arab people of Palestine of their rights and seeking the systematic elimination of these people.

45. It has been proved beyond any doubt that since the Camp David meeting Israel's aggression and colonial policy have assumed such proportions that the very existence of the Palestinian people is threatened. Through the use of the crudest possible means, means proper to the capitalist market economy, by the occupation Power, the Palestinian peasants have lost their land and their water. The use of that land and that water has been made impossible for them.

46. The representative of Jordan and the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization have proved in their statements here that the Israeli Government has embarked on a course of eliminating the last remaining living space of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. The representative of Egypt has confirmed that the situation is intolerable—not only on the West Bank of the Jordan, but also on the Golan Heights, in the Gaza Strip and in occupied Jerusalem. What is happening there is that a deliberate change is being made in the geographic, demographic, economic and cultural identity of these areas and the people in them; they are being kept in a state of war.

47. The Organization cannot stand idly by while these outrages are committed. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic believes that the demands put forward by the representative of Jordan are just. The very least that the Security Council should do is categorically to condemn the Israeli aggressor, to demand the cessation of practices that are in contradiction with international law. If there is not compliance with these demands, then a decision should be taken to apply the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter and to work towards a speedy decision of principle on the Middle East problem.

48. The elimination of the Middle East conflict requires the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territories occupied in 1967. Since the question of the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine is one of the fundamental issues of the Middle East problem, that question must be resolved. There is a view, which is gaining considerable ground, that peace in the Middle East requires the implementation of a comprehensive programme. Such a programme has been repeatedly formulated in resolutions of the General Assembly. If, however, the Security Council now has to deal with the question of the outrageous practices of Israel in the occupied Arab territories, responsibility for that belongs primarily to the ruling circles of Israel, but not to them alone.

49. In this regard I should like to recall once again an event which could have constituted the beginning of a genuine peace process in the Middle East. I have in mind the joint United States-Soviet Union communiqué of 1 October 1977. All peace-loving peoples, particularly the Arab peoples, welcomed the possibility which became obvious at that time, the possibility of achieving mutual understanding on the question of the attainment of peace in the Middle East. It also became clear to the aggressor when this document appeared that the knell was tolling for him.

50. However, making use of the Zionist lobby and the military-industrial complex, the United States exploited new possibilities for engaging in interference, and chose a course that led to Camp David—that is, to deadlock. As a result, the Security Council is holding this series of meetings. It is a fact that the economic, military and political support given Israel by the United States has been encouraging the aggressor to continue his aggressive and colonial policy.

51. We have been hearing and reading a great deal about peace, about the peace process, about fulfilling the hopes of the Palestinian people. But the actual situation is quite different. Although, for example, there are resolutions of the General Assembly adopted by overwhelming majorities, that recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization as the only lawful representative of the Palestinian people, the United States voted against the very appropriate participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the discussion in the Council, and other States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization abstained in the vote. But it is clear that anyone who wants to keep the Palestine Liberation Organization outside the decision-making process with regard to a solution of the Middle East conflict is attempting to keep a whole people apart from participation in the solution of an issue which is for that very people a vital

question, a question viewed by the Arab peoples as of vital concern to them.

52. The Palestinian people, like any other people, has the right to its own sovereign State. Anyone who does not recognize that right cannot promote the cause of peace in the Middle East. It is easy to understand, therefore, why the Arab States, with one exception, have rejected the settlement of individual questions that has been organized and imposed by United States imperialism. If a separate agreement is concluded which in practice does not impede the further occupation of Arab territory by Israel, if the aggressor is promised something along the lines of a military alliance—and the intention is to station in the Arab Sinai peninsula troops of the State which has constantly afforded support and assistance to Israel—then we cannot expect peace. Three Governments do not by themselves determine the fate of the Middle East. That is a lesson we have learned from history.

53. Israel's aggression is doomed to failure. The Arab peoples have trustworthy friends who are not pursuing their selfish interests but are working for peace, security and justice.

54. So far as the German Democratic Republic is concerned, I should like to quote from the joint communiqué signed by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and President of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, and the Chairman of FRELIMO and the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Samora Moisés Machel, on 24 February this year at Maputo. The communiqué states:

“Comrade Erich Honecker and Samora Moisés Machel expressed profound concern about the situation in the Middle East and categorically condemned Israel's aggressive policy, which is the principal reason for tension in that area. They are convinced that the separate negotiations, which sacrifice the legitimate interests of the Arab peoples, and particularly the Arab people of Palestine, serve only to complicate the situation and make even more difficult a final and lasting solution to the Middle East problem.

“Both leaders welcomed the results of the summit conference at Baghdad and stressed the need for a resumption of the Geneva Conference, with, necessarily, the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization. A just and final solution to the conflict can be achieved only through the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories occupied in 1967 and the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to establish its own independent State.

“Both sides also confirmed that the right of all the peoples and States in the area to exist and develop independently should be guaranteed.”

55. Mr. MILLS (Jamaica): Mr. President, the continuous activity of the Council since your assumption of the presidency for the month of March would appear to be heading us towards the establishment of some kind of record which has placed heavy demands on you and your delegation.

Your performance confirms our highest expectations of effective leadership, and we can continue to feel confident that the work of the Council will benefit from your vigour and resourcefulness for the remainder of this month.

56. The issue before the Council, which concerns the situation in the occupied Arab territories, is not a new one. The Council has in the past adopted a number of resolutions on the principles and objectives which provide the basis for an acceptable solution to that question. But with the passage of time, and with the failure to implement those decisions, there has been a continuing deterioration in the situation. There have been more debates and more resolutions adopted in the Council on the situation in the Middle East than on any other issue. Since 1967 the situation in the occupied Arab territories has been a matter of continuing and serious concern both to the Council and to the General Assembly, as a specific issue and as a vital aspect of the broader question on the Middle East.

57. Israel has continued to occupy Arab territories captured in the war of 1967 and to adopt measures which have the effect of changing the legal status, the geographical nature and the demographic composition of these territories. It has persistently disregarded the resolutions of the United Nations on these matters. Consequently a situation has been created which is fraught with danger for international peace and security.

58. Jamaica has followed developments in the area with utmost concern, and we are particularly disturbed about the persistent reports of Israeli activities which violate the human rights of the residents of the occupied territories. Such tendencies aggravate a situation already compounded by the tragic heritage of the past and most particularly by the failure to achieve a just solution to the Palestinian question, which lies at the heart of the whole problem.

59. The withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories occupied since the 1967 war is an essential step which must be taken if peace is to prevail in the area. Jamaica is firmly opposed to the acquisition of territory by force as a matter of principle, and we deplore all measures taken by Israel towards the annexation of the Arab territories it now occupies. We believe that real security cannot be advanced by holding on to the fruits of military conquest. No Arab State in the area can be expected to become reconciled to the permanent alienation of its territory, nor can the Palestinian people be permanently relegated to the status of refugees and denied their legitimate and inalienable rights. Continued occupation and the adoption of legislative and administrative measures which lay the basis of a permanent presence by Israel in the occupied territories will continue to be a source of tension in the area. There can be no peace as long as this situation persists.

60. In this regard, the expropriation of Arab land and the policy of establishing Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, which have escalated in recent times, contain elements of grave danger and are inimical to the creation of conditions of peace. These settlements are illegal. Their establishment is a direct contravention of international law, in particular the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of

12 August 1949. In article 49 of that Convention, it is stated that "the occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies". My Government cannot accept any right of the occupying Power based on the concept of "liberated territories". Nor are we swayed by claims as to the beneficial results of occupation and the need for modernization. We are guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the accepted tenets of international law.

61. Special concern has been expressed in the Council regarding the erosion of the status of Jerusalem. The Holy City is revered by three religions—Christianity, Islam and Judaism—and holds a special place in the hearts of people all over the world. The need for satisfactory arrangements for the protection of the holy places and for access to them by adherents of three religions has always been recognized. The annexation of East Jerusalem and other actions by Israel affecting its legal status and altering its national character obviously generate intense emotions and aggravate the over-all situation in the Middle East. We cannot accept that these actions are legitimate or valid.

62. While we concentrate on the single issue of the situation in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, it is necessary to see the issue within the wider context of the requirements for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. My Government continues to believe that despite its studied ambiguity and inadequate treatment of the Palestinian question, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) contain the basic elements for the establishment of a durable and just peace.

63. We believe that three basic elements have to be emphasized. First, Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since the 1967 war. This is an essential condition for a peaceful settlement of the problem. Secondly, the Palestinian people must be able to enjoy their inalienable rights, including their national right to a homeland. Thirdly, there must be an effort to establish conditions under which all States in the area can exist in security and enjoy respect for their territorial integrity and political independence. In our view achievement of these three basic objectives within a comprehensive framework represents the only hope for a permanent and just peace in the area.

64. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation entirely shares the views of the representatives of Jordan, the Palestine Liberation Organization and the many States that have spoken in favour of an immediate consideration of the question of the situation in the Arab territories occupied by Israel and the adoption of urgent measures in this regard. The policy being pursued by the Israeli authorities and the exploitation of occupied Arab territories represents a direct and serious threat to international peace and security, and that is demonstrated, *inter alia*, by the concern of a large number of delegations which have taken part in the Security Council discussion on this matter.

65. The particularly relevant and urgent nature of the problem of the activities of Israel in the occupied territories is due, in our view, to the following factors. First, the illegal actions of the Israeli authorities in terms of the seizure of

Arab lands and the expulsions of the indigenous Arab population over the last few months have been sharply on the increase and are clearly aimed at ensuring that as early as possible the Arab peoples and the whole world are faced with a fait accompli: the inclusion of those territories within Israel. Secondly, it is precisely over the last few days that we have witnessed the conversion of the Camp David plot into a separate agreement which—and we are firmly convinced of this—can only have as its result the ever firmer entrenchment of Israel in the gains of its aggression against the Arab States and the creation of new difficulties in the struggle of the Arab peoples for the recovery of their ancestral lands.

66. From the statements of representatives of many countries here, from documents in the possession of the Council, a very clear-cut picture emerges of how the Government of Israel is pursuing a deliberately planned course of action for the expropriation of Arab lands occupied in 1967 and the expulsion from them of the indigenous Arab population, and of its use for that purpose of the most sophisticated and brutal methods.

67. The Israeli authorities are stepping up their expropriation of Arab lands. So far, 29 per cent—or almost one third—of the whole territory of the West Bank of the River Jordan has been confiscated. The Israeli authorities have been confiscating State and community property and also private property belonging both to the refugees they drove out before and to the remaining inhabitants, forcing them to seek ways of existing in other places. In order to cover up this robbery, various tricks or devices are sometimes used; but, more often than anything, what is used is direct force, on the pretext of military necessity, accompanied by the use of bulldozers for the destruction of houses and the physical expulsion of the Arab population.

68. The lands which have been seized in this way are used by the Israeli authorities for the creation of new Israeli settlements and the expansion of those already existing. The number of Israeli settlements is growing fast; by the end of 1978—that is, after 12 years of Israeli occupation—there were 68 such settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan, while in the first two months of this year the number of such settlements rose to 79. And in the early future, 27 new settlements are planned. In Gaza, 25 Israeli settlements have been set up, and on the Golan Heights, 27.

69. Israeli settlements are being created not only as strong points for Israel's military presence in the occupied areas: the land which has been taken from the Arabs is being used for the creation of industrial complexes and infrastructure, with the clear purpose of the total colonization of the area seized, and of depriving the indigenous Arab population of the means of subsistence, converting the Arabs into personnel for servicing the Israeli occupiers.

70. In order to make this goal easier to attain, the Israeli authorities have established in the occupied territories a régime of repression and terror; large-scale use is being made of punitive operations: special commandos break into the homes of peaceful inhabitants during the night, drive them out onto the street and blow up the houses. Many young Palestinians have been subjected to arbitrary arrest and torture on charges of belonging to organizations fighting for the liberation of the occupied territories.

71. A particularly difficult situation has arisen in East Jerusalem: there a planned process is going on of destroying historical, religious and national features which are of particular value to the population of many countries.

72. All the activities of the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories are in flagrant violation of the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949. The United Nations, in a number of its decisions, has condemned these activities of Israel and demanded that the Government of Israel, in accordance with that Convention, cease forthwith the carrying out of any measures leading to changes in the legal status, geographical character or demographic composition of the Arab territories it occupied in 1967.

73. The stubborn refusal of the Israeli authorities to comply with the obligations they have assumed under international agreements for the protection of the victims of war demonstrates that they are deliberately adopting a course of flagrant violation of international law and are embarking upon the dangerous course of war crimes. In practice, Israel's policy represents an attempt to deprive the Arab people of Palestine of its territory, its identity and its sovereign rights, as well as to eliminate it as a nation.

74. The most recent events eloquently testify to the fact that Israel, by no accident, is attempting at an increased rate to entrench itself in the occupied Arab territories of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Golan Heights. The Egyptian-Israeli agreement which has been arrived at, in actual fact, pursues the goal of preserving the present situation in these Arab territories, and those who are attempting to camouflage the essence of this deal are undertaking a task which is beyond them. There is no way of covering up the fact that what we have here is an attempt to deprive the Arab people of Palestine of their inalienable national rights, including that of the creation of their own national home—their own State.

75. A great fuss has been made about the question of how close a link there should be between the separate agreement and the process of granting so-called autonomy to the people of Gaza and the West Bank. Thus an attempt was made to divert attention from the essence of this notorious "autonomy". Such attempts, however, cannot possibly mislead anyone. As we know, the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Begin, said frankly that Gaza and the West Bank are historically Israeli lands and that the right of the Jewish people to settle in all parts of Israel was inalienable; that right had been exercised in the past, and it would continue to be exercised in the future. The other day, the representative of Israel confirmed in the Council this official position of his Government.

76. The present discussion is most timely and useful, inasmuch as it clearly demonstrates to everyone what is meant by so-called "autonomy" for the West Bank of the Jordan and for Gaza. "Autonomy" means the maintenance of Israeli troops throughout the territory they have occupied. "Autonomy" means the further expropriation of Arab lands until all land fit for habitation or cultivation reverts to Israel. "Autonomy" means new Israeli settlements, the creation of which is planned for scores of years ahead.

"Autonomy" is the policy of expelling the Arab population from their ancestral lands, subjecting them to intolerable conditions, and depriving them of water and other resources. To sum up, we have every justification in saying that "autonomy", in the final analysis, means annexation.

77. As we know, the population of the occupied Arab territories is so decisively and unanimously against the Camp David agreements and the so-called autonomy they provide for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip that even the Prime Minister of Israel was forced publicly to acknowledge that the inhabitants of these regions have no interest in such "administrative autonomy".

78. This forced acknowledgement, this confession, was the direct consequence of the continuing upsurge of the struggle being waged by the Arab population against the policy of the Israeli occupying authorities and against the policy of separate deals. Sharp clashes between the inhabitants of Ramallah and the occupying troops, strikes in the municipality of Nazareth, the demands of the national committee of Nablus for the release of Palestinian students who had been arrested and expressions of solidarity with the Palestine Liberation Organization by mayors of towns of the West Bank are just a few actions by the Arab population against the Israeli occupiers, carried out in defiance of the situation of terror.

79. It is clear that the course of separate deals in no way leads to universal peace, as the participants in the tripartite talks have been trying vainly to have us believe. This is a course which diverts us from the task of a comprehensive, just settlement in the Middle East, and is designed to supplant it by partial decisions which are beneficial and advantageous only to the aggressor and the forces which support it.

80. But everyone acknowledges that the Palestinian problem constitutes the very core of the whole complicated complex of questions involved in the Middle East settlement and without a solution to this problem, we cannot achieve a just and lasting peace in this part of the world. Therefore, any attempts to bring about a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in defiance and in spite of the legitimate interests of the people of Palestine are doomed to failure. Furthermore, what kind of juridical validity can an agreement and understanding have which affects the Arab people of Palestine, if it is achieved behind the backs of that people without the full participation of its lawful representatives.

81. The participants in the tripartite talks have asserted that anyone who opposes the separate understanding is, in their words, opposing peace. However, in actual fact, a separate agreement encourages the expansionist ambitions of Israel, makes the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East more difficult and greatly exacerbates the international situation.

82. The Soviet delegation once again wishes to state that the path to genuine peace in the Middle East is the path of a comprehensive and just settlement. It is the path of a collective search for a solution which would include—as has been provided in decisions of the Security Council and the Gen-

eral Assembly—the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the implementation of the inalienable, lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine—and that includes the right to the creation of their own State and the ensuring of an independent existence and security for all States in the area. Such a settlement can be achieved only with the participation of all interested parties including, of course, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

83. This position of the USSR is well known and remains unchanged to this very day. As was recently stressed by the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev:

"In the Middle East, as in other parts of the world, we are not seeking any selfish advantages, nor are we laying any claim to the natural resources of other countries. We are in favour of a lasting peace and we are firmly on the side of the lawful rights of the Arab peoples and their struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and against imperialist diktat, capitulationist deals and bargaining away the vital interests of the Arabs."

84. Guided as we are by this policy, the Soviet delegation whole-heartedly supports the just proposals put forward in the Security Council by Arab and other States, to the effect that the Security Council should condemn the policy of Israel in the occupied Arab territories and demand a cessation and rescinding of the illegal actions which have been carried out previously in these territories. In order to verify compliance with that decision, it would be useful to create a special organ of the Council. The Soviet delegation is ready to support the application of sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter if there is further non-compliance by Israel with decisions of the Council. The adoption of such a decision by the Council would undoubtedly play a useful role among other efforts which are aimed at preventing the annexation by Israel of Arab lands and promoting the attainment of a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

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

86. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): I pondered for some time whether to ask for the floor again to make another statement before the Council or to exercise the right of reply. I found that both options were really the same. Any human being with a minimal sense of justice when addressing himself to the conflict in the Middle East would find himself replying to the Israeli aggression. In fact, all the events in the Middle East for the last three decades, tragic as they were, were in some way exercising a right of reply in the face of persistent Israeli aggression.

87. Nevertheless, I must thank the representative of the Zionist entity of Israel for personally bolstering one of the main points which I made in my statement a few days ago [2124th meeting], namely, that as Zionism nears its inevitable demise, it becomes more desperate, more violent and more bellicose. The representative of Israel was desperation

personified. In his frenetic effort to defend the bankrupt logic of Zionism, he had to resort to the most impudent forms of conduct and tricks of deception by indulging in cheap slander or outright and gross distortion of facts. In a blind fury, but still with calculated determination, he lashed out at every representative who voiced support for the very principles upon which the Organization is founded.

88. Allow me to draw the Council's attention to two main issues with which, by means of a heap of lies and insults, the Israeli representative has attempted to obscure in this debate. These issues are: first, Zionist aggression is the root of the problem in the Middle East; it was the Zionists' racist chauvinistic pursuit of a Jewish "homeland" which uprooted the Palestinian people from their land, and it is the Zionists' expansionist ambitions which constitute the main obstacle in the search for a just peace in the Middle East; secondly, Israel's belligerent refusal to give up the areas which they have occupied is tied to their aims of exploiting the natural and human resources of the occupied Arab territories.

89. In his efforts to obscure the roots of the conflict in the Middle East, the Zionist representative attempted to fragment the problem and to place all subsequent historical developments in the region completely out of historical context. For example, he attacked Syria for its presence in Lebanon, forgetting that there would be no strife in Lebanon, no Arab deterrent force in Lebanon, of which Syria is but a part, if it were not for the persistent Israeli aggression which was principally responsible for the expulsion of the Palestinian people from their home.

90. For the record, I should like to reiterate here that the Syrian presence in Lebanon is part of the Arab deterrent force which is acting on the clear-cut approval of the legal Lebanese Government, and Syria would not extend its presence there by a single day were it not necessary and approved by the Lebanese Government.

91. With the same obscurantist aim, the Zionist representative also devoted many of his vulgar comments to the Arab Summit meeting at Baghdad, which was held from 2 to 5 November 1978, alleging that the summit had bellicose declarations and designs. At one point he described the participants as the enemies of peace. Well, let me read out relevant paragraphs of the declaration of the Arab summit meeting:

"It affirmed commitment of the Arab nation to just peace based on withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Arab Jerusalem, and guaranteeing the inalienable rights of the Arab Palestinian people and the setting up of their independent State on their national soil.

"The Conference resolved to launch a large-scale international offensive to expound the rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. It expressed sincere thanks and appreciation to all States which stood on the side of the Arab right."²

92. Now, who are the enemies of peace? The victims of aggression who are striving to liberate their occupied land,

to regain their liberty and fundamental human rights or the aggressors? We oppose the Camp David approach; we shall always oppose any separate settlement, because if any peaceful settlement is to be achieved, it must be just and comprehensive and, above all, address itself to the Palestinian cause, which is the core and essence of the Middle East conflict, and must include the total withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories.

93. I turn to the second point which the Israeli representative also deliberately ignored, that is, the fact that their parasitic economic desires for the natural and human resources of the occupied Arab lands account for their obstinate refusal to give up these areas to their rightful owners. He enumerated the many glowing "achievements"—roads, schools and so on—of Israeli occupation. But all these "forms of development" are meaningless if they exist within the context of occupation. And this is borne out by the present situation. The so-called forms of Israeli development in the occupied Arab territories only serve to facilitate and consolidate its principal aim of oppression and exploitation. Yes, there are indeed forms of development, but the question is: development for whom?

94. Their policies in agricultural "development" in the West Bank expose this fact. West Bank economist Mr. A. R. Husseini writes that Israel's Department of Agriculture is "anxious to promote certain crops for the benefit of Israeli exporters", thereby creating "production patterns along lines which are not compatible with the long-term interests of West Bank agriculture".

95. The most conspicuous manifestation of his deliberate attempt to obscure the real issues is the fact that the Israeli representative ignored the Golan Heights altogether—as if there is no Israeli occupation there, no settlements, no destruction and no exploitation in contravention of all international laws and practices.

96. The Israeli representative's many insults to the Organization are all set out in the records of the United Nations, and it is pointless to refute them, precisely because they are mere insults with no basis or substance. After having listened to all these abuses directed against the international community, one wonders to what extent Israel might go in defying international law and order, to what extent might this Zionist madness go and how long we in the Middle East might remain threatened by its aggressive actions. The Israeli representative, by affirming his Government's defiance and disrespect of this international Organization, is once again proving the point which many representatives here have reiterated, that is, that Zionism can be equated to Nazism. And if Zionism persists, I am sure that it will only lead to the same grave consequences that Nazism brought to the world. In trying to save our region and the world from a repetition of such a tragic period, we reiterate our call to the Council to act and to take the necessary measures in order to carry out its responsibilities according to the Charter, in the service of international peace and justice. In this context my delegation completely supports the requests of the representative of Jordan.

97. And, last but not least, what about Jerusalem? Ever since 1967, the Security Council has repeatedly rejected the

² A/33/400, annex, paras. 11 and 12.

annexation of Jerusalem and condemned Israel in its resolution 252 (1968) and many other subsequent resolutions. The Council has deplored the failure of Israel to comply with General Assembly resolutions concerning Jerusalem and considered that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem, were invalid and could not change that status. The Israeli representative's only reply to that was:

"As the representative of Israel, let me therefore repeat here again that Jerusalem, one, undivided and indivisible, shall remain for ever the capital of Israel and of the Jewish people." [2125th meeting, para. 88.]

98. Is that a passionate sentiment for peace, or a call for war and more suffering in the Middle East? Will such intransigence serve the cause of international peace and security, or will it leave us the victims, the Arab peoples, the Palestinians, no option but armed resistance to recover our national rights?

99. With all due respect to this august body, I sincerely call upon the members of the Council, individually and collectively, to save the Middle East from more suffering at the hands of Zionist-racist Israel. I appeal to all mankind to check the madness of Nazi Israel. In short, I call upon this Council to stand up to its obligations so eloquently stated in the Charter to which we all claim to adhere.

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

101. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Mr. President, I wish to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I am pleased to see you, an eminent representative of a friendly country with which my country has excellent relations, in the highly important office of President of the Council: I am confident that, with your extraordinary qualities and diplomatic experience, you will most effectively conduct the deliberations on this difficult matter on our agenda. I thank you and the other members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in this debate.

102. I take this opportunity of a meeting of the Council to express the views of my Government on the situation in the occupied Arab territories that disturbs peace and stability in the Middle East and has an adverse effect on the whole world. We find it very useful that the Council has again taken up this vital issue, because it reflects the lasting concern of the international community for the attainment of the ultimate goal of peace in that area.

103. For more than three decades the fundamental issues of the Arab-Israeli conflict have been on the agenda of the Organization without being settled, mainly because States try to conceal facts and realities and gain time for the realization of selfish interests. The attempts of those States to protract the solution of the main problems connected with the peace and security of the Middle East evoke justified concern. They intend to justify the need to wait for conditions to ripen for a compromise and a comprehensive settlement. Those attempts are nothing else but a screen to

hide the real intentions of those States, which hope to control the oil resources and the strategic positions of the Middle East. It is needless to reaffirm that they have nothing in common with the true interests of the peoples of the Arab countries.

104. New and fresh allies in the Middle East support and rely on those forces, but it can be safely assumed that the peoples of the Arab countries will neutralize the plans hostile to the cause of Arab independence. To achieve a settlement in the Middle East is a very difficult task but, in our view, an attainable one. The basis for a real settlement should, in our opinion, include three important elements: first, withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; secondly, satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their inalienable right to set up their own State; thirdly, ensuring the security and inviolability of the frontiers of all States in the Middle East and their right to independent existence and development under international guarantees.

105. Such a settlement would ensure the return of the occupied Arab territories, and, by removing the territorial aspects of the conflict in the Middle East, would finally make the Arab-Israeli issue a matter of the past. At the same time it would allow the peoples of the Arab States to concentrate their efforts and resources on economic and social tasks, surmounting the heritage of colonial and neo-colonial domination. It would enable the Arab people of Palestine to exercise their right to build their own independent State and occupy their rightful place among the peoples of the region. That settlement would also ensure the existence of Israel in conditions of peace and security, within recognized borders, and enable it to normalize relations with the countries in the Middle East and other States of the world.

106. There is an international mechanism for achieving such a real settlement set up especially for this purpose: it is the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. Taking into account the recent developments and events in and around the area of the Middle East, I think it is useful to recall that the Soviet Union and the United States of America, in a joint statement issued on 1 October 1977 in their capacity as co-chairmen of that Conference, stated that a solution encompassing all issues of the Middle East and all parties to the crisis should be reached within the framework of a comprehensive settlement. It was explicitly noted in that statement that negotiations within the framework of the Geneva Conference set up for this purpose are the only correct and effective way of achieving a settlement of all aspects of the conflict and that the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people should be ensured. We have no reason to doubt that the provisions of that statement are still valid and could and should serve as a basis for a comprehensive solution.

107. The occupation by Israel of Arab territories poses a grave threat to international peace and security, and the tension in the area can easily spill over the confines of the Middle East. We deplore the measures taken by Israel to alter the geographic, demographic, political, social and cultural characteristics of the occupied Arab territories. This policy does not help the search for a peaceful settlement of

the conflict. Quite the contrary; it is a violation of the fundamental principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by means of war—a principle embodied, *inter alia*, in the Charter of the United Nations and in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Annexation and integration of lands and cities of other peoples can lead only to enmity and hatred, endangering the foundations of a possible understanding between Israel and its Arab neighbours. In the final analysis, the danger that hostilities will erupt anew in the Middle East will exist so long as Israel remains in the occupied territories of the Arab countries, and so long as the Arab people of Palestine is deprived of its inalienable national rights.

108. For those reasons, my Government welcomes the fact that the Security Council is taking up again the real heart of the Middle East conflict—namely, the question of the occupied territories and the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. We are happy to note the presence of the legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine during the deliberations on the present agenda item. This is a very promising sign for the global solution of the Middle East problem.

109. My Government has always supported the genuine national liberation movements, and we do so in the case of the Arab people of Palestine. These people have the right to a national identity, to self-determination, to a homeland. This right was endorsed by the General Assembly when it accepted the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. As a member of that Committee, we hope that the Council will do its best to put an end to the striking injustices that have afflicted the Arab people of Palestine for more than three decades, and will follow the path and the example of the General Assembly in supporting the Committee's recommendations on this issue.

110. My country and its people express their solidarity with the Arab people of Palestine and assure them again of our full support for their fight for their national independence.

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

112. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Yemen): May I at the outset, Sir, express to you my felicitations on your assumption of the presidency of this lofty organ of the United Nations, and wish you success in your highly important and delicate task.

113. Once again the Security Council has been convened to deal with the worsening situation in the Arab territories resulting from the Israeli-Zionist military occupation, which has embarked on waves of terrorist actions and intimidation aimed at evicting the inhabitants from their homes to make room for new waves of alien settlers.

114. Eighty-five years ago, Yusuf Zia Al-Khalidi, the Mayor of Jerusalem and former Deputy in the Ottoman Parliament, said in a letter which he sent from Constantinople to Zadok Kahn, Chief Rabbi of France: "In the name of God, leave Palestine in peace".

115. The events which have subsequently characterized the Middle East arena, since the injection of Israel, an alien body, into the midst of the Arab world, have been brutal and barbarous. However, the very nature of Zionism and its philosophy, according to its own prophet, Theodor Herzl, is based on force and coercion. In fact, Herzl confided his belief that military power was an essential component of the Zionist strategy: "the Zionists should acquire the land of their choice by armed conquest".

116. The continued waves of terrorist measures and practices affecting the human rights of the Arab population of the occupied territories have clearly demonstrated to those who maintain a romantic relationship with the Zionist State the true nature of Zionism as a form of racial discrimination rightly condemned by the United Nations.

117. The situation in the Arab territories under Israeli military occupation gives ample evidence of calculated and systematic measures designed to emasculate the Arab Moslem legacies in a manner abhorrent to any standard of civilized and responsible behaviour.

118. In this connexion I should like to draw attention to the Israeli practices aimed at desecrating the mosque of the Hebron—Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi Al-Sharif—which has, since the Zionist aggression in June 1967, been transformed into a synagogue.

119. Just today Reuters reported from Jerusalem that Israeli forces and armed Jewish settlers fired on West Bank demonstrators, killing two Arab students, one a teen-age girl, and wounding other students.

120. Furthermore, Israeli terrorist acts have caused a larger flow of Arab refugees from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; since June 1967 the number has risen to more than 400,000.

121. Israel has continued to pursue a policy of outright expulsion of the Arab civilian population in the occupied territories, through deliberate intimidation, oppression, economic strangulation and psychological warfare. The Zionist goal has been and continues to be to de-Arabize Palestine and other Arab lands and substitute the Zionists for the indigenous people.

122. The aggressive and expansionist policy of the Zionist leaders has no limitation, a fact recognized by and often confusing to Israel's friends. Indeed, the late President Lyndon Johnson of the United States once told the Zionist leaders, "You ask me for secure and recognized boundaries. Tell me first what boundaries you want".

123. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories clearly shows the daily violation of basic human rights of the Arab population under Israeli military occupation.

124. My Government has repeatedly asserted its belief that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the Middle East problem, and that, consequently, we should address ourselves to restoring the legitimate and inalienable rights

of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in Palestine. To that end, and in view of Israel's persistent defiance of the principles of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Security Council is duty-bound to take effective measures as laid down by the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

125. My delegation believes that the Council will do an injustice to the cause of peace if it allows itself to adopt a routine decision condemning Israel for its gross violations of human rights in the Arab occupied territories in complete disregard of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention of 1949. What is needed now, in view of the Zionist measures of subjugation and annexation of Arab territories aimed at establishing permanent domination over those territories, is strong and effective measures to frustrate the Zionist policy of colonizing the Arab territories, thus preventing further victimization and human suffering. In the interests of international peace and security, the Council should abandon its apathetic attitude towards this grave problem and act in accordance with the duties and responsibilities vested in it by the Charter.

126. Everyone in this chamber, and particularly the members of the Council, are certainly aware and evidently convinced that Israel is neither interested in a just peace that involves the restoration of the Palestinians' right to return to their homes and properties nor willing to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories in the Golan, in the West Bank, including Jerusalem, and in Gaza and Sinai.

127. The people of the world are unanimous in their condemnation of Israeli occupation of Palestine and other Arab lands and are demanding restoration of the Palestinian rights to self-determination and establishment of their national home in Palestine. For us, the United Nations remains the only forum which lawfully and rightfully has the duty of bringing just and permanent peace to our region. We fully share the view of the Secretary-General expressed in his annual report to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly³—that: irrespective of developments which may ensue from the endeavours currently undertaken, in the final analysis all concerned parties must come together and search for a way which will lead to a permanent and just peace.

128. My Government has today declared that the Yemen Arab Republic is fully and unreservedly committed to the unanimous Arab position as stated in the resolutions adopted by the Arab summit conferences in Algeria, Rabat and, most recently, Baghdad. The Government of Yemen believes that any separate solution will harm the cause of a just peace in the Middle East. The Yemen Arab Republic confirms its long-standing position that the Palestine Liberation Organization is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

129. I must add that United Nations documents clearly and amply demonstrate that Israel is the only party that is consistently rejecting a just peace. Hence it is imperative that the international community, represented by the

United Nations and the Security Council, take whatever measures it deems necessary within its power, as specified in Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure Israeli compliance with United Nations resolutions.

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

131. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): This is the International Year of the Child. Children all over the world have a right to life. They have a right to enjoy peace and security. Children all over the world merit our attention, our loving care and tenderness, in particular during this very year.

132. We all have children, and we know what that means. Children all over the world have high hopes that theirs will be a world of peace and happiness, a world in which they can pursue their education and learning and contribute to the advancement and welfare of mankind. Children have a right to go to school and to return home without hindrance or fear. In theory, at least, this is true of children everywhere except in occupied Palestinian and other Arab towns and villages, where children are treated as non-human beings. Is that the kismet, or fate, or our children, or is it the result of a conspiracy by so-called humans?

133. Only this morning, the Fascist forces of occupation opened fire on schoolchildren at Halhoul, south of Jerusalem, murdering two young students in cold blood. Children, we say in Arabic, are the apples of our eyes; they are our joy. The parents of those two children have tonight lost the best of their lives.

134. Students are the hope of our future. Yes, two young students were murdered by the military forces of illegal occupation, by neo-Fascists, by the racist Zionists.

135. In my statement of two days ago [2125th meeting], I referred to another atrocity that had been committed by the racist Zionists against students at Ramallah, north of Jerusalem, under the very eyes of an unwelcome visitor heading a big Power, almost the biggest in military potential, but not so big in its morals and its defence of morals. The unwelcome visitor proves to be not only a provocation and a challenge; he proves to be the curse that brings devastation to Palestinian land and Palestinian people. He not only provokes, but he finances and arms the murderers with lethal weapons to deprive our children of their first right—the right to life. And that right is taken away by force, the force of guns made and provided by the United States of America.

136. That he was unwelcome can be confirmed by the violent reception accorded him by the Palestinian people. On 13 March the *Daily News Bulletin* of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency reported from Tel Aviv as follows:

“Violent demonstrations against President Carter's peace-keeping efforts erupted on the West Bank for the fourth consecutive day. . . . Ramallah, near Jerusalem, and Bir Zeit, site of the Arab University, were the focal

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 1.

points of disturbances... Widespread violence occurred in many more towns and villages during the past 24 hours...

"All shops and businesses were closed. Schools remained open but most students roamed the streets setting up roadblocks, burning piles of tyres, and hurling barrages of stones at police and Israeli vehicles. The situation was the same at Bir Zeit.

"[On 12 March] three Bir Zeit students were wounded when Israeli security forces opened fire to break up a demonstration. A curfew was imposed, and all male residents were rounded up in the church square for screening and identification. The Military Governor appointed a special committee to investigate the incident.

"Other incidents occurred yesterday"—that is, on the 12th—"at Ramallah, Al-Bira, Beth Sahour, Halhoul and Bethlehem.

"A large number of security forces"—that is the name they give the illegal forces of occupation—"patrolled East Jerusalem... in an effort to put an end to the continued unrest among Jerusalem's Arabs. The present wave of unrest began when President Carter arrived [at Jerusalem] last weekend and intensified with the positive end of the talks."

137. Not only the regular and undisciplined or ill-disciplined members of the Israeli armed forces committed these crimes. The settlers in the illegal settlements also participated in the commission of those crimes. Fascists.

138. In an attempt to demonstrate what the future holds for the Palestinians, a group of those colonial settlers stormed the house of a Palestinian Arab citizen, Ibrahim Ghosheh by name, in Wadi El-Jhoz, Jerusalem. For us who know Jerusalem, who were raised in Jerusalem, Wadi El-Jhoz stands on the slopes of the Mount of Olives, the place of ascension of Our Lord the Redeemer. It is in the vicinity of the Palestine Archaeological Museum, but the Zionist racists stormed the house and fatally shot Ibrahim Ghosheh. And while we sit here deliberating, our children are being slaughtered, in their own homes, by a Member of the United Nations.

139. Of course, it is the right of some to ask why the Palestinians reject and oppose the bilateral or the trilateral approach. Simply because the Palestinians know exactly what that means. Yitzhak Modai, Minister of Energy and Infrastructure of Israel, in an interview with *Ma'ariv*, was asked the question:

"Now that Israel has given up the settlements, recognized the legitimate rights of the Palestinians and their just demands, and has agreed to abolish the military Government in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza, are Israeli relations with the United States tolerable?"

And the answer of the Minister was:

"First, I must disagree with the basic assumptions in your question. True, Israel has given up the settlements in Sinai. It is not true that it has recognized the legitimate rights of the Palestinians."

And when the correspondent proceeded further and asked:

"No? Is it not written so in the Camp David agreement about peace in the Middle East?"

the Minister said:

"True, it is written so, but six appendices have been added to that agreement, and in one of them President Carter writes to Prime Minister Begin that he, the President, certifies that the Prime Minister has informed him that in every place where it is written 'the Palestinian people' the Prime Minister's meaning of this phrase is 'the Arabs of the Land of Israel'."

140. Now, what is this "Land of Israel"? Menachem Begin has written a book, and, to make it still more infamous, the foreword to it is by a certain Rabbi Meyer Kahane, the founder of the so-called Jewish Defense League. He defines the "Land of Israel" as follows:

"The Land of Israel has been regarded since biblical times as the motherland of the children of Israel. It has always comprised what came subsequently to be called 'Palestine' on both sides of the River Jordan—that is to say, not only western Palestine, but also the territory formerly occupied by three of the 12 Hebrew tribes, Manasseh, Gad and Reuben."

Well, I am glad he did not mention Ur, the city from which Abraham came.

141. Now, continuing this interview with the Minister, he was asked about this wording. The interviewer commented: "It is one of those legalistic pieces of sophistry." And his answer was:

"Yes, it is a piece of sophistry, but Israel will insist on this interpretation and by no means will it agree to any right of creation of a Palestinian State or"—mind you—"of self-determination. The American positions have not changed from the time of the six-day-war. Had Israel refused to sign the Camp David agreements, the Americans would have stated their positions—which are completely opposed to ours—both openly and immediately on the Palestinian subject. In Camp David the procedure for dealing with the problem was fixed. The United States has agreed to the presence of the Israel Defence Forces in Judaea and Samaria and Gaza."

And when pushed further by the journalist with this question:

"But Israel has given up the source of its authority in Judaea and Samaria, in agreeing to abolish the military government."

the clever Minister said:

"It is not so, absolutely! The source of the authority was not changed. In the negotiation Israel will demand that the military government shall continue to be the source of the authority of the autonomy, even though it will not sit physically in the areas of the autonomy but in Tel Aviv or in Haifa."

Yes, that is exactly why the Palestinians reject and oppose the so-called autonomy theme.

142. Yesterday we saw the Mayor of Gaza, Mr. Shawa, on American TV. He made it clear he strongly rejected the Sadat-Begin-Carter plot, and he said it was a new name given to continued illegal occupation. Yes, it is a plot. It was concocted in the dark. It left out the heart of the conflict in the Middle East—namely, the question of Palestine and the future of the Palestinian people. It completely ignored the United Nations, its principles and relevant resolutions. It is a plot against the Palestinians, the Arabs, international peace and security and the United Nations.

143. We still believe that it is high time that the Security Council took action in accordance with the terms of the Charter—and, in particular, Chapter VII—to see to it that its decisions are respected and implemented.

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

145. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): I have asked to exercise the right of reply to respond briefly to the references which the Israeli representative made to my country in his intervention yesterday [2126th meeting]. At the outset, I must categorically reject his allegations and those he claims to have been made elsewhere as baseless and as a gross distortion of the facts. It should be quite evident that the Israeli representative, by injecting "red herrings" into these discussions, hopes to divert the attention of the Council from the crucial subject under discussion, which is Israel's expansionist policies in the Middle East, its usurpation of the rights, property and land of the people of Palestine and, above all, its unacceptable encroachment on and occupation of the Holy City of Jerusalem.

146. In the course of this debate the Council has been treated to railing and rancour by the Israeli representative in a vain endeavour to defend his country's indefensible policies. But he must be made to understand that the Security Council, in its deliberations on an issue as crucial and explosive as the one before it, must be guided solely by the tenets and precepts of international law.

147. As long as Israel continues its inhuman, illegal and immoral policies, in defiance of international opinion, the representative of Israel must be left in no doubt that the international community will always remain firmly opposed to those policies and will side with justice, for to do otherwise would be to undermine the objectives and purposes of the Charter and, indeed, would gravely erode the whole structure of international order.

148. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of the Sudan, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

149. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan): May I express my gratitude to the members of the Council for permitting me to exercise my right of reply to the remarks made yesterday [*ibid.*] by my neighbour to the right. He was kind enough to make his remarks about the state of affairs between the north and the south in the Sudan and, at the same time, to

take upon himself the task of answering on my behalf. I must confess that I find this both gratifying and intriguing: gratifying because the Israeli representative has made my task much easier, as by referring to allegations which are non-existent, he has demonstrated to the members of the Council that his contribution to the debate is not really serious; and intriguing because the fact that the Israelis, constantly seeking to sow seeds of suspicion and contention between peoples who live together in peace and harmony, are giving us a demonstration of the role they intend to play in the territories and regions which have the misfortune to be adjacent geographically to theirs.

150. In the course of the debate over the past few days, we have heard the Israeli representative huffing and puffing and lashing out at any representative who took the floor and expressed a point of view that he considered inimical to the Israeli stand. That attitude is only to be expected of a lifelong supporter of the Irgun Zvai Leumi. The diversionary tactics adopted by him, and the deliberate avoidance of a discussion of the substance of the issue inscribed on the agenda of the Council, are designed to frustrate the work of the Council.

151. I turn now to the allegations of the Israeli representative. The unsavoury words used by him, such as "slaughtering" and "bloodiest régime", were meant to produce a dramatic effect, although he knows full well that they are neither pertinent nor relevant to the circumstances prevailing in the Sudan. There is simply no conflict between the north and the south; the Addis Ababa Agreement, which was signed in 1972 between the Sudan Government and the representatives of the southern region, put an end to the conflict and launched the country on a course towards national unity and stability. The resolution of the conflict between the north and the south was eventually followed by other steps leading to national reconciliation with major opposition groups in the north, and the total release of all political detainees and all sentenced political prisoners by April 1978. The report of Amnesty International for 1978 has this to say:

"The reconciliation thus finally embraced all political opposition groups. Political discussions following this key preliminary measure continued and several released detainees took part in the elections as Sudan Socialist Union candidates. Some were elected and given office in the National Assembly and the ruling Sudanese Socialist Union. An indication of the degree of reconciliation achieved may be found in the appointment of Clement Mboro to be Speaker of the Southern Regional Assembly and of Hassan Al-Tourabi to the political bureau of the Sudan Socialist Union.

"After each phase of releases, Amnesty International cabled President Nimeiri, congratulating his Government on the amnesty measure."

152. If we turn the pages of the same report to pages 261 to 264, we find some interesting reading material about the record of the Israeli authorities, which prompted the authors of the report to express their deep concern:

"Amnesty International was sufficiently concerned by the allegations of torture committed by the Israeli security forces to renew its request, in July 1977, that the

Israeli Government permit an independent inquiry into the allegations. To this request, as to Amnesty International's earlier ones, the Israeli authorities have not, at the time of writing, replied."

153. I feel that the two quotations that I have just read absolve me of the obligation to tax the patience of the members of this august body and to take up any more of their valuable time. The issues at stake are too serious to be sidetracked by the theatricals and frivolities of the Israeli representative.

154. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

155. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The sad procession of speakers aligning themselves with the opponents of peace was joined earlier this week and today by India and a number of countries from the Soviet bloc. As I listened to the representative of India condoning the "armed struggle" inspired by the criminal PLO it made me wonder what had happened to the ideals of the great Mahatma Gandhi, who led his country to independence.

156. We have been lectured by the representative of Bangladesh. It is fortunate that we in Israel do not model our relations with the Arabs in Judaea and Samaria on the example set by that State, for no country represented on the Security Council today has a more abysmal record than Bangladesh. I will not dwell on that record here but would refer representatives to the devastating report by the Minority Rights Group of London entitled "The Biharis in Bangladesh", which details the plight of the remnants of the community, who were the victims twice over of the most brutal slaughter and massacre. For those who remain unconvinced, Amnesty International has new evidence in its most recent report of the "inhuman conditions" in which between 10,000 and 15,000 political prisoners are still held, the majority without trial. It also reports on hundreds of executions which took place in October 1977, either without trial or after summary military trials without any possibility of appeal. According to Amnesty International, "trials before military tribunals in Bangladesh fell short of internationally accepted standards".

157. It was reassuring to see that the representative of Yemen could take time out from his country's difficulties at home and be with us here today. We are presumably to assume from his presence that the war between North Yemen and South Yemen—and it is no small or uncomplicated war—has been resolved to the satisfaction of all sides. I do not think that I shall be divulging any secret if I say that the information available to all of us here is by no means as reassuring.

158. The Syrian representative in his elegant statement quoted extensively from the concluding statement of the Baghdad summit conference of last November. Interestingly enough, he deleted one passage which reveals the true intentions of the signatories of that declaration, that is, the elimination of Israel. I should like to quote from a subparagraph of paragraph 3 a:

"The conflict with the Zionist enemy goes beyond the struggle of the countries whose territories were occupied

in 1967 and involves the entire Arab nation in view of the military, political, economic and cultural danger which the Zionist enemy represents to the entire Arab nation, its fundamental nationalist interests, its civilization and destiny."⁴

159. So those are the peaceful intentions of Syria and its friends. It is the peace of the graveyard for Israel, the demise of which the Syrian representative also prophesied here today. It would be interesting to hear from him upon which article of the Charter this prophecy of the destruction of a State Member of the United Nations is based.

160. The Soviet representative made a predictable statement, although the purely fictitious horror stories that punctuated that statement were rather crude, even by Soviet standards. His country's position on the Arab-Israel conflict, like his country's record on other matters concerning international peace and security, is, after all, well known. In essence it is to block any genuine progress towards peace, for it is the situation of "no peace, no war" in the Middle East which best suits the Soviet Union's purposes, as it has done for almost three decades. If there must be peace, then at least let it be a peace dictated by Soviet interests. But in the context of the present debate, better by far would be a clear field in Judaea and Samaria so that the massive supplies of Soviet weapons in the hands of the Governments at Damascus and Baghdad, as well as at the disposal of the terrorist PLO, could reach the outskirts of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv unimpeded.

161. The Soviet representative also spoke darkly about the conditions of the Arabs living under Israeli administration. He will forgive me if I observe that many of the peoples, national minorities and religious communities living in the Soviet Union and in the extensive territories annexed by it in the wake of the Second World War would have been fortunate had they enjoyed, or could enjoy, even a fraction of the rights and freedoms enjoyed by the Arab inhabitants of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district, which, let me remind the Council, include freedom of movement and expression, freedom of religion as well as many other fundamental freedoms denied to the citizens of the Soviet Union.

162. As for Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany, individual replies are not really called for. These are countries which follow a collective line. Incidentally, they are also countries which have distinguished themselves in everything to do with human rights and fundamental freedoms and apparently cannot refrain from raising their pious voices when Holy Places at Jerusalem and elsewhere are discussed.

163. Having said that, I must, however, refer to the remarks of the representative of East Germany. Here is the representative of a country that has buried its hideous record towards the Jewish people as though it never existed, a country with virtually no Jewish population, no Jewish memories and no Jewish problem, a country that has cut itself off from its own past in the most cynical way. Indeed, all of this is necessary, for East Germany now trains PLO

⁴ A/33/400, annex.

terrorists in special camps near Leipzig and Dresden and, more actively than any other Government in Eastern Europe, encourages those terrorists in their most extreme designs for the destruction of the Jewish State. When Jewish civilians are killed in bomb blasts in a Jerusalem supermarket or at a Tel Aviv bus station, we are bound to ask ourselves whether the perpetrators of those crimes were trained in East Germany.

164. Here is a régime that must build a massive wall to keep its citizens from fleeing to freedom accusing a free country—Israel—which allows free movement across its borders and the free right of its citizens to settle where they wish. Has the representative of East Germany forgotten the 3 million persons who fled to the West before that infamous wall was built in 1961—a wall that remains the physical symbol of repression to millions? Has he forgotten the 200,000 of its citizens still patiently awaiting exit visas? Has he forgotten the thousands of dissidents languishing in East German gaols as his Government cynically barter their lives for foreign exchange? Under the headline, “Trade in humans divulged”, *The Christian Science Monitor* on 2 June 1978 reported the extent of this “*Menschenhandel*”, or trade in human beings, and the most recent Amnesty International report remarked that an estimated 1,300 prisoners were released from East Germany in 1977 for prices ranging from DM 30,000 to DM 60,000 per person. It appears that doctors and scholars fetch considerably better prices than unskilled labourers.

165. But if the East German representative has forgotten these facts, he has certainly not forgotten the sight of Soviet tanks in the streets of his country when thousands of workers marched into the streets in June 1953, calling for the downfall of his country’s régime.

166. Before he begins to rewrite the history of the Middle East, I would suggest that he take a long, hard look at his own country’s record and examine closely the propriety of a German attack on Jewish rights while the holocaust generation is still alive.

167. Yesterday I challenged the Jordanian representative’s description of what he called the few peaceful demonstrations which Arabs staged in 1947 to express their dismay at General Assembly resolution 181 (II), and I quoted from United Nations reports of February and April 1948 to refute his assertion. The Jordanian representative then backtracked and claimed that he was speaking only about the few days following the adoption of the resolution in question. I shall quote him yesterday’s record:

“I stand completely by my statement that the Palestinians did no more during the first few days that followed the partition plan than protest and demonstrate against the dismemberment of their country against their will.” [2126th meeting, para. 117.]

168. The trouble is that that statement is historical nonsense, and the representative of Jordan surely did not think that members of the Council would accept such hogwash uncritically.

169. Let me refer members to the world press in the days immediately following the adoption of General Assembly

resolution 181 (II). I have chosen *The New York Times*, but they will no doubt find the same details in any newspaper they choose, including those published in Arab capitals at the time. *The New York Times* of 1 December 1947, reporting from Palestine the events of 30 November, that is the day after the resolution was adopted, had the following front-page headline: “Palestine’s Arabs kill seven Jews, call three-day strike—buses fired on from ambush—[Arab] higher Committee adopts plans against partition”. The article begins:

“In a violent Arab retort to the United Nations decision on Palestine seven Jews were killed by Arab ambushes in Palestine today 30 November. Five were slain in an attack on one bus and one in an assault on another bus.”

The article goes on to report that a Jew was killed in Jaffa and eight buses were attacked in Jerusalem and Haifa. Incidentally, the same article notes that in Damascus an Arab mob killed a member of the Soviet legation there.

170. *The New York Times* of 2 December 1947 had the front-page headline: “Arab States call meeting; riots over Palestine go on”. The same newspaper, page 11, headlines: “Palestine firings keep tension high—Arabs try to invade Tel Aviv”. The report states:

“One Jew was killed and four other Jews and two Polish Christians were wounded as Arab bands roved through the Holy Land, punctuating their protests with gunfire and bomb blasts.”

The article added that two Jews had been wounded by grenades in Tel Aviv.

171. *The New York Times* of 3 December 1947 had the front-page headlines. “Eight Jews reported killed in Palestine—clashes—mob loots shops—Moslem sages ask holy war”. One article began:

“Arab threats of violence . . . materialized today in stoning and stabbing attacks against Jews and in the burning and looting of their shops.”

The article continues on page 4 of the same edition:

“The trouble in Jerusalem began when a crowd of 200 to 300 young Arabs marched from the Walled City into the central business section about 9 o’clock in the morning and began smashing shop windows and looting. The mob spirit swelled fast, and the youths turned on passing Jews; a Jewish newspaperman, Ashar Lazar of *Haaretz*, was dragged from his car and stabbed three times in full view of the crowd.”

172. *The New York Times* of 4 December 1947 had the front-page headline: “Palestine strife widens, grips Jaffa-Tel Aviv area; Arabs rebuff peace plea—pillage, arson, sniping mark the second day of protest strike.” The article goes on to state clearly that the Arabs used automatic weapons.

173. *The New York Times* of 5 December 1947 had the front-page headline: “Arabs make roads new battlefields; rake bus convoys—casualty toll mounts.” The article began: “The Arab three-day strike ended today with bloodshed throughout Palestine.”

174. Those were the "peaceful" demonstrations staged by the Arabs during the first few days after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II). We can readily understand what the Jordanian representative means when he talks of "peace" in this chamber.

175. If this is not enough to eliminate completely whatever little credibility the Jordanian representative may have claimed for himself, I do not know what else is needed. I shall avoid the temptation to pick up such an absurd contention as that no Jordanian had ever seen the Straits of Tiran. And that too is taken from yesterday's record, which I shall quote: "I do not think that any Jordanian or Palestinian had ever seen the Straits of Tiran." [*Ibid.*, para. 118.]

Are we to believe that Jordan has joined the ranks of the land-locked countries?

176. We are all familiar with the expression "eyeless in Gaza", but "eyeless in Aqaba" is surely a new one. How are we to suppose that ships proceeding to Aqaba get there if not through the Straits of Tiran? It is just conceivable that, unknown to us, they are taken overland to avoid interfering with the water-skiing and speed-boating off Aqaba. Or perhaps the crews blindfold themselves and let themselves be guided in by Israeli pilots?

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.