

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2356th MEETING: 19 APRIL 1982

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY

JAN 26 1990

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2356)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14967);	
Letter dated 13 April 1982 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14969)	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.

2356th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 19 April 1982, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA
(Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2356)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14967);
Letter dated 13 April 1982 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14969)

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14967);

Letter dated 13 April 1982 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14969)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2352nd to 2355th meeting], I invite the representatives of Israel and Morocco to take places at the Council table. I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Bangladesh, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco) took places at the Council table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Sobhan (Bangladesh), Mr. Coumbassa (Guinea), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Djalal (Indonesia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Iran), Mr. Mohammad (Iraq), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zainal Abidin (Malaysia), Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Djigo (Senegal), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Kirya (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from the representatives of Djibouti and the United Arab Emirates letters in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussions 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. Farah Dirir (Djibouti) and Mr. Al-Qasimi (United Arab Emirates) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Council is once again obliged to meet to discuss the question of the situation in the occupied Arab territories. This time, we are considering the question of outrageous actions with regard to the Muslim Holy Places in Jerusalem, committed under cover provided by the Israeli occupying authorities.

4. The very context of this discussion is extremely illuminating. Members of the Council no doubt have fresh in their memories the arguments put forward by the Israeli representative at a recent meeting of the Council. At that time he spoke of what he described as Israel's desire to make constant efforts to create an atmosphere of mutual understanding and co-operation on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip. However, as the facts show, that was nothing more than a smokescreen. Dozens more Palestinians have been killed and wounded—and this includes old people, women and children—in Jeru-

salem, in the West Bank and in Gaza: that is the tragic toll over the past few days. It is a vivid demonstration of what the Israeli occupiers are in actual fact bringing to the Palestinian people: tears, blood and destruction.

5. On the other hand, the Israeli military machine is now posed over southern Lebanon; if a halt is not called to that, then in that region too we shall once again witness the blood of innocent people being shed. Therefore, it is the direct duty of the Council to keep under review that question as well. On the whole, the recent stepping up of Israel's aggressive actions in the Middle East has been making the already explosive situation there even more dangerous.

6. The question of Jerusalem is a part of the problem of the Israeli occupation. Since the Israeli aggression against the Arab States in June 1967, the Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly adopted resolutions condemning Israel's actions designed to bring about a change in the status of that city. Those resolutions have been based on the important principle that the Israeli occupation is illegal. All those documents contain a demand that Israel take no arbitrary action in the occupied eastern part of Jerusalem. But in spite of that, Tel Aviv has proceeded along the same course of its planned and open policy of arbitrary rule in regard to Jerusalem, and indeed in regard to all the occupied Arab territories.

7. The clumsy attempts by the Israeli authorities today to evade responsibility for the new flagrant acts of vandalism in Jerusalem, through references to the actions of what they claim is a lone mentally deranged person, cannot possibly mislead anyone. After all, if we are to call things by their proper names, this is an act of terrorism. It was committed by a soldier of the Israeli army of occupation under cover provided by other Israeli soldiers. That is the real point: this was an act carried out by a terrorist under cover provided by other terrorists.

8. It is quite clear that these recent events are one further consequence of the fact that the Israeli occupiers continue to lord it over Arab territory, and are a result of the policy of terror and violence elevated to the status of Israeli State policy.

9. Equal responsibility also lies with the overseas protectors of Israel. Their assistance and support have alone permitted Israel to keep the territories of others under the yoke of occupation. It is precisely that assistance from the United States, which has now openly taken on the role of the strategic ally of Tel Aviv, that has given Israel the ability and the means to implement in the Middle East its expansionist designs against Arab lands, to assault the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring States and, finally, unabashedly to disregard the will of the international community. It is precisely because of the complicity of the United States here in the Security Council

that it has been impossible to take the necessary measures against the arbitrary rule of the Israeli occupiers in order to halt the annexationist ambitions of Israel.

10. The delegation of the Soviet Union believes that Israel must be vigorously condemned for its most recent inadmissible actions in the occupied Arab territories. At the same time, today—like yesterday, and indeed tomorrow and until the time when a solution is arrived at—we must bear in mind the most important thing: the whole problem that has arisen in connection with the occupation by Israel in June 1967 of Arab lands is urgently awaiting a solution. We must bring about the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories. We must implement fully the inalienable national right of the Arab people of Palestine to its own State. Without that, there cannot and will not be a just, and hence lasting, peace in the Middle East.

11. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The level of oppression, of wanton shooting at innocent children, women and men, and of other forms of savagery continues unabated in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories. Curfews which have been imposed for a whole week across the length and breadth of the occupied territories—and in the case of the Golan Heights for almost 10 weeks now—are still in force and have inflicted untold suffering, particularly in villages and refugee camps whose inhabitants are surviving from day to day. This situation is depriving them of water supplies and basic sustenance and even bringing their lives to a total standstill. Any child, woman or man who ventures out of his dwelling is immediately shot at and wounded, as we have seen from the newspapers and other media here and as we have been informed in far greater detail by our own people in the occupied territories. Indeed, we have received several appeals addressed to the United Nations that something be done about the carnage.

12. In the *Jerusalem Post* of 14 March, we find something very germane to our discussion, something which shows how deceitful the Israeli representative has been here in trying to convey to the Council the impression that the abominable act at Holy Places in Jerusalem was the work of a lone deranged soldier. Here is what that Israeli newspaper wrote:

“The Israeli Government has decided to issue commemorative stamps in honour of Eliahu Betzouri and Eliahu Hakim, who assassinated Great Britain's Minister of State, Lord Moyne, in 1944, and Ben-Joseph, who shot at a bus full of Arab civilians—men, women and children—at Rosh Pina in 1938.”

13. In a letter published in the same newspaper, two Jewish Israeli women commented:

“It is hard to see how anything but a double standard allows us to elevate Ben-Joseph to the status of martyred hero while we designate Palestinian would-be killers as murderous terrorists.”

14. I have received a message dated 29 March from Mrs. Ruth Blau, the widow of a well-known rabbi of Natorei Karta of the Orthodox Jewry. I think that message gives a clear picture of how real Jews feel about what is happening. She addressed it to me and asked me to read it out to the Council. I shall now do so:

“The events taking place nowadays in the Middle East in general and the Holy Land in particular bring back to my mind”—and that was written by her late husband—“memories of my youth in France when the European leaders’ failure to realize the situation was bringing Europe and the world to disaster.

“From 1936 the French socialists were running the country while, next door, Hitler, the ‘Fuehrer’ of a super-race, was preparing the conquest of Europe. He nevertheless always announced his ideas, his ambitions and his plans and the Jews, whose sole existence was, according to him, a danger to the ‘Great Germany’ to be, were turned into the universal enemies of the Germans and even of the world.

“Hitler’s plan was expounded in *Mein Kampf* and he continuously threatened the whole world in his speeches. Some leaders apparently did not take his threats seriously; some were impressed by his strong will; others, maybe, tried to show him some friendship to quiet down the irascible leader. The result was that Hitler swallowed the countries of Central and Eastern Europe one after the other; then France was invaded and occupied within a few days by Hitler’s army and his fifth column.

“The four years France was occupied by the Nazis was a long nightmare. De Gaulle led the fight from outside the country and the French Resistance was organized inside. Those patriots were labeled ‘terrorists’ by the Germans. I was, without a gun, a member of that underground movement.

“A Zionist State has been created in 1948 in the Holy Land against the will of God and against the will of a great part of His creatures. The main thing for its leaders afterwards has been the building of the ‘Great Israel’.

“If Hitler wrote one book, *Mein Kampf*, to explain his Nazi ideas, there are a lot of Zionist books explaining Zionist ideals and ambitions and from the Israeli Parliament insults and threats are now raining on Western leaders’ heads when they do not agree completely with Israeli leaders whose policies are based on hatred of the Arabs, whom they have turned into the universal enemies of the Jews.

“After the six-day war, Moshe Dayan made a statement which was reported in *The Times* of London on 25 June 1969:

“ ‘Our fathers have reached the frontiers which were recognized in the partition plan. Our generation reached the frontiers of 1949.’ ”

I might add here that the Israelis did not hesitate to gobble up lands after the signing of the General Armistice Agreement—’ including the city of Eilat itself, which is the Palestinian port of Um-al-Rashrash. They also occupied parts of Al Oja Al Hafir between Palestine and Egypt and the demilitarized zones between Syria and Israel, and other places. I now continue Moshe Dayan’s statement:

“ ‘Now the six-day generation has managed to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights. That is not the end. After the present cease-fire lines there will be new ones. They will extend beyond Jordan—perhaps to Lebanon and perhaps to central Syria as well.’ ”

“An extract from his book, *A Soldier Reflects On Peace Hopes* was published in the *Middle East Reader*—New York, Pegasus, 1969. This was a speech of Moshe Dayan to the graduates of a cadet school.

“ ‘The Arabs do not agree to our venture. If we want to continue our work in Eretz Yisrael against their desires, there is no alternative but that lives should be lost. It is our destiny to be in a state of continual warfare with the Arabs. This situation may well be undesirable, but such is the reality.’ ”

“Yoram Bar Porath, a writer in the Israeli newspaper *Idiot Acharonot*, wrote on 14 July 1972:

“ ‘It is a duty of the Israeli leaders to explain to the public with clarity and courage a number of facts that have been submerged with the passage of time. The first of these is the fact that there is no zionism, settlement or Jewish State without eviction of the Arabs and expropriation of their land.’ ”

“Yoel Marcus wrote in *Ha’aretz* on 25 March 1975 the following:

“ ‘We shall have to mobilize American Jewry’ ”—

indeed there is an article in today’s *New York Times* by a prominent American, in which, with anguish, he asks American Jewry to raise their voices about the misdeeds which Menachem Begin is perpetrating and which are tarnishing the name of world Jewry throughout the world. I shall continue the quotation:

“ ‘We shall have to mobilize American Jewry, still a powerful voice. . . We shall have to explain again and again that a strong Israel is not only in the American interest, but also still the only

way to convince the Arabs to find some form of coexistence with her. We must make clear—and first of all to ourselves—that we do not necessarily intend to play according to Arab rules. We shall determine which Arab move is, from our point of view, a *casus belli* and at what point we shall play the game differently from the way the others expect us to. If the free world is frightened and the West is in the process of decline, it may be that we have a number of means available to terrorize it more than the Arabs would. A word to the wise is enough.'

''Why do people refuse to learn from the lessons of the past? Why do they close their eyes before the real danger while they mobilize all their energies to protect themselves against an eventual, more remote, danger—that one which may precisely proceed from the danger against which they remain inactive? On the way to Auschwitz, a Jew asked Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Ehrenreich, the Shimloer Rav, why the Holy One—blessed be He—had let this catastrophe fall upon the Jews of Europe. He answered him, 'We are punished because we did not fight the Zionists enough' ''—

I think I need hardly state that there were throughout the Second World War connections between certain agents of the Jewish Agency and the Gestapo which included acquiescence in the persecution of Jews to make them leave the land even before Hitler decided to commit his abominable act of total genocide. This is documented and available. I continue the quotation:

''It is dangerous for everybody to let a people, under the circumstances the Palestinian people, who have suffered for more than three decades, sink into despair. The story of Samson, a Jewish judge at the time covered by the Bible, should be meditated upon nowadays. His unfaithful wife cut his hair while he was asleep after she had heard from him that his physical strength came from his hair, and she delivered him into the hands of his enemies. They put out his eyes and threw him into a prison. But his hair grew again and with it he regained his formidable strength. A prisoner and a blind man, condemned to live for ever in darkness, Samson knew that there was no hope for him in the future. And one day, as he was brought into his enemies' temple to divert them, he asked to be guided to its centre. There he embraced the two main pillars of the idolaters' temple, which crumbled upon him and upon the people crowded in it.

''Egoism, the lack of justice and comprehension of the Western nations, as well as the division of the Arabs and consequently their inaction, are giving the evil side 90 per cent of its strength. If, as a result of such short-sighted policies, the Middle East—and may God preserve us—will become one of the foreseeable future Viet Nams in the world, and I am afraid the largest one, the only valid answer to the

reason for this new catastrophe will be exactly that one given by the holy Rabbi on the way to the death camp.

''It is in the hands of human beings, partners of God in this world, either to bring its destruction or to help for its redemption. Both lack of responsibility and lack of clairvoyance of the European and American leaders before the Second World War have cost tens of millions of human lives and caused a tremendous lot of suffering, when the only way to prevent such a disaster would have been to stop the evil, by all means, at the beginning. In this atom-bomb age, we are now all of us, together, rich or poor, powerful or not, on the brink of an abyss. Will these leaders of nowadays continue to clear their conscience by only 'observing the events with uneasiness' on the television, make speeches and never take action until all the new Fascists, Nazis, racists of this generation bring the whole world to its complete collapse?

''The prophets of Israel have undoubtedly announced the Jews' return to the Holy Land, at the hands of God and at the end of the times, but it is no less true that the redemption promised to the Jews is also that of the whole world:

'' . . .

''According to Sforno, and conforming to the interpretation of Isaiah's sentence: 'and the righteous will inherit the land', the Patriarch's posterity is his inheritance which became that of all of mankind and which, at the coming of the Redeemer, will extend to the ends of the earth.

''Here we are, once more, according to the Holy Scriptures, quite far away from Zionist theories and the meannesses of a Menachem Begin (Nobel peace prize winner of 1978!) with his settlements established by force, far from his claim to found, physically speaking, the 'Great Israel'.

''These new heavens and earth with its redeemed inhabitants, as described in Isaiah's prophecy 65:17, will be a regenerated, spiritualized world—a world of justice in which all human beings will live in peace, in recovered fraternity. No States, then, no more wars, but the ascent, in crowds, of all the nations to the House of the Unique God acknowledged, at last, by the whole universe.''

The widow of the late Rabbi concludes:

''My dear husband, Rabbi Amram. . . left this world at a time when the Natorei Karta people of New York were arranging for him to speak before the United Nations Assembly when the Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat made his speech, on the condition that he be provided with an international document to travel, since he had no identity papers from

the State of Israel and he would never have accepted to travel with a passport of a State which he did not recognize as legal. Rabbi Amram Blau had agreed to the idea of being away for a short time from the Holy City in which he was born, in his desire to tell the world about the old friendship between Arabs and Jews"—

the friendship I have referred to on many occasions. The quotation continues:

"He would have explained why he wanted to see in Palestine the creation of a State where all its inhabitants, all believers would have lived in peace as in the past. He would have developed with his own words, and certainly more eloquently, what I tried to explain in this letter. "I pray your Excellency to help that a Jewish voice be heard by people of good will."

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

16. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates): I wish at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this body. We are confident that with your well-known skills, you will lead the deliberations of the Council to a fruitful conclusion.

17. The 11th of April 1982 will be recorded as one of the darkest days in the history not only of the Muslim community, but of mankind in general. The sacrilegious attack perpetrated on that dark day against the sanctity of Haram al-Sharif, one of the holiest places of Islam, exemplifies the vulnerability of Jerusalem under Israeli occupation. The sad date of 11 April 1982 brings to mind the similar date of 21 August 1969 when the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem was sent up in flames.

18. The fourth Geneva Convention of 1949,² was concluded with the aim of affording maximum protection to territories under military occupation. Israel, as a party to this Convention and, accordingly, as a military occupier, is obligated to guarantee maximum protection to the Palestinian people and to their resources and their institutions in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem.

19. In the criminal attack on Haram al-Sharif on 11 April, two of these categories were affected, namely, population and institutions. Two persons were murdered in cold blood and scores were wounded. The Dome of the Rock and Al-Aqsa Mosque—two institutions holy to Muslim Palestinians—were subjected to the worst types of sacrilege and profanation, as well as to material and artistic damage. Israel, the military occupier, not only has failed to guarantee maximum protection to these two religious institutions and their worshippers but has even failed to offer them minimum protection.

20. In considering the attack of 11 April, one cannot isolate it from certain contextual factors that preceded and accompanied it. Among the preceding factors are the placement of explosive charges at the entrance of the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the building adjacent to it by the Gush Emunim terrorist group, the deep diggings under the Holy Sanctuary, which are threatening it with collapse, the repeated attempts by various Israeli groups to storm their way into the mosques of the Holy Sanctuary, the repeated threats to blow up the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the liquidation of religious dignitaries.

21. As regards the accompanying factors, we must note the following: first, the ability of the armed culprit Alan Goodman to pass easily through two check-points manned by the Israeli army and then enter the area of the Dome of the Rock; secondly, the cover given him during the attack by the firing from many directions; thirdly, the recent admission by the Israeli authorities that one of the two men killed was hit by a bullet different from that which caused the death of the other victim.

22. This clearly indicates that the crime was committed by more than one person. In its 16 April issue, *The New York Times* stated:

"Reporters and photographers on the scene at the time said they saw two Israeli civilians carrying rifles running from a crowd of stone-throwing Arab demonstrators, and shooting back over their shoulders, after Mr. Goodman had been captured and led away."

23. It was understandable for Israeli spokesmen to describe the criminal, Alan Goodman, as deranged, a description aimed at exonerating the Israeli establishment of any responsibility in the commission of the crime. It is not a novelty for Israelis to resort to distortions and fabrications. Yet we were astonished by the similar description given by Mr. Walter Stoessel, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, on 11 April. He stated, *inter alia*: "According to the information available to us, this was the work of a deranged individual."

24. The insanity of a culprit can be established only in a court of law after a thorough examination of the mass of evidence submitted by expert witnesses. The facts available on the character of Mr. Goodman indicate his full sanity. I shall now quote descriptions of the character of Mr. Goodman given by friends and colleagues of his who know him well. These descriptions were printed in *The New York Times* of 15 April, in an article by its correspondent Mr. David Shribman:

"'He was a very well adjusted guy,' said Ira Albert, a psychologist and one of Mr. Goodman's classmates at Baltimore's City College, an élite public high school. 'If you had to pick one guy who was well adjusted, it was him.'"

The same article states that many of his classmates and friends, "like Robert G. Agus, a Washington lawyer", "could remember only that he was 'a nice, intelligent and reasonably sensitive person.'" According to the same article, Mr. Emory Martinez, who ran the rooming house where Mr. Goodman lived in 1979, stated:

"When I heard it, I could not believe it. It surprised me. I had other people there who would have done stuff like that, but him—I never would have suspected it."

In a court of law such testimony would be considered primary evidence in establishing the sanity of Mr. Goodman.

25. We believe that the United States bears great responsibility for what is happening now in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, including Jerusalem. The unlimited support of the United States for Israel and its commitment to facilitating Jewish immigration—even through denying another country equal treatment with other nations unless it changes its immigration laws to give the Jews special privileges—is ample evidence of that responsibility.

26. It is pertinent here to indicate that Alan Goodman is an American citizen who emigrated to Israel, joined the Israeli army and committed a hideous crime, while Palestinians born in Palestine are denied return to their homes and property.

27. Ironically enough, the only Palestinian whose return was facilitated by the United States was Mr. Ziad Abu Ain. He was handed over to the Israeli authorities on the fallacious and unproven pretext that he had committed an act of violence in Tiberias. It is a well-known fact that Palestinians have been subjected to torture in Israeli prisons and never received a fair trial.

28. My country considers that a resolution of the Council condemning the appalling acts of sacrilege perpetrated within the precincts of Haram al-Sharif and deploring the Israeli failure to protect and safeguard that sanctuary is not sufficient, since it would deal with the symptoms rather than the origin of the problem. To deal with its origin and to prevent the recurrence of similar crimes requires that the Council shoulder its responsibilities as prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations. It requires that a final end be put to the illegal Israeli occupation of Palestine and that the Palestinians be enabled to exercise their inalienable right of self-determination. That is what we expect the Council to do.

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

30. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, when you assumed your respon-

sibilities at the beginning of this month, we thought that would be the end of your troubles for this month. We did not know that it was only the tip of the iceberg. Your predecessor had left you some very unwelcome duties, because your predecessor was not really courageous enough to confront the issue within the powers of the presidency.

31. Be that as it may, we watch television in this city. The main feature these days has been somebody in a bunker in Yamit, in an occupied place, who is threatening to commit suicide. But that is where he has ended up; he wants to be there. Of course, that fellow has illegally occupied the land and established himself there. He is promised maybe \$100,000 or \$300,000 to leave and a nice house in another occupied area near Jerusalem, near Hebron, near Nablus. It has become some sort of merchandise: you occupy a territory and refuse to leave until you make some good dividends on that; it is a good business.

32. On the other hand, there is the destiny and future of a hotel which is built on this or the other side of the municipality line.

33. These are the issues that are really disturbing to the public in this country. The future of 4 million Palestinians does not seem to disturb it. We hear about submarines going to the *Islas Malvinas* or, as my British friends like to call them, the *Falkland Islands*. We hear of sanctions being taken by States—not only by the British, but by their friends—against Argentina. They even avoided the Security Council in taking such measures. And yet we come to the Council with some hope that the United Nations can do some justice and invoke its powers, especially in the Security Council. And we are, of course, faced with lengthy deliberations while people are being killed.

34. We are told it was a solitary maniac, an American citizen, who went there and, the moon over Jerusalem having made him moonstruck, shot at worshippers—perhaps he simply did not like the way they prayed! No, that is not true. Because who in his right mind opens fire at anybody, much less worshippers? And, for that matter, who in his right mind displaces millions of people, turning them out of their homes? Who in his right mind permanently mobilizes 30 per cent of the prime-age population, as the Israelis are doing, and keeps it constantly under arms? Who in his right mind has 60 per cent of the population on reserve and fighting? Who in his right mind would actually drag the Council into meeting on such issues?

35. It is not that they are really maniacs. This is the implementation of a policy—conceived, of course, in a criminal way. Right-thinking people cannot really accept that, but it seems to be a fact. We are dealing with the derivative of a policy of really persistent State terrorism. Shooting at worshippers in the *Al-Aqsa Mosque* is a provocation to and a humiliation of not only the worshippers there, but all people of any faith—not just Muslims.

36. Perhaps it is a good thing that the Muslim world reacted in a sensible way. There was a general strike: that was one way of showing their displeasure and wrath. They came to the Security Council: that was another way. But I must say this: do not tax our patience. There is a limit to the patience of the Muslims, the Christians and the Arabs, and if their wrath and their love and respect for their dignity get the better of them the price will be too high even to describe. The friends of Israel will have to pay their share for the crime to which they are a party.

37. Israel is abusing the hostage called the Government of the United States. I say the United States is a hostage; and it has voluntarily permitted itself to become a complacent and willing hostage. But at what price? At the price of its moral values, at the price of its commitment to the principles of the Charter, and at the price of its commitment to the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights¹ but also at the price of the blood of my brothers in Palestine, at the price of the blood of the Palestinians and the Arabs. This complacency of the Government of the United States is at the expense of international peace and security.

38. Of course I shall not go into the fact that the relationship of the United States with Israel is at the expense of the poor American taxpayer, who is forced to contribute to these acts of State terrorism. His Government is financing these acts of State terrorism. He is an innocent victim of his Government's complicity, its open and direct involvement in the barbaric crimes against my people. But the people of the United States will eventually and inevitably wake up to the reality and seek the remedy in their own way.

39. In the Council, the Government of the United States is duty bound to declare its commitment and position. It is duty bound to reaffirm that the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem has not been changed and that the United States is committed to upholding the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention,² and to reaffirm the applicability of its provisions to occupied Jerusalem. The failure of the United States Government to state that in very clear terms can only be interpreted by us Palestinians, Arabs and Muslims all over the world as a clear and unambiguous commitment of that Government to support and encourage Israel in its policies and practices.

40. On Saturday I received the following message on my telex addressed to the President of the Security Council by Rashad Shawwa, the Mayor of Gaza in occupied Palestine—our people are still appealing:

"I appeal to you to intervene, in the cause of humanity, to alleviate the brutal attacks of the Israeli army on the civilian inhabitants of the occupied Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

"The population here is continuously being oppressed and brutalized by the Israeli army, who

shoot unarmed women and children causing death and injury. The bodies of those killed are often denied proper funeral services, the injured are often left unattended without medical aid due to curfews imposed on their areas which prevent them from getting to the hospitals which are also under siege by the army.

"Many areas in the Gaza Strip have been under curfew for as long as five days without allowing the inhabitants the opportunity to procure basic necessities to sustain them and their children. This is what is happening at the moment in the town of Rafah where 80,000 inhabitants have been subjected to total curfew for five days.

"The sanctity of the Holy Places is no longer respected, as Israeli soldiers have even attacked the peaceful worshippers with tear gas bombs and bullets.

"Merely to walk in the streets of Gaza has become dangerous as Israeli soldiers pick up children and youths at random, beat them brutally or arrest them.

"I submit this appeal asking you to intervene in order to stop these inhuman attacks on the unarmed and defenceless population. I would ask you to circulate my appeal to the representatives of the major Powers and to urge them to use their influence to save the women, children and the elderly people who are being terrorized every day simply because they seek to regain their freedom and their acknowledged right to self-determination.

"For God's sake act without delay to protect the people of Gaza and the West Bank." [See S/14991.]

41. I add my voice: the Council is duty bound to act. For God's sake act now before it is too late.

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

43. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. With your wide experience and proved diplomatic skill, I have every confidence in your ability to preside over the deliberations of the Council with prudence and to discharge your task with success.

44. I wish also to express our appreciation to Mrs. Kirkpatrick, the representative of the United States, for the excellent manner in which she carried out the duties of President of the Council during the difficult month of March.

45. I welcome the opportunity to speak on the question before the Council because Somalia, a Muslim

State, associates itself unreservedly with other members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in calling on the Council to respond appropriately to Israel's latest betrayal of its responsibilities as an occupying Power.

46. The murderous attack on Muslims at prayer on Easter Sunday and the desecration of the holy precincts of Al-Aqsa Mosque were not isolated incidents. The sense of outrage experienced by Muslims throughout the world was heightened by the knowledge that Israeli policies and actions, which gravely offend Muslim sensibilities, have been carried out in the area of Haram al-Sharif ever since it came under Israeli military control.

47. It will be remembered that, early in the Israeli occupation, places of worship and structures having religious significance for Muslims were demolished in order to clear the area in front of the Wailing Wall. Also since 1968, archaeological excavations in the area of Al-Aqsa Mosque, which are likely to damage its foundations, have continued, despite the protests of Muslims all over the world. Furthermore, it will be recalled that the attempt to burn the Al-Aqsa Mosque itself in 1969, as in the case of the incident we are considering today, gave rise to widespread demonstrations in every Muslim country to protest against that sacrilegious action.

48. All these incidents are symptoms of Israel's expansionist policies and of its contempt for the Arab people under its illegal occupation. Whether we consider East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, which have been openly annexed in flagrant violation of international law, or the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which are being subjected to creeping annexation, we see an expansionist drive that tramples on the inalienable political rights, the cultural and ethnic identity and the religious rights of the people of the occupied territories.

49. The Judaization of the West Bank and of Jerusalem through a policy of Jewish settlement and Arab dispossession is a process that has been going on since 1967. The dismissal of the democratically elected mayors of the West Bank by a country which falsely claims to be the sole democracy in the Middle East and their replacement by discredited non-entities is another aspect of the same process of annexation and dispossession, as is the establishment of village leagues, which are designed to strengthen Israeli control.

50. The various aspects of the Israeli presence in the Middle East which I have touched upon have direct relevance to the incident under consideration. That incident is necessarily linked to the question of the status of Jerusalem and indeed to the whole situation arising from Israel's continued illegal occupation of Arab lands. It is also unquestionably linked to Israel's persistent colonialism, its intransigent flouting of the

Geneva Conventions of 1949 and its disregard for the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

51. The desecration of Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock on 11 April arose from the example set by a callous régime which routinely imprisons children or even shoots them to death and which demolishes the homes of their parents on the basis of unproven suspicions. Clearly, the despicable act being debated here today was encouraged and abetted by the arrogant contempt of the Israeli régime for human rights and for international law. This violent incident, therefore, provides a compelling reason for the Council to direct its strongest condemnation against Israel for its dangerous and inhuman policies.

52. But condemnation alone is not enough. Since Israel has betrayed its responsibilities as occupying Power to protect the historic shrines and places of worship in Jerusalem, I believe that the time has come for the Council to demand and to insist upon the restoration to the City of its international status as a *corpus separatum*. In the interests of international peace and security, it is of the utmost importance that Israel should be prevailed upon to relinquish its illegal occupation of Jerusalem. Only then can there be an end to the desecration of the Holy City and the forcible alteration of its demographic character. The Council cannot fail this time round in the discharge of its obligations to the Holy City and to its indigenous inhabitants.

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

54. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): Sir, allow me, first of all, to convey to you my warmest congratulations, and those of my delegation, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I am confident that, with your well proven competence and vast experience in diplomacy, the current debates of the Council under your able guidance will be concluded with the achievement of successful results compatible with the aspirations of all freedom- and peace-loving nations.

55. My congratulations go, as well, to your predecessor, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, for the excellent manner in which she handled the deliberations of the Council last month.

56. I should also like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in the discussion of the question before it.

57. The Council is once again determined to confront yet another challenge in regard to its task of maintaining international peace and security: a serious

challenge to its credibility in the serious affair of preserving international peace and security.

58. We trust—as we have always done—in the ability of the Council diligently to discharge its responsibilities for preserving international peace and security; yet at times our confidence is utterly shaken to the point of exasperation when the Council frustrates its own objectives and ideals and fails to take full responsibility for preserving international peace and security.

59. The creation of Israel and its régimes that have emerged since then become a diabolical phenomenon of dangerous confrontation to the Council. No nation in the whole world has violated in so many ways the moral code of conduct and international law and order in international relations and has thus been condemned by so many resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other international forums as has Zionist Israel since its inception.

60. The creation of Israel has become, ever since, a *fait accompli* instrument of war: a war of attrition; of political, economic and spiritual unrest and annihilation; an instrument of war implanted in the Middle East to exterminate the economic, human and spiritual resources not only of the Palestinians but of the Arab and other Islamic nations of the Middle East and beyond.

61. Unfortunately, in these circumstances, the Council has been left in suspense and has become accustomed, over the past 35 years, to hearing complaints about the unacceptable behaviour of Israeli forces and their ill-treatment of Palestinian civilian inhabitants of occupied Arab land. The Council has been warned about the consequences of the provocative acts of Israeli aggression and the escalation of tension in the Middle East. It is unfortunate that the Council, in spite of all these warnings, has not been able to take the necessary action to safeguard the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people in a manner compatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

62. It was not long ago that the Council failed to adopt the draft resolution in document S/14943, of 1 April 1982, which called on Israel:

“to rescind its decision of disbanding the elected municipal council of Al-Bireh and its decision to remove from their posts the Mayors of Nablus and Ramallah”,

as well as:

“to cease forthwith all measures applied in the West Bank, including Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights, which contravene the provisions of . . . [the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949].”

63. The failure of that draft resolution, and of others before it, has obviously led to the tragic incident whose occurrence has marked yet another phase in which the Zionist entity, in its defiance of and contempt for the international community, has committed sacrilegious acts of aggression against the Holy Places in the Holy City of Jerusalem and has thus added a dangerous precedent to its hideous record of atrocities perpetrated against the Palestinian people and other Arab inhabitants of the occupied Arab lands. The Council's current debates should bring out in the open the sinister intentions of Zionist Israel, in the light of the renewed escalation of terror and violence against the Palestinian civilian population; the Council should seriously ponder, in clear conscience, the extent to which the lawlessness and unrestricted defiance of the State of Israel might take the world closer to the brink of dangerous confrontation, which could grow to international dimensions. What we expect of the Council is that it deal with the serious matter before it in a manner more propitious for and conducive to the establishment of peace and security in the Middle East.

64. The shooting incident, and the wanton killing of the two Palestinian civilian worshippers in the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock in Haram al-Sharif, followed by the shooting spree by Israeli soldiers against the Arab worshippers in the midst of their deep prayers, leaving over 100 wounded victims inside the holy mosque, have struck the Muslim communities throughout the world with anger, revulsion and indignation.

65. These sacrilegious acts perpetrated against the Muslim Holy Places in the Holy City of Jerusalem cannot be overlooked as an act of lunacy committed by a deranged individual. It is inconceivable that a sophisticated military establishment such as that of Israel would put an instrument of death into the hands of someone whose physical and mental condition had not been ascertained through prior routine check-ups.

66. The criminal in question was a normal Israeli soldier. Now, if we accept for a moment that he was deranged and that he lost his sanity just one second before he started shooting, how can we justify the outrageous acts of the Israeli soldiers who threw tear-gas canisters at the worshippers for no justifiable reason other than to make a laughing stock of a religion to which 900 million Muslims adhere?

67. It is extremely ironic that the shameful incidents of trigger-happy Israeli soldiers laughing at the wounded Arab worshippers in their agony of pain resulting from the shooting spree in Haram al-Sharif reminded us of the sadistic bouts of laughter and amusement of the Nazi Germans at the sight of their victims being exterminated in the infamous gas chambers.

68. Zionist Israel has seriously and wilfully betrayed the principles enshrined in the proclamation regarding

the protection of the Holy Places. At this point I cannot help relating to the members of this body a worthy example of the excellence of the Islamic tradition when it comes to respect for and protection of Holy Places.

69. When the Holy City of Jerusalem came under Muslim rule 1,344 years ago, the Muslims set an example that can be a source of inspiration for mankind. When the conquering Muslim armies were at the gates of the Holy City, they gave the defenders of the city the option of putting themselves under the protection of Islam. They accepted that proposal on the condition that the Khalifah in person come to ratify the peace treaty. That Khalifah was Omer Ibn Al-Khattab, the second of the four Khalifahs. In accordance with that condition, the Khalifah went to the Holy City to fulfil the commitment. It happened that the meeting took place in a church, and when the Khalifah noticed that it was time for prayers he took his leave and went out to fulfil his religious obligations. When he returned he was asked why he had not performed his prayers in the church. He replied that he could have done so, were it not for fear that Muslims after him might arrogate to themselves the right to make use of places of worship belonging to other faiths on the pretext that the Khalifah had done so before them.

70. That was the kind of justice that the Muslims brought with them, not only to Jerusalem, but to every country that came under their rule. For the first time in the history of mankind new elements—tolerance and respect for human rights—were introduced, at a time when the state of mind of nations was reflected in the dictum, "woe to the vanquished".

71. The Muslims of the world cannot accept that the profane act of violence inflicted on Haram al-Sharif was an isolated incident committed by a deranged individual. Rather it is the beginning of a dangerous exploit and a premeditated pattern of behaviour aimed at demolishing the holy shrines of Haram al-Sharif and other spiritual and cultural institutions in the Holy City of Arab Jerusalem.

72. It was against the background of these infamous acts of aggression perpetrated against the holy shrines of Haram al-Sharif that Muslim nations throughout the world, in their outrage, made the solemn declaration of last Wednesday, 14 April, as a day of solidarity with the Palestinian people. In response to that declaration, the President and head of Government of the Republic of Djibouti, El Haj Hassan Gouled Aptidon, decreed that

"In view of the sacrilegious attack perpetrated against the Al-Aqsa Mosque and other sacred places of Islam by the Zionists, Wednesday, 14 April 1982, will be observed throughout the territory of the Republic of Djibouti as a solemn day of reaffirmation of solidarity with the Palestinian people,

and all public and private sectors will be closed for the day."

President Hassan Gouled especially called upon all the faithful of the world to pray that the souls of the martyrs should rest in eternal peace.

73. We are not participating in this debate "to fan the flames of religious hatred and incitement", as has been alleged on several occasions here in the Council, but in fact to voice our outrage and apprehension at the alarming developments in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, and to condemn the despicable act of sacrilege inflicted on the holy shrines of Haram al-Sharif.

74. These recent incidents and others preceding them have all revealed the Zionist plan to annihilate the Arabs and their institutions. They have exposed the Zionist intention to annex the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and other parts of the occupied Arab lands. We are confident that these premeditated designs—no matter who may nurture them—are certainly doomed to failure. We believe that no power on earth can liquidate the Palestinian cause, for unlike Zionist Israel, the Palestinian people have never been bankrupt of their spiritual might and moral courage.

75. The whole world should reject outright the blatant implementation of the Zionist entity's policy of absorbing and annexing the occupied Arab lands. We all know that that plan has been in operation ever since the State of Israel was created. The prevalence and perpetration of widespread violence and a reign of terror; the annexation of Arab lands; the creation of new Jewish settlements with the simultaneous expulsion and deportation of the indigenous Arab residents along with the forcible transfer of their property and their eviction from their homes; the arming and enlistment into the reservist army of the Jewish settlers by the Israeli authorities; the armed incitement of those settlers against the indigenous Arab population; the sacrilegious acts, including the desecration of the Al-Aqsa Mosque; and the profane murder in cold blood of the worshippers in their deep veneration in the Haram al-Sharif: these are but a few of the acts which are leading to the implementation of the eventual annexation of all the occupied Arab lands.

76. The people and Government of the Republic of Djibouti hail the struggle of the Palestinian people, who in their heroic confrontation with the Israeli conspiracies have chosen not to yield to repressive methods, but to continue to shoulder their responsibilities and to foil the Israeli scheme.

77. We reaffirm and pledge our solidarity with and full support for the Palestinian people and the PLO, the sole representative of the Palestinian people, in their righteous struggle for their national legitimate rights, including their right to self-determination and the

establishment of an independent State of Palestine in Palestinian territory.

78. In conclusion, it is high time that the Council shouldered its grave responsibility by taking quick and effective action in arresting any further deterioration of the situation in the Middle East and by ensuring that Palestinian and other Arab rights in the occupied Arab land are not violated.

79. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel.

80. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The statements of the representative of Jordan are becoming increasingly bizarre. Today we have been treated to a welcome innovation. We have been privileged to enjoy his valuable theological insights, with which he interspersed his statement today.

81. Last Friday he posed here as the protector and defender of General Assembly resolution 181 (II). Of course, I could not spare him slight embarrassment when I pointed out that it was his country, in conjunction with other countries, that destroyed, through armed aggression, resolution 181 (II). I also had occasion last Friday to mention some of the statements made in the Council in 1948 condemning Transjordanian aggression [2355th meeting, paras. 95 to 98].

82. Well, the representative of Jordan is undaunted. He has carried his attempt to falsify history one step further today. Last Friday he posed as the defender of the resolution which his country helped to destroy; today he complained of Israel's presence in Eilat, which is located within the territory projected as Israel under the said resolution. Be that as it may, it is high time that we expose these attempts of the representative of Jordan to masquerade here and that we state the case very clearly.

83. The aggression committed by Transjordan and other countries in 1948 was successful in destroying resolution 181 (II). But it failed in its other avowed purpose, namely, that of crushing the State of Israel. However, the fact that the Arab States failed in their armed aggression aimed at destroying Israel does not legitimize their violation of international law. At the same time, that armed aggression precludes them from now invoking in any form the benefits of the General Assembly resolution which they both rejected and destroyed by force of arms.

84. We have also been treated today to a statement by the representative of the Soviet Union, who has joined the list of bigots who have sponsored this debate. I welcome his participation because it puts this entire exercise in its proper perspective. I for one could not fail to be moved by the display of concern of the representative of the Soviet Union for the sanctity of holy places. After all, his country has an enviable record in preserving holy places all around the Soviet Union.

I know, of course, that the Soviet Constitution guarantees freedom of religion—but, then, it also guarantees freedom of expression, freedom of association, freedom of movement, and virtually all basic freedoms.

85. Incidentally, the Soviet Constitution also introduces the right to conduct atheistic propaganda while it prohibits the right to reply to such propaganda or even to conduct religious education for children and young people. In effect, this means that there is a constant bombardment of anti-religious propaganda, to which no redress is even available. How does this work out in practice? Well, over the years the Soviet Union has closed tens of thousands of churches, synagogues and mosques. At best, they are used as barns or stables; at worst, as museums of atheism.

86. For instance, those who have been to the former Cathedral of St. Isaac in Leningrad know what has happened to that Christian holy place. Those who have been to the former Khazan Cathedral in Leningrad know what has happened to that holy place; it is a museum of atheism.

87. The Muslims of the Soviet Union have not fared any better. There are about 50 million of them—one of the largest Muslim communities in the world. But the number of trained ulema—that is, Muslim religious clergy—is derisively low. There are only two *medresses*—theological colleges—one of which provides the equivalent of secondary school education, though boys can enter only after completing their military service, and the other providing supposedly higher Muslim theological education. Students are not accepted every year and the total student population of these *medresses* for the six-year course is about 70 young men each. The essential qualification for entry is a good knowledge of Arabic, something which is extremely difficult to acquire outside the *medresse* since there are very few people who now know this language in Central Asia and, religious education being banned, none of the ulema dare take the risk of teaching it.

88. Now, what has happened to the mosques in the Soviet Union? There were about 25,000 mosques in the Soviet Union 60 years ago. There are 398 left—so-called working mosques—despite the fact that the Muslim population has increased considerably over the past 60 years. Religious publications are almost non-existent and copies of the Koran are in very short supply.

89. If the representative of the Soviet Union wants to check on my figures, I have the honour to refer him to an article published in a book entitled *Religion in Communist Lands*, 1979; that article is by A. Benningsen and Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejeay, entitled "Official Islam in the Soviet Union".

90. So again we have been treated here today to a manifestation of Soviet cynicism which is all too well known.

91. I understand that it is much more convenient for the representative of the Soviet Union to keep the Council busy with alleged desecrations of Holy Places in other parts of the world rather than have it discuss the situation in Kampuchea or the activities of Soviet-Cuban mercenaries in various parts of Africa or the situation in Poland or, for that matter, in Afghanistan. How many mosques, Mr. Ovinnikov, has the Soviet army of occupation destroyed in Afghanistan over the past two years? Could you oblige the Council by enlightening us on that and other relevant facts before leaping into this debate as the protector of Holy Places?

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization who wishes to make a statement in reply and on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

93. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I wonder how anyone can dare speak about religion when the fundamentals of the teachings of zionism all refer to Our Redeemer as the Beautiful Dreamer who came from Nazareth to Jerusalem to sow the seeds of hatred. This is what Herzl, the founder of zionism, did.

94. I wonder how many of us know that in the textbooks in Israel now the plus sign has been changed into an inverted "t" simply because it looks like a cross. It is a shame that anyone would still have the audacity to come here and speak about religion when even the cross-like plus sign, which is used all over the world and has been for centuries, has been removed and replaced by an inverted "t". This is very Orwellian, I must admit. But at least Orwell used the "t" properly and not inverted.

95. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel, Mr. Blum, responding to the Soviet representative used the tactic which amounts to telling the adversary that he is a fool. It is not a very elegant device. But that is not the point. The point is that the one resorting to this as part of his equipment is in practice virtually confessing that not everything is in order in his own house.

96. Now, what did the representative of Israel say in substance about the arguments contained in the Soviet statement? He did not say anything at all, not a single word. He simply avoided the issue. In our statement we said that recent actions of the Israeli occupying authorities had led to dozens of newly dead and wounded Palestinians. I do not think that the representative of Israel denied that fact and I doubt that he can deny it. He simply avoided mentioning it.

97. The Soviet statement said that the reason for the existing tension in the Middle East was the continued occupation by Israel of Arab lands. That is the root of all evil. Did the Israeli representative say anything

about the Israeli occupation—that it might end soon, that it is inhuman? No, he passed over it in silence.

98. The representative of Israel does not like Soviet representatives speaking in support of the just cause of the Arab peoples. But we do not do it because we dislike the internal situation in Israel itself. We might not agree with it, but that is the business of Israel itself. What we are against is Israel as an aggressive State, a State that is pursuing annexationist policies in the Middle East. We oppose aggression; we oppose the aggressor and we defend the victims of aggression. Soviet policy with regard to a political settlement in the Middle East is clear and comprehensible. We have repeatedly set it forth and I can state it once again, particularly for the personal attention of Mr. Blum.

99. It has three elements; first, total withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories; secondly, the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to the creation of its own State; and thirdly, respect for the rights of all States in that region to live in peace.

100. That policy recognizes the right of Israel also to exist. However, Israel does not want to acknowledge the right of the Palestinians to exist, the right to have their own State. Israel does not want to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab territories. That is the essence of the problem.

101. Therefore I must reassure the representative of Israel. I can tell him that there is a simple and very effective means of putting an end to statements, not only on the part of the Soviet representative but also on the part of many other representatives, against the expansionist policy of Israel. To do this it would be enough for Israel to withdraw all its troops from the occupied Arab territories and to ensure implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine. Is Israel ready to do this or not? I should like the representative of Israel to answer that question.

102. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Before I speak in exercise of my right of reply, I wish to elaborate on some statements that I made earlier. Indeed, it is my solemn duty to do so, having received messages from the beleaguered Palestinian and other Arab peoples asking me to address an appeal to the Security Council in their hour of need.

103. I think we are all aware that the Israeli troops and armed settlers—those armed settlers being the very same people who took over, usurped and confiscated the remnants of the Palestinian homeland and continue doing so, to the point where they now have almost 40 per cent of it—are enjoying the spring hunting season, literally. The only difference is that the hunted are not certain animal species. And not all animal species are accepted as being the objects of hunting. I am talking about those that are.

104. Those that are being hunted are mainly Palestinian children between the ages of 6 and 16. They are totally unarmed and without any means of defence. I have received numerous appeals and reports, one of which is from Mr. Paul Ajlouni of Jerusalem, a journalist, and which describes how armed Israeli settlers, aided and abetted by the official Israeli occupation authorities, have been behaving towards the beleaguered Palestinian people. Up to this moment, the reports of authoritative eyewitnesses describe in detail how the Israeli armed forces and armed settlers go to peaceful and serene villages and abduct, beat up and brutalize children. They go regularly, every night, to these villages adjacent to the settlements in which they have implanted themselves. They round up the children and elderly men and women, take them to the adjacent illegal settlement and force them, as the point of a gun, to spend the whole night in the open without cover, without provisions and without water. Such acts are being perpetrated every night.

105. After enumerating many of the acts during the hunting spree, Mr. Ajlouni describes how the Israeli troops even break into hospitals and clinics, to prevent them from attending to the wounded. Indeed, at one hospital Israeli troops attacked the few doctors still available in the occupied territories. Such is Israeli Zionist behaviour, which a former member of the Israeli Supreme Court, Mr. Cohen, has described, in commenting on Israeli brutalities in the Golan Heights, as "barbarian behaviour". These are not my words—they are the words of a former member of the Israeli Supreme Court. He would have spoken no less indignantly, I am sure, if he had been commenting on the hunting season of the Zionist Nazi practices and ideology.

106. It is my solemn duty to convey to the Council these reports about the unspeakable savagery to which the Palestinian and Arab peoples are being subjected as we are debating today what is happening to them. The Council cannot, and should not, stand idly by while those heinous crimes are being committed.

107. The representative of Israel has again tried to refute what I stated categorically at the last meeting of the Council, namely, that the only legally valid resolutions for a solution to the question of Palestine are General Assembly resolutions 181 (II), which calls for the creation of a Palestinian Arab State, and 194 (III), which mandates the right of every Palestinian refugee to go back to his home, unconditionally, unless he chooses to do otherwise. The Israeli representative has tried to give the Council the impression that it was the Arabs who had aborted the implementation of that resolution. At the expense of having to repeat what I said at the last meeting, let me say that it was the Israelis themselves who, a few days after adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II)—and we know that the General Assembly is the ultimate decision-maker in these matters, particularly when the problem concerns a Trust Territory inherited from the League

of Nations, even though we naturally were unhappy about the dismemberment of our country—by armed force started to implement their plan of taking over the whole of Palestine, when the Palestinian people were totally without arms. There is no question whatsoever about this; in fact, the Israeli leaders, including Mr. Ben-Gurion, were about to reject the partition plan but were advised that the Arabs had no choice but to protest the dismemberment of their country.

108. But what are we talking about here? We are talking about the Palestinian people, and I would repeat what I said at an earlier meeting—that the Palestinian people were not given the chance, either through an election or a plebiscite or in any other manner, to express their views on the resolutions of the General Assembly. It was the Israeli representative—either the Permanent Representative Mr. Eban or possibly the Minister for Foreign Affairs (I do not exactly remember)—who said before the Assembly that General Assembly resolutions are normally recommendations which are not binding, but that what we are dealing with here is a Trust Territory, and a Trust Territory has a unique status and we therefore declare before the Assembly that we shall adhere to and respect the General Assembly resolutions.

109. Whatever subsequent resolutions may have been adopted—and there have been tons of resolutions, including Security Council resolution 242 (1967)—to end the consequences of Israeli aggression in 1967, there is no authority which can invalidate a General Assembly resolution which is still on the books, whether it is 181 (II) or 194 (III), resolutions which we reiterate every year. It is therefore not the Palestinians who aborted the implementation of those resolutions; it was the Israeli military machine, which managed to occupy four fifths of Palestine, even while the troops of the United Kingdom, the mandatory Power, were still in the country. And they had no plans whatsoever to stop at the level of four fifths.

110. They continued their aggression against the remaining one fifth. And that was what compelled small contingents of the Arab armies to go into the country after the departure of the British—to save the remnants, this one fifth, of Palestine from the massacres to which the other four fifths had been subjected and which had resulted in the expulsion of the vast majority of the inhabitants of Palestine, who owned at least 94 per cent of the lands and territory there.

111. In my last statement I mentioned some of the cities and towns which were 100 per cent Palestinian and which would have been a part of the Palestinian Arab State. In fact, a corridor to the city of Jaffa was suggested. It was 100 per cent Arab; the city of Lydda was 100 per cent Arab; the cities of Ramla, Susta, Tiberias were overwhelmingly Palestinian, as were two thirds of West Jerusalem, in addition to what is now called Arab Jerusalem; and many more—for instance,

Ashkelon. But I need not go further with this enumeration of cities, towns and villages.

112. The Israeli representative thought that he had caught me in a serious error when he talked about Eilat, or Um-al-Rashrash, having been seized after the General Armistice Agreement. Let me remind him that in its last clause the General Armistice Agreement specifically states that it is being concluded without prejudice to the ultimate solution of the Palestine problem.

113. The acid test came in 1949, when the Palestine Conciliation Commission was set up by the United Nations [*General Assembly resolution 194 (III)*]. They had long meetings in Lausanne⁴ in an effort to resolve the Palestinian issue on the basis of the General Assembly resolution, and the Protocol⁵ was initialled by the Arab States, including some Palestinian leaders.

114. The Israeli delegation, having initialled those Protocols, which could have solved this problem more than 30 years ago, reneged. A Palestinian member of one of the Arab delegations came to a Jewish friend, whom he knew very well, in Haifa, and said to him, "What is happening?" His Jewish friend told him, "My dear friend, every time we tell the old man about a return of territory or the return of a single refugee, his eyes turn red." He was talking about the late Mr. Ben Gurion. It was therefore inadmissible—and this has nothing to do with whether Um-al-Rashrash, or Eilat, was within the proposed Palestinian State or the Israeli State; I shall look into that—to capture it by force after the signature of the General Armistice Agreement. Otherwise, all the towns, villages, lands and so on should have been returned simultaneously. It was a violation of the General Armistice Agreement.

115. I hope that the members of the Council know that the facts as I have stated them are the truth and nothing but the truth.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before the representative of Israel speaks in exercise of his right of reply, I call upon the representative of Spain on a point of order.

117. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I apologize to the representative of Israel, but I should like to know how many times—two, three, or four—the right of reply can be exercised in the Council. It seems to me that according to the rules we do not have the right to continue making statements in exercise of the right of reply. We are hearing new statements now; these are not, strictly speaking, statements made in exercise of the right of reply. I must therefore conclude that the debate has not yet ended. All those who wish to make new statements should inscribe their names on the speakers' list, and we can hear them at another meeting. I think that what we are hearing now are actually new statements; we are not confining ourselves to exercising the right of

reply. That was all I wanted to say to the Council. The President must rule as he sees fit.

118. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are no other names on my list of speakers. The Council is still seized of the matter and this is not our last meeting. Members of the Council and others participating in the discussions can of course speak at subsequent meetings. We shall now continue hearing representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

119. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of Jordan has again subjected us to his fanciful "facts". To give just one example, he alleged that Israel took control of Eilat after the coming into effect of the General Armistice Agreement between Jordan and Israel of 1949. But the real facts are somewhat different.

120. The Armistice Agreement between our two countries was signed in April—I believe on 3 April. Israel took control of Eilat in March—I believe on the 17th. I speak without documentation, but I am positive that Israel's taking control of Eilat occurred in March. The Armistice Agreement was concluded in April. So much for the "facts" of the representative of Jordan.

121. In his first statement today, the representative of the Soviet Union posed as the protector of holy places, and in his second statement as an apostle of peace.

122. Now, I shall not go into an analysis of the peaceful role of the Soviet Union in various parts of the world. Members are acquainted with that role. But as far as the Middle East is concerned, I think I owe him a few words.

123. Mr. Ovinnikov, a peace treaty was signed some three years ago between Egypt and Israel. What was the Soviet role in welcoming that tremendous step towards peace-making in our region after three decades of warfare and bloodshed? How did the Soviet Union encourage peace-making in our region? Has it ever welcomed that peace treaty? Has it introduced in the Organization any draft resolution calling upon the parties to persevere in their efforts towards reaching a comprehensive peace in the Middle East? Well, you know exactly what the response of your country has been: It has been inciting against peace. It has been lining up opponents to that peace, in keeping with the now traditional role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East over the past three decades of heightening tension, of increasing polarization, of fomenting dissension, of fishing in the troubled waters of the Middle East.

124. That has been the Soviet policy in the Middle East, and it has contributed substantially to every conflagration that we have had in our region since the

early 1950s. There has been no war in the Middle East over the past three decades that has not been preceded by Soviet incitement and Soviet encouragement of aggression. And here you come before the Council today as an apostle of peace in the Middle East.

125. Interestingly enough, you did not say one word about the desecration of 25,000 mosques in the Soviet Union over the past 60 years. You did not say one word about the desecration of mosques in Afghanistan by the Soviet army of occupation over the past two years. This, to follow your logic, must clearly be an admission of guilt on your part, Mr. Ovinnikov.

126. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. Blum wondered why the Soviet Union did not support, as he put it, the peace treaty on the Middle East. Well, I am ready to answer that question.

127. We did not support the Camp David accords—in fact we were actually against them—because the second part of those accords was a secret understanding that the Arab people of Palestine should not be allowed to implement its right to self-determination, should not have its own State. We categorically disagree with that. That is why we oppose the Camp David accords and the so-called peace treaty—which is in fact a separate treaty.

128. What is noteworthy is that the representative of Israel is speaking endlessly against Soviet statements and engaging in anti-Soviet slander. Is that a coincidence? No, it is not. It is an attempt to divert attention from the essence of the matter. This anti-Soviet slander is being exploited by Israel and its older partner, the United States, so that under cover of that slander they can engage in dirty machinations in the Middle East. We do not have to look very far for examples; I shall give a very concrete one.

129. Only last year, Israel and the United States concluded a treaty on so-called strategic co-operation. It would appear that that treaty was aimed against the Soviet Union. But I should like the representative of Israel to tell us why the effect of that treaty was halted by the United States after Israel committed an act of annexation with regard to an Arab State, Syria.

130. I shall answer that question myself, because anti-Sovietism is just a smokescreen for this so-called strategic co-operation; the actual core of the so-called strategic co-operation agreement in the Middle East is the alliance of Israel and the United States against the Arabs. The United States suspended putting that treaty into effect only because Israel made a too hasty attempt to implement the secret articles of the treaty and placed the United States in an embarrassing position.

131. But those secret agreements are now being implemented before our very eyes. Precisely after

the conclusion of the so-called strategic partnership Israel annexed the Syrian Golan Heights; that was the first step towards the implementation of the secret understanding. At present we witness Israel attempting in fact to annex the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; that is the second stage of the implementation of the secret understanding between the United States and Israel.

132. Therefore, the representative of Israel should not engage in anti-Soviet slander. He will not be able to conceal from anyone, still less from the Arabs, that his policy is aimed against the fundamental interests of the Arab countries, that Israel's policy in the Middle East is one of expansionism and aggression.

133. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are still two speakers on my list. Since it is so late, I intend to adjourn the meeting after we have heard them. Anyone else who wishes to take part in the debate may inscribe his name for a subsequent meeting.

134. I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

135. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Papers and documents should not be misnamed; they should be judged by their effects. The so-called peace treaty, or the framework for peace in the Middle East—usually referred to as the Camp David accords—is nothing but the usurpation of the right of a people, the Palestinian people. That paper, as is known, has 131 lines on the future of the Palestinian people—in the absence of that Palestinian people and against the wishes of that people—and only something like 22 lines about Egypt, the other party to the framework. It is a misnomer.

136. It is a bill of slavery; it is a violation—nay, an attempt at an annulment—of the rights of the Palestinian people. It has facilitated the establishment of bases for the rapid deployment force, that military arm of the United States, to be deployed outside or beyond Sinai. It is not merely a force to be placed between two nations which have just fallen in love—I do not understand how people falling in love and becoming friends could need a rapid deployment force in between them. It means the importation and stationing of troops of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Africa. Maybe that is what resulted in the strategic alliance.

137. That so-called peace treaty was only the green light for the Israelis to continue their aggression, to invade Lebanon, to annex Jerusalem, to annex the Golan, to strike at Baghdad, to remove those settlers from Sinai and place them in and around Jerusalem, Nablus, Hebron, and the Palestinian territories. What is more, that so-called peace treaty has kept the Security Council busy for quite a few weeks now as a result of the escalating brutal acts of Israel, supported by the

United States—acts that have been denounced by the European Community and are considered by it as violations of the freedoms and rights of the inhabitants of the occupied West Bank and the Gaza [S/14954].

138. It is a misnomer; it is not a peace treaty. I think that as we sit here in the Council we had better call things by their proper name.

139. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): My mind reels with the recitations of the representative of the Soviet Union regarding the "secret" agreements into which my Government has, in his perspective, entered in recent months. To the best of my knowledge, my Government never enters into agreements which are secret—or which, at least, remain secret for very long.

140. I do not wish to be flippant in any way, however, about my reaction to his comments on the agreement undertaken between my Government and the Government of Israel in the latter part of 1981. That agreement was not, and is not now, directed against anyone, any nation or any group of nations, within the Middle East or outside the Middle East. The agree-

ment was entered into to preserve, protect and extend the interests of my Government and the Government of Israel, in so far as these interests—as they so frequently do—substantially coincide. The agreement was temporarily suspended in its implementation, for reasons well known to my Government and to the Government of Israel. Our relations have always been conducted as between friends, allies, peoples, whose enduring, as against transient, interests substantially coincide. That will remain the basis, I trust, of a long and fruitful association in years to come.

The meeting rose at 2.05 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

³ General Assembly resolution 217 A (III).

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex*, vol. II, document A/927.

⁵ *Ibid.*, document A/927, annexes A and B.

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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