



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2865
8 June 1989

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 8 June 1989, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. PICKERING

(United States of America)

Members: Algeria
Brazil
Canada
China
Colombia
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Malaysia
Nepal
Senegal
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
Yugoslavia

Mr. DJOUDI
Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA
Mr. FORTIER
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. PEÑALOSA
Mr. HAGOSS
Mr. TORNUDD
Mr. BLANC
Mr. RAZALI
Mr. RANA
Mrs. DIALLO
Mr. SMIRNOV

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. PEJIC

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 31 MAY 1989 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SUDAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/20662)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Yemen to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; I invite the Permanent Observer of Palestine to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia) and Mr. Sallam (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, Cuba, Japan and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in

(The President)

conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Ms. Florez Prida (Cuba), Mr. Kagami (Japan) and Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The first speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): When you assumed the presidency of the Council this month, Sir, you expressed the hope that it would be a fruitful tenure. That is definitely a good omen. Yet I would feel remiss in my duties if I did not formally extend my warmest congratulations to you, not only as the representative of a very friendly country but also, and most of all, as an accomplished and distinguished diplomat.

I wish on this occasion also to address to your predecessor, Sir Crispin Tickell, sincere appreciation for his constructive skill in carrying out his duties during the month of May.

(spoke in Arabic)

Less than four months ago, I had the honour of presenting my country's views to this body. At that time we were discussing the same problems that we are concerned with today. Although the discussion then brought to light an

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

international consensus on the need to put an end to the acts of repression committed by the occupation forces against the inhabitants of the region, the situation has not improved. Quite the contrary: things are going from bad to worse.

Indeed, we have now entered a new stage in the deterioration of the situation. The occupation forces refuse to understand the true scope of the revolution of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and to recognize that this political reality can be dealt with only in terms of a genuine and just political solution, and not through police methods of repression and violence. The situation has deteriorated to such a point that extremist elements are now taking over. Showing contempt for all scruples and morality, they are killing Palestinian children and women.

Thus, we can state that the violence of the Israeli occupation forces is now being compounded by the violence of the extremist elements. Since the Israeli Government refuses to face the political facts, we are now witnessing a radicalization of the situation which flies in the face of all the factors working for moderation and dialogue. That is why the champions of the rule of law are losing out to those who advocate violence.

During the Council's last discussion of this subject, in February, we requested the international community to use the consensus in order to put an end to this deterioration. Now, given the radicalization of the situation, it has become even more necessary to take urgent action. The situation is fraught with very serious dangers to peace and security.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

It is shocking that some should hide their heads in the sand. We therefore call upon the Security Council to adopt, by consensus, a resolution expressing the international community's repudiation of the situation.

The uprising of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories is the expression of a unanimous will and a rejection of illegal occupation. That will cannot be deterred by violence or force. The situation must be remedied and the evil attacked at its root. As we have repeated on numerous occasions, occupation and the use of force have no legal justification.

Because of Israel's continued stubborn refusal to deal with the root causes of the problem, the situation has deteriorated to such an extent that the Israeli settlers are today running rampant, arbitrarily attacking and even killing the Palestinian inhabitants. Apparently these illicit acts are beyond the control of the Israeli occupying forces. Thus, confronted with the intifadah, Israeli policy has served to worsen the situation in the occupied territories; it is also a good indicator of whether Israel truly wishes to live in peace with its neighbours. If such a will exists, it must be reflected in an improvement of Israel's relations with its closest neighbours, in particular the Palestinian people.

That is why, as a first step towards a political settlement, Israel must fulfil its contractual commitments under international treaties dealing with the protection of civilian persons in time of war. It is a waste of time to pursue the present, outmoded, methods: they will not lead to peace.. The price paid will be the deaths of thousands of Palestinians and of Israelis who wish to see the establishment of peaceful relations between their two States.

In our view, it is also up to the Government of Israel to respond favourably to the numerous constructive initiatives put forward by the Palestine Liberation

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Organization (PLO) since last summer. We hope that Israel will show goodwill and realism, offer practical solutions and take advantage of the historic opportunity at hand. In so doing, Israel will show that it can meet the constructive Palestinian initiatives presented by the Palestine National Council in Cairo, in February 1985, and later in Algeria, in November 1988, not to mention the Stockholm Declaration, Chairman Arafat's statement in Geneva and the Paris Declaration. We hope that the Israeli Government will avoid proposing ambiguous solutions that contain more gaps than constructive ideas and are devoid of substance, so necessary to a serious political solution of the conflict.

A just political settlement to the overall problem of the Middle East and to the specific issue of the occupied Arab Palestinian territories requires negotiations between the representatives of the two parties involved, the Palestinians and the Israelis. An Israeli-Palestinian dialogue and an Israeli decision along those lines would be significant steps in the right direction, since unilateral acts aimed at imposing conditions on the other side have no possibility of success.

Peace in the region is the responsibility of the international community as a whole and of the peoples of that region in particular. Member States of the Security Council bear a share of the responsibility, too, but the Israeli and the Palestinian parties must bear the brunt of it. For its part, the Palestinian people has already put forward constructive, positive initiatives to that end. We hope that wisdom will prevail and that Israel will take the necessary steps to achieve a settlement.

Egypt has intensified its dialogue with the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people, since that is one of the natural bases of any solution to the

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Middle East problem. We were relieved to note the position of the French Government in that respect and hope to make continued progress.

Dozens of United Nations resolutions, numerous international conventions and humanitarian principles, including the experience we have gained throughout history, point to the appropriate framework for peace. Egypt has always advocated a peaceful settlement leading to a just and comprehensive peace. My Government believes that such a peace must be based on the following principles:

First, the plight of the Palestinian people is at the core of the Middle East problem. Thus, a lasting solution to the Middle East problem must aim, above all, at allowing the Palestinian people to exercise its political rights, foremost among which is the right to self-determination, including the right of all peoples of the region to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

Secondly, the numerous Palestinian peace initiatives must meet with the approval of the Israeli side and all other parties involved so that a political settlement based on international law will prevail. Israel can demonstrate the honesty of its intentions by respecting international conventions providing for the protection of civilian persons in time of war in all of the occupied Palestinian Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. The initiation of a dialogue with Palestinian representatives would also be a step in the right direction.

Thirdly, through preparatory negotiations in which they would participate, all of the parties involved should reach agreement on an international peace conference based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions, in accordance with international law and with the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Peace requires us to make difficult choices, but such choices are necessary and vital, for the situation has become intolerable. We can no longer accept the deaths of thousands of innocent Palestinians - men, women and children. Those deaths cry out to our conscience; they oblige us to ensure respect for international humanitarian principles consecrated by the long history of our civilization.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Egypt for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency, to offer the fullest co-operation of the Malaysian team and to affirm our confidence in your ability to discharge your heavy duties, given your wide experience and the great respect Malaysia has for your country, the United States.

I should like also to express our full appreciation to Sir Crispin Tickell of the United Kingdom for his presidency last month, which combined efficiency and skilful handling as well as a refreshing innovative approach.

This is the second time in less than six months that the Security Council is attempting to pronounce itself on the occupied territory of Palestine. With each consideration the Council has made serious and protracted efforts to work out an adequate response to this issue, which cries out for an urgent solution. It is a sad fact that the Council achieved very little the last time, and since August 1988. Any failure this time would reflect severely on the capacity of this Council, giving ground to those who do not want the United Nations to play a primary role in this issue and, most importantly, it would further embolden Israel, with dangerous consequences.

It is highly objectionable that, despite the overwhelming voice of the international community and a ready detailed and comprehensive framework for such a solution that would involve the joint efforts of the United Nations and various parties, this issue should remain mired. Given the increasing mutuality of interest of nations, in particular the major Powers, this issue, however difficult, should now be at the negotiating table. That this is not so, that Israel can with impunity continue to reject all exhortations, is highly unacceptable. If there is

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

to be a realistic chance to move any distance in any tangible way on this matter, the United States has to help and allow for that movement. Our second consideration of the issue this year, and the efforts being attempted towards a consensus draft resolution with very modest objectives, are predicated on this factor. Freed from this constraint, the Council can discharge its responsibilities and the Secretary-General can bring into effect a broad range of initiatives.

If we examine the progress, or more accurately the regress, of Israeli policy in the occupied territory of Palestine, we cannot but be horrified by the clear indications of a cumulative deterioration of that policy. Israel has simply, in desperation and in defiance, gotten worse. We can catalogue a litany of acts of aggression, violations of conventions, acts of terror and deprivation, base desecration and, now rearing its ugly head, racism. What we are witnessing and what Israel's supporters cannot fail to witness also is a State policy that has become twisted. Reports of rampage and vigilante rule by illegal Israeli settlers is a consequence of this. Malaysia appeals to the United States and others to assess honestly the deterioration of Israeli policy in occupied Palestine. Is it realistic to expect or hope that from such a policy will come peace? Is there any possible good that can result from the so-called elections proposals with built-in conditions, promising and recognizing nothing? If a State represents the macrocosm of man, then something is very seriously wrong with man and State in Israel.

It is the duty of this Council to take stock of the depth and severity of what we have before us. It is the duty of this Council to pronounce clearly its abhorrence and rejection of such policies. It is the Council's duty to protect the Palestinians from such policies pending an overall solution and the restoration of a Palestinian State. It is the Council's duty to demand that Israel, as an occupying Power, comply with the obligations and responsibilities under the 1949

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of which Israel is a signatory.

I should like to draw the attention of this Council to the modest objectives to which I referred earlier. This relates specifically to the question of identifying measures to protect the civilian population in the occupied territory of Palestine. In his report of 21 January 1988 (S/19443), the Secretary-General has identified four main types of protection in respect of the civilian population in the occupied territory. These have been categorized as "physical protection", "legal protection", protection in the form of "general assistance" and, finally, the intangible protection afforded by outside agencies, including, especially, the international media under the rubric of "protection by publicity". No doubt some of the protection measures identified in the Secretary-General's report, such as the physical protection of Palestinian civilians, may, while ideal in themselves, be difficult to carry out. However, there is a wide range of protection measures outlined in that report that the Council can and must consider if we are collectively to exercise our moral and legal duty to reduce the plight of the Palestinian civilians living under foreign occupation.

Malaysia appeals to the Council actively to consider that report. The report has languished unattended for well over a year. There can be no justification for standing in the way of the implementation of the various measures mentioned in that report.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Malaysia for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

Council for this month. We fervently hope that your wide experience in the details of the question before the Council and your well-known skill will lead the Council to the desired results.

I should also like to thank the representative of the United Kingdom on his stewardship of the Council during the past month and to commend the excellent manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Council.

The Council is now meeting to adopt the measures it should have taken when it met for the first time on this matter after the beginning of the blessed intifadah of the Palestinian people. These measures are necessary to protect civilians living under occupation, in accordance with the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

I need not recall that on 22 December 1987 this Council adopted a resolution in which it requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the situation in the occupied Arab territories. He submitted that report, and one of his most important conclusions was that the Geneva Convention is applicable to the occupied Palestinian territories.

The Council should have discharged its duties by ensuring respect for international instruments and by adopting a resolution conducive to implementation of the Secretary-General's recommendation. But the veto sword continued hanging over the Council, prompting the Arab Group to resort to the General Assembly, which convened and on 20 April 1989 adopted its resolution 43/233, calling on the Security Council once again to consider the adoption of measures necessary to protect civilians in the occupied territories, in this regard adding wording not included in its previous resolutions on the subject, referring to the urgency of the need to adopt the required protective measures.

Consultations and meetings were held, but they did not result in any action by the Council because of the objection of a State that is a permanent member, which brandished the veto not only at draft resolutions but also at presidential statements.

When we look back about two years to when the intifadah was beginning, we find it was not given its due. Many considered it amounted to short-lived demonstrations by some zealots that would soon be crushed. But they did not realize that the flame ignited two years ago was a full-blown national revolution. Many had the impression that the Palestinian people had been defeated and had capitulated, that Israel had tamed it into accepting its rule, leaving that people with no option but to accept the fait accompli.

That impression resulted in the question of Palestine being eclipsed by other questions. That was also the situation in the United Nations, where discussions on

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

the subject became annual rituals that always ended with the same recommendations. But the blessed intifadah set things right and placed the question of Palestine in the right perspective as the cause of a people chafing under a brutal occupation, a people that had revolted for the sake of its freedom, independence and dignity and the establishment of its independent State on its national soil.

This Council bears a special responsibility for ensuring adherence to international conventions, including the Fourth Geneva Convention. The General Assembly has repeatedly affirmed the applicability of that Convention to the occupied Arab territories, which implies that the Security Council cannot but speak out unambiguously and that whoever obstructs such action by the Council should be held responsible before the entire international community for the persistence of the occupation authorities in violating that Convention and escalating its practices of terrorism and oppression against the Palestinian people.

The valiant Palestinian intifadah that has been raging in the occupied Palestinian territories represents that people's exercise of a legitimate right to ensure self-determination, a right acknowledged by United Nations instruments and exercised by all the peoples of the earth, foremost among them the major Power that exercises its veto right to prevent the Council from discharging its responsibilities.

The Council's reluctance to shoulder its responsibility for implementation of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War implies encouragement for the occupier to persist in its practices, which in turn implies further loss of life and victims among the Palestinian civilians.

A simple comparison between the number of persons who have now been martyred and the number who had suffered thus when this Council began to consider the question affirms our conclusion. It also implies encouragement of Israel's denial

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

of international norms and escalation of its policy of oppression aimed at crushing the Palestinian intifadah.

In escalating its practices the Israeli enemy has gone so far as to deny the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, as was noted recently by Amnesty International and in the recent annual report of the United States State Department. We find that the settlers have been given a free hand to attack the Palestinian people, to fire upon them and to seize their property.

All the evidence indicates that the settlers are not subject to the judicial process. Rather they receive the encouragement and blessings of the official occupation authorities. No wonder: historically, settlement is in itself responsible for the tragedy of the Palestinian people. Settlement forms the basis of the plans to build "Greater Israel".

Israel's racism is at its most blatant when it demands that Palestinian citizens wear badges to distinguish them from Jews. Israel's practices have peaked in its defiance of the feelings of Arabs and Muslims in most hideous violation of the sanctity of the glorious Koran and in its Prime Minister's abusive reference to Prophet Mohammed - God's peace and blessing be upon him - whom he accused of treachery and not keeping his word. We do not know what that racist mentality will come up with next if the international community as represented in this Council continues to be indifferent to such practices. Nor do we know the possible serious repercussions of such practices, which offend the sensibilities of all Arabs and Muslims. We do not know what practices the Council would condemn, if these practices are not to be condemned. What human rights remain after such violations? Which international instruments are not violated by such practices?

On behalf of my country I call upon the Council to live up to its historic responsibility in this regard and to take such actions as would protect civilians and preserve human dignity in accordance with international instruments.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Qatar for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. BEIN (Israel): Mr. President, it is a personal pleasure for me to be able to congratulate you on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June. I have no doubt that your wealth of proven diplomatic experience will be of crucial and invaluable importance during the coming days and weeks.

I should also like to congratulate Sir Crispin Tickell for the way in which he conducted the affairs of the Security Council during the preceding month.

Recently, a session of the General Assembly was devoted to the same topic as the one on today's agenda. We have listened, in the General Assembly Hall and in this Chamber, to the statements of some representatives of the Arab Group. These statements can only serve as yet additional convincing proof that the Arab-Israeli conflict cannot be resolved in an international conference. This is, no doubt, how such a conference will look when resolutions are drafted even before listening to the statements of all the parties concerned. Nor will the Arab-Israeli conflict be resolved as long as this vehement belligerent attitude, as reflected in statements here, persists.

The Arab-Israeli conflict will not be resolved here; it will not be resolved by blatant accusations, extreme demands and futile debates in the Council. Such debates only fan the ashes of hatred and belligerency in the area and are therefore counter-productive - assuming that the goal of all of us here is to reach positive solutions leading towards peace.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Allow me to remind the Security Council once again that the flames of belligerency are fanned by none other than the PLO - the PLO which pretends to speak moderately in English, while calling for war in Arabic.

In the Western world, the PLO speaks of a renunciation of terrorism and a desire to live in peace. The Arab world hears different sounds:

"We shall liberate Palestine stage by stage ... we will work to expand [the borders of our State] in order to realize our aspirations for all the land of Palestine",
said Abu Iyad, Arafat's deputy, last December in a Kuwaiti newspaper.

Yasser Arafat himself, cunningly speaks of the "peace of Saladdin". Those of us who are familiar with history will recall that after Saladdin negotiated a truce with the Crusaders, he promptly attacked them again and destroyed their strongholds in the Holy Land.

Just a couple of days ago, on 4 June, a terrorist mass murder plan was prevented on our northern border thanks only to the alertness of Israel's Defence Forces. Eight additional PLO terrorist actions from across the border were likewise stopped since Arafat supposedly renounced terrorism in December 1988.

While declaring that it renounces terrorism, the PLO goes ahead with its terror campaign none the less. Naif Hawatmeh, the head of the mainstream PLO "Democratic Front", clearly voiced the PLO's intentions when he told Reuters in Damascus on 21 April that PLO leaders, including representatives of Arafat's Fatah, had met in Tunis and had agreed to co-ordinate future raids against Israel. Speaking in Abu Dhabi a month later, Hawatmeh declared, and was quoted on 21 May by Reuters:

"We have recently launched a series of attacks against Israel and we will launch more."

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Yasser Arafat himself told a press conference in Kuwait on Tuesday 6 June, just two days ago, that the PLO would continue to carry out terrorist attacks against Israel. Israel has no illusions about PLO terrorism. Terrorism is part of the PLO ideology and strategy.

Just recently, on 6 April 1989, Arafat sent a note to the Director-General of the World Health Organization. This note carries the graphic letterhead symbol of the PLO. I have it here for the Council to see. It carries the graphic letterhead symbol of the PLO and includes the map of the State they seek to establish. This map includes all - I repeat, all - the territory, "from the River Jordan to the Sea". The concept of the State of Israel does not appear in the PLO's maps or in its ideology. It is excluded from them.

This is entirely consistent with the PLO's Covenant, which remains in force to this day. Arafat declares the Covenant "caduc" - whatever that may mean - but simultaneously states that he has no authority to change it. Accordingly, the only goal of the PLO remains the initiation of violence and war and the eventual destruction of Israel.

The grave mistake and tragedy of the Palestinian movement has always been to adopt the extreme option - excluding any compromise - all or nothing. They did so in the 1930s, when they identified with the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, who - from Nazi Germany, where he resided - called for the liquidation of the Jewish community in Palestine. The Palestinians repeatedly rejected compromise: in 1947 - the partition plan; in 1967 - after the Six Day War; and in 1978 - the Camp David Accords. By identifying in the past with the extremists they have hurt their own cause, and the chance of finding a peaceful solution to their aspirations was buried for many years.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Unfortunately, some Palestinian arabs are ready to repeat the same sad mistake, resorting to and identifying with the extreme, instead of taking the route of dialogue, compromise and a genuine search for peaceful political solutions.

We repeatedly hear claims that the source of the belligerency in the Middle East is Israel. Listening to some of the statements here, one may get the idea that Israel one day started a campaign of conquest to capture a territory, called by some speakers "Palestinian territory", and now refuses to negotiate peace.

Some members know the truth, because they lived through these times. Some members, however, may be too young to remember. Allow me therefore to share with the Council some personal memories and reflections. 1929, the year I was born, is remembered in Israel for the brutal slaughter, with axes and knives, of 66 helpless, innocent Jewish residents of Hebron, whose families had lived there for many generations. 1929 was a year in which pogroms were perpetrated all over Palestine against peaceful Jewish communities living under British rule. They murdered us - yet called us aggressors.

In the mid-1930s, this sad tale repeats itself under the leadership of the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini. Then, too, like now, they described their acts of murder and terrorism against innocent civilians as an "Arab uprising". Again they murdered us - yet called us aggressors.

In 1947, before independence, I volunteered to serve in units guarding Jerusalem, kibbutzim and agricultural villages against attacks from across the northern and eastern border. Once again we were defending ourselves - yet were called aggressors.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Then again, in 1948, when Israel regained its independence and seven Arab countries attacked us, we all volunteered to defend the reborn State. I fought with the Israel Defence Force (IDF) in the Galilee, in the Negev desert and down to Eilat, carrying one of the six machine guns, sadly outmoded even then. Six machine guns constituted the entire machine-gun inventory of the IDF at that time. Seven of my classmates, more than a quarter of my class in Jerusalem, were killed in the defence of our very existence. Many more were wounded. One colleague of mine, Shlomo Argov, was wounded then, and many years later, in 1982, while serving as Israel's Ambassador to Great Britain, was wounded again when in London he was shot in the head by PLO terrorists. Today my classmate and friend Ambassador Argov remains totally paralyzed at Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem.

In 1948 seven Arab countries attacked the State of Israel, a State the size of Massachusetts or New Jersey in the United States, or of Wales in the United Kingdom, one tenth the area of Yugoslavia, one sixteenth the area of Finland, a State with an unequipped small army defending its very survival against aggression by countries whose size, population and military force was hundreds of times larger. Yet we were called aggressors.

In 1967 we listened to aggressive threats and watched television broadcasts from Arab countries calling for the destruction of the Jewish State. They described in detail how they were planning to slaughter us all. My family, including my four-year-old daughter, was helping build bomb shelters in Jerusalem, hoping - praying - that there would be no imminent war. Yet we had to face a war of aggression, and another in 1973, only six years later. Again and again we were on the defence; yet were called aggressors.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Those are but some of my personal memories of our so-called aggression. All my adult life I have been on the defence of Israel. Sixteen thousand seven hundred and forty Israelis died defending the very existence of my State. And here in the Security Council representatives accuse Israel of aggression, of occupation, of a wish for expansionism.

I remember 1967. It was not Israel that then blockaded the straits of Tiran. It was not Israel that ordered the United Nations troops to leave the Sinai in order to clear the way for aggression and war. We beseeched our neighbour to the east not to attack Jewish Jerusalem, and some in this Chamber may remember the well-known telephone conversation between President Nasser and King Hussein in which it was claimed that "victory" for the Arab armies was imminent and that Tel Aviv was about to fall. Based on that false information Jordan attacked us, hoping for a decisive victory. As members all know, six days later we found ourselves in Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Sinai desert - and in Jerusalem, the reunified capital of Israel, which was one unified city throughout 3,000 years and had been divided for only 19 years, owing to Arab aggression.

Listening to some of the speeches here, however, one might get the impression that we decided to attack and conquer lands, and that now, therefore, a retreat from territory is the condition for certain Arab countries even to start a dialogue and negotiate peace.

From statements here one might get the impression that before 1967 Arab States called for peace, and that 1967 was not the year in which Israel was in imminent danger of being overrun by three of its neighbours. Yet in spite of all that misrepresentation and false accusations here, in spite of the atmosphere of belligerency and boycott around us in the area, my Government as well as I

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

personally remain optimistic. We hope and believe that the selective conscience and biased attitudes will disappear - I hope soon - and that reason will return to the international community in regard to the war-torn Middle East too.

The United Nations is successful in furthering peaceful solutions in cases where the parties to conflicts both genuinely wish for peace and are ready for peaceful dialogue and direct negotiations to reach it.

In the Arab-Israeli conflict, unfortunately, we have not yet reached that stage. In the Middle East we face, on the one hand, belligerency, terrorism, violence and calls by some Arab countries to do away with Israel, and, on the other hand, Israel's call to start a dialogue for peace. On the one hand, we face the PLO's "phased plan", which calls for the destruction of Israel in stages, and on the other Israel's call for a change from belligerency to a peaceful atmosphere, settlement of the refugee problem and a solution to the Palestinian problem in all its aspects. We believe this can be achieved through dialogue, elections and peaceful negotiations for interim and permanent solutions.

Do members of the Council believe it is possible to strive for peace while brandishing the sword? Is it possible to achieve peace with violence all around? Is the lesson of Lebanon not enough?

As the Council meets today, 40,000 Syrian troops occupy Lebanon, bombarding innocent civilians, killing hundreds and wounding thousands. They claim to be doing this in the name of "peace-keeping". I can only say that with "peace-keepers" like Syria, Lebanon does not need enemies.

Arabs are killing Arabs not only in Lebanon. The PLO, which purportedly has renounced terrorism, daily initiates terror not only against Israelis but against fellow Palestinian Arabs as well. Since December 1987 hundreds of attempts on the lives of Palestinian Arabs have been made by terrorists in Judea, Samaria and

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Gaza. Thirty-four Palestinian Arabs have been killed by the PLO - and it appears that in the past two days three more have been added to that sad list - and 124 have been wounded. And that PLO terror increases. During 1988, 35 per cent of the victims of Arab violence were Arabs, while during the first four months of 1989 they constituted 78 per cent of the victims. Of the 748 terrorist incidents recorded during the four months January to April 1989, 323 were against Palestinian Arabs. They kill those Palestinians who dare to speak up, those who seek dialogue and peace, those who object to terror and violence. Peaceful solutions through elections and dialogue cannot be reached while terror and violence reign, be it against Jew or against Arab. Intimidation and murder are anathema to the concepts of democracy, negotiations and peace.

We genuinely wish to change the status quo and to move towards a better future for all. That can be done by making a major concerted effort to break the cycle of violence and defuse the atmosphere of animosity and mistrust.

I should like to emphasize that the Government of Israel opposes categorically all acts of violence and will continue to do its utmost to prevent them. Israel believes unequivocally in the maintenance of the state of law, and no person, be he Jew or Arab, is entitled to take the law into his own hands.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

The Government of Israel on 14 May 1989 approved a viable and practical peace initiative, whose main components are as follows.

First, Israel views it as important that the peace between Israel and Egypt, based on the Camp David Accords, serve as a corner-stone for enlarging the circle of peace in the region, and calls for a common endeavour for the strengthening of the peace and its extension, through continued consultations.

Secondly, Israel calls for the establishment of relations of peace between it and those Arab States that still maintain a state of war with it, for the purpose of promoting a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, including recognition, direct negotiations, ending the boycott, diplomatic relations, cessation of hostile activity in international institutions or forums and regional and bilateral co-operation.

Thirdly, Israel calls for an international endeavour to resolve the problem of the residents of the Arab refugee camps in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district in order to improve their living conditions and to rehabilitate them. Israel is prepared to be a partner in this endeavour.

Fourthly, in order to advance the political negotiation process leading to peace, Israel proposes free and democratic elections among the Palestinian Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district in an atmosphere devoid of violence, threats and terror. In these elections a representation will be chosen to conduct negotiations for a transitional period of self-rule. This period will constitute a test for co-existence and co-operation. At a later stage negotiations will be conducted for a permanent solution during which all the proposed options for an agreed settlement will be examined, and peace between Israel and Jordan will be achieved.

Fifthly, all those steps should be dealt with simultaneously.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Israel calls upon the international community to support that initiative. Extreme, unrealistic and impossible demands will not breed solutions. False accusations and double-talk will not result in agreements.

The only hopeful and practical approach is to proceed step by step and through a democratic process. The issues involved in the negotiations are far too complex and the emotions are far too deep to move directly to a permanent settlement. Accordingly, some transitional period is essential.

Let us remember that peace with Egypt, too, was achieved through interim stages stretching over a five-year period. The peace process then started with a disengagement agreement in January 1974, followed by an interim agreement in September 1975. Three years later the Camp David Accords were signed and, finally, the peace agreement in 1979.

Political platforms are often based on security concepts founded on past and present experience. Friendly relations and peace must be developed in the minds of people. Free and democratic elections, therefore, will lead to a transitional period of self-rule in which we should all dedicate ourselves to further the process of confidence-building in the area. Negotiations on a permanent solution will follow. All proposed visions, options and plans for an agreed settlement will be examined then. By changing the atmosphere in the area, before and during the transitional period, from belligerency, terrorism and violence to confidence, dialogue and peace, permanent solutions can be negotiated and agreed upon.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Israel for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes first, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency this month. You have had a long and successful career, which has earned you the respect

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

of the diplomatic world. Moreover, in the few weeks you have been with us we have come to know and admire your many personal qualities and characteristics. We are sure that you will conduct the Council's work with skill and wisdom.

We also wish to express our thanks to Ambassador Sir Crispin Tickell of the United Kingdom, who displayed a broad range of skills in conducting our work last month. We regret that a number of his initiatives, though taken with care and intelligence, did not bear fruit. That was surely a source of frustration for him.

We have not met in the Council today to speak about resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), one of which was adopted nearly 22 years ago and both of which have been ignored by the very parties that are called upon to comply with them. Nor have we come to speak of the illegality of the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. We have not come to speak about the need to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East. Nor do we wish to speak about the need to establish at an early date a Palestinian State in the occupied territories, and of course we have not come to speak about the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force or about the importance of recognizing the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all the States of the region and their right to live in peace, free from any threats of force.

We have not come to speak about any of those issues, because for 22 years the opinion and will of almost all the States on the planet has been expressed in both the General Assembly and the Security Council, and we believe that there will be further opportunities to discuss these issues and to ask the parties concerned, as well as all the members of the Security Council, and especially the permanent members, to mobilize the international community and promote the initiation of an effective negotiating process to bring peace and security to the area.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

It is with genuine anguish and concern that Colombia is a sponsor of draft resolution S/20677, with which we hope the Council will send a message to Israel that the international community, full of horror, cannot overlook the continuing violations of human rights, defined in the United Nations Charter and proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whose fortieth anniversary we celebrated last December, and the failure to comply with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

We simply want the Council to register a protest about those violations and failures, which have caused so much sacrifice and suffering to the Palestinian people.

We do not want to hear the argument that the draft resolution needs to be more balanced to command consensus. We believe that no one can justly argue that the situation in the occupied territories is balanced from any point of view. The whole world is witness to that.

Let us make an effort to ensure at least that there is an end to the violations of basic human rights being carried out in Palestine.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA (Brazil): I should like first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June and to wish you much success in your difficult task. Please be kind enough to transmit to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Tickell, our appreciation for his efforts as President of the Council for the month of May.

We are confronted once again with reports of further repressive measures taken by Israel in the occupied Palestinian territories. We have been apprised by various sources that such measures range from the continuation of shooting at defenceless Palestinian civilians, the practice of administrative detention, the imposition of curfews, the demolition of houses and the closing of schools to instances of religious intolerance and disrespect, the identification of Palestinian workers with badges, and attacks perpetrated by Israeli settlers against Palestinians in those regions. Such measures violate the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 1949, relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, as well as other conventions and protocols signed or ratified by Israel in the field of human rights. The measures were taken, moreover, in complete disregard for decisions adopted by the Security Council, such as resolutions 605 (1987), 607 (1988) and 608 (1988) - to mention only the more recent ones.

The Council is again faced with the need to take a decision which would represent our collective stand that Israel should fully comply with its international obligations. The Security Council, therefore, should now concentrate its efforts on ensuring the co-operation of Israel in preventing its military and police forces, as well as Israeli settlers in Gaza and in the West Bank, from

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

taking repressive measures against defenceless Palestinians, measures which have been widely perceived as violations of human rights in the occupied territories. At the same time, we should also ensure that the Israeli Government accepts the de jure applicability to the occupied territories of the Fourth Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and comes to act, in all circumstances, in accordance with its obligations as the occupying Power and a party to that Convention. Finally, the Council should adopt the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report of January 1988 (S/19443) as regards the safety and protection of Palestinian civilians under Israeli occupation.

The Brazilian delegation will be ready to vote in favour of a draft resolution along those lines. We sincerely hope that the Council will not be blocked in its efforts to fulfil its duties and to meet the expectations of the international community by adopting a resolution that may help alleviate the plight of the Palestinian people.

Let me also express the expectation that the peace process on the Palestine question can move forward quickly. We are following with interest and as closely as possible the intense political-diplomatic activity under way on this complex issue, the settlement of which would open the way to the solution of other pressing problems in the Middle East, such as the restoration of the national integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon. My delegation would look favourably at the possibility of use being made of the Security Council as a forum for informal or formal exchanges of views that may help to bring about a peaceful, negotiated and lasting solution to the most-long-standing issue on the agenda of the United Nations: the question of Palestine.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): I welcome you, Sir, to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June. Your assumption of the presidency is a source of deep satisfaction to me personally and to the Pakistan delegation. We are conscious of the traditional ties which bind our two countries in a relationship of warm friendship and close co-operation. The current visit of the Prime Minister of Pakistan to the United States is the latest manifestation of the reality of our mutually beneficial relationship. We are confident that your great experience and diplomatic skill will enable you to conduct with success the deliberations of the Security Council on all important issues such as the one before us today.

Allow me, Mr. President, to avail myself of this opportunity to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Sir Crispin Tickell, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, for the excellent manner in which he conducted the business of the Security Council during the month of May.

It is nearly four months since the Security Council met, in February last, to consider the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory. That series of meetings of the Council served to focus global attention on the deplorable Israeli policies and practices in Palestine; to highlight the need for the scrupulous observance by Israel of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War; and to underscore the imperative need of achieving, under the auspices of the United Nations, a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict. It is regrettable that since the

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

adoption of resolutions 605 (1987), 607 (1988) and 608 (1988) the Security Council has not been able to take Israel to task for its defiance of international law and the will of the international community.

Last year the Palestine National Council, at its meeting in Algiers in November, accepted Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as the basis for the convening of an international peace conference with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council and all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing. It is regrettable that Israel missed a great opportunity for the initiation of a genuine peace process, by its negative response to the Palestinian gesture, and opted for the continuation of a barren policy of repression and use of force which, in fact, is no policy at all vis-à-vis the new, emerging realities.

It is indeed tragic that not a day passes in the occupied territories without Palestinian men, women and children being shot, wounded or tortured by Israeli troops. According to the latest figures published by the Data Base Project on Palestinian Human Rights, since the beginning of the intifadah 611 Palestinians have been killed, of whom 118 have been children under the age of 15. The Defence Minister of Israel himself is reported to have admitted to the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committee of the Knesset that 10,000 Palestinians have been injured and 35,000 imprisoned, of whom 7,000 are still under detention.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Prestigious newspapers such as The New York Times and The Washington Post are full of reports of Israeli brutalities against the Palestinian people, day in and day out. The New York Times of 7 May reported the killing of 3 Palestinians and the wounding of more than 138 others. The Washington Post of 1 June reported the shooting in the head of an eight-month-old Arab boy by an Israeli soldier. According to another report in The New York Times, of 17 May, Israeli soldiers again shot and killed a 13-year old boy. The latest such incident, reported by The New York Times of 30 May, relates to the killing of a 14-year-old Palestinian girl in the West Bank by Israeli settlers.

These are tragic happenings which cannot but stir the conscience of the world community. Besides the killing and shooting, the Israeli authorities are continuing their policy of destroying houses, imposing curfews and deporting prominent Palestinians. Even educational institutions have not been spared. According to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), virtually all schools in the West Bank have opened only sporadically since February 1988, threatening the future of a whole generation of young Palestinians. Interim arrangements to enable the continuation of basic education for Palestinian children have been barred by Israeli authorities.

The cycle of repression and revolt, oppression and violence, defiance and reprisal that has characterized the Palestinian tragedy continues to be a matter of deep concern to the international community.

The people of Palestine have demonstrated both by their heroic struggle in the Israeli occupied territories and by their historic political initiative that they are a people born to freedom and that their genuine struggle to regain their national independence and statehood cannot be denied by a policy of repression and the use of force. As Chairman Yasser Arafat said: "The uprising is a truly popular revolution in action".

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The determined struggle of the people of Palestine, combined with Chairman Yasser Arafat's peace initiative, has convinced the international community that a door has been opened for a resolution of the Palestinian problem through a constructive dialogue. The only remaining obstacle on the path of peace in the Middle East, of which the question of Palestine is the central issue, remains the Israeli preference for burying its head in the sand so as not to face the overwhelming realities of the situation.

The so-called peace initiative proposed by the Israeli authorities has been correctly described as an example of sham democracy. Under the Israeli plan, the only function of the elected delegates would seem to be to rubber-stamp the policies of the occupying Power. Palestinian representatives have rightly noted that, as long as the Israeli election proposals remain separate from the final objective of the exercise of the right by the Palestinian people to self-determination, they will be nothing but a device for perpetuating Israeli occupation.

The deceptions and flaws of the Israeli election proposals were pointed out at the recent emergency Arab Summit at Casablanca. The Summit supported the Palestinian stand on that subject and called for the holding of elections after Israeli withdrawal from occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, under international supervision, within the framework of a comprehensive peace plan to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its right to self-determination.

We in Pakistan are committed to the just struggle of the Palestinian people and eagerly look forward to the day when Palestine can assume its rightful place in the community of nations. Our commitment to the people of Palestine was reiterated by Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in a message to Mr. Yasser Arafat on his election

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

as President of the Palestinian State. "In the struggle for freedom of the Palestinians", the Prime Minister said, "the people of Pakistan will continue to march shoulder to shoulder with their Palestinian brethren".

As the twentieth century draws to its close and some of the most intractable issues approach peaceful solutions, Israel's obstinacy and its unchanging adherence to policies that have been thoroughly exposed and discredited by events stand out as a deplorable incongruity and float as a dark spot in the international community's vision of peace and justice around the world. The framework for peace in the Middle East, fully supported by the General Assembly, already exists in the proposed convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations, to be attended by the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing. It is incumbent on the Security Council to convey the message to Israel that through the instrumentality of such an international conference alone can the resolution of the Palestinian question, the crux of the Middle East problem, be achieved.

Meanwhile, the Security Council needs to take determined action to provide international protection to the Palestinian civilians and to alleviate the sufferings of unarmed Palestinians in occupied territories, especially women and children. Israel must be made to comply with its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to which it is a party.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): I should like at the outset to extend to you, Sir, the representative of the United States, my cordial congratulations on your assumption of the duties of President of the Council for this month. In the short time that you have spent with us here in the United Nations in your new capacity,

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

you have already displayed exceptional diplomatic skill and wisdom and, more than that, extreme diplomatic tact, all of which convinces us that you will conduct the deliberations of the Council most successfully.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation of and gratitude to the Ambassador of the United Kingdom, Sir Crispin Tickell, for his very successful and effective conduct of the work of the Security Council during the month of May.

At this juncture in international relations, characterized by a broad orientation towards dialogue and the constructive solution of some outstanding international problems, the news that we are receiving every day on the deterioration of the situation in the Palestinian territories under Israeli occupation is very discouraging. The dramatic worsening of the status of the Palestinian population because of the ever more brutal acts and measures of the occupation authorities - the most conspicuous among which has of late become the behaviour of armed illegal settlers in that very sensitive region - causes the understandable concern and indignation of the international community as a whole.

The gravity of the situation, which is fraught with the permanent danger of the outbreak of a new conflict in the region, and in particular the escalation of the repressive policies and practices of the occupation authorities, are, in the judgement of the broadest segments of the international community, serious threats to peace and stability. It is therefore quite natural that the issue should become the subject of consideration in the Security Council and one of its main preoccupations, since it is an expression of the demand and expectation of the largest number of countries that the Security Council provide an impetus and contribution to the quest for ways and means for a lasting, comprehensive and just solution of the Middle East crisis and the Palestinian problem.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

The awareness that a lasting solution to the Middle East crisis and the problem of Palestine can be achieved only by political means - that is, through dialogue and negotiations - is shared by the vast majority of the international community. The ongoing uprising of the Palestinian population - the intifadah - which has entered its second year, demonstrates the untenability of the situation created by foreign occupation and by attempts to deny the legitimate rights of the Palestinian population to self-determination and its own homeland. These events have also shown the illusory nature of the expectation that the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians to decide their own destiny freely and independently can be suppressed and quelled by increased repression and the use of arms, which has resulted in hundreds of Palestinians killed and thousands of others wounded.

Ever since the emergence of the problem, Yugoslavia, along with a large number of other countries, has pointed to the need to find a solution that would proceed from respect for the existing realities in the region - that is, from recognition of the legitimate demands and rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence, as well as the rightful interests of Israel to enjoy, together with the other countries of the region, the right to security and existence within internationally recognized borders.

Along those lines, the important decisions adopted by the Palestine National Council at its nineteenth special session in Algiers, the statement by Mr. Yasser Arafat in the General Assembly in Geneva, as well as the important decisions adopted on that occasion, together with the United States-Palestinian dialogue, have no doubt contributed to the removal of some important psychological and political barriers that stood in the way of the substantial efforts towards the opening of a peaceful process towards a political solution to the crisis.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Unfortunately, the expectations of the broadest segments of the international community to which these developments gave rise have remained without a proper response from Israel. I would point out also on this occasion that the continuation of this policy causes irretrievable damage to the Israeli people itself and to Israel's international standing and interests.

It is therefore of the utmost importance at this moment to create the appropriate conditions and atmosphere to enable concrete and resolute efforts to be made towards solving this problem. As a first step that would lead to the relaxation of tension in the occupied territories, it is necessary to ensure full and consistent implementation of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and thus prevent fatalities among the innocent and deprived Palestinian population in the West Bank and Gaza.

The root cause of the problem, however, can be lastingly removed only through political measures that would take account of the authentic interests and rights of all interested parties. In the opinion of the overwhelming majority, the best way to do this is to convene the International Peace Conference under United Nations auspices on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and other relevant resolutions, with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council and all directly interested parties, including that of Palestine, on an equal footing.

The process that could lead in this direction would no doubt be long. Patience and perseverance will be needed to change the decades-long atmosphere of conflict and intolerance with an orientation towards dialogue, mutual trust and respect. At the same time, however, the explosive situation in the occupied territories brooks no further delay. The Security Council and the entire United

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Nations have a major historic obligation to facilitate and contribute actively to a lasting, just and comprehensive solution of the Middle East crisis and the problem of Palestine. If they fail to do so, the danger of escalation may indeed bring about developments extremely harmful to world peace and stability.

May I, in conclusion, express my delegation's hope that this time the Security Council will be able to adopt the draft resolution proposed by a group of members of the Security Council. It has already been said that the draft resolution is a mild and constructive proposal. I should like to add that our only motivation is to help create a positive atmosphere for the opening of the process towards the solution of this difficult crisis.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Yugoslavia for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish at the outset to congratulate the Permanent Representative of the United States of America on his assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We have high hopes that his diplomatic skills and personal wisdom will be of assistance to the Security Council and to those whose causes are before it, as well as guarantee success in the Council's deliberations.

I wish also to take this opportunity to express our thanks to Sir Crispin Tickell, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, for the efforts he exerted during his presidency of the Security Council last month.

The Security Council has been convened to consider the tragic situation in the West Bank and the Gaza district, which are occupied by Israel and in which Israel

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

daily perpetrates the worst kinds of harassment and oppression of a people that is merely demanding its most basic human rights. The fact of the matter is that the behaviour and practices of the Israelis do not merely hamper and undermine all efforts at peaceful initiatives. Indeed, as international public opinion has made clear, that behaviour and those practices have now reached the height of barbarism. They are fraught with provocation and aggression, fuelled by blind hatred and spitefulness on the part of the Zionists against the rightful owners of the land whom they oppress, and hatred for their identity, religion, national sentiments - indeed, their legitimate aspirations. Yes, hatred and spitefulness have blinded the Zionists. They now allow themselves to desecrate the Holy Book of more than 1,000 million Muslims. Such behaviour is not new for those who have allowed themselves to desecrate all that is sacred - all sacred traditions and norms - and to shed the blood of children and their weeping mothers.

The harsh words of the Israelis against the Holy Koran and their Prime Minister's words against Islam and its blessed Prophet are grave sins perpetrated by the Zionists in but yet another link in a long chain of acts of aggression committed against Holy Muslim tenets in the land of Palestine all aimed at putting an end to the escalating intifadah and its noble objectives.

We are all amazed that the Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, has been unable to issue a statement condemning those crimes. Indeed, how can it be that it is unable to compel Israel to comply with international resolutions and heed the will of the international community? What is the Council waiting for in the occupied territories before it moves against the occupier and aggressor? Is it waiting for the Israelis to carry out the genocide of those Palestinians still remaining on their own land? Is it waiting for the lines of suffocation that surround the

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Palestinian people and are aimed at expelling them from their land to tighten completely and make room for more colonizing settlements to be inhabited by bands of extremists coming from all parts of the world armed to the teeth who, under the very eyes of the world, daily apply the law of the jungle against peaceful Palestinian villages, leaving behind them death and destruction?

Israeli barbarism has reached the point where, during one of the barbaric attacks against the camp of Tulkarm, an Israeli soldier fired at the head of a Palestinian infant only eight months old. Furthermore, we must point to those new measures decreed by the Israelis that were once used by the Nazis against the Jews themselves, such as having to wear identifying badges. Once again we ask: Is this not the very racism that so distresses the supporters of Israel when our International Organization uses it to characterize zionism?

The Zionist racist régime - which is based on aggression and daily perpetrates genocidal crimes against the Palestinians - is one whose behaviour is raising innumerable question marks with regard to the future of peaceful coexistence in the region and putting those supporting the idea of a peaceful settlement based on legitimacy in an unenviable position.

A week ago, for the second time in a very short period, Amnesty International deplored Israel's violations of the fundamental human rights of Palestinians in the occupied Arab territories. We were pleased to see the countries of the European Community condemning Israel, also a week ago, because of its arbitrary measure almost two years ago to close Palestinian schools, thus depriving tens of thousands of pupils and students of their right to education.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

The freezing of all the educational institutions of an entire people on the pretext of maintaining order cannot be justified in any way whatsoever. It runs counter to all fundamental human rights, including the right to education. It is a flagrant breach of all the Geneva Conventions.

The Zionists do not stop there. Reports inform us that Israeli soldiers continuously pursue the young people of Palestine and have forced between 4,000 and 5,000 of them to leave their homes and villages.

This escalation of Israeli oppression is aimed at snuffing out the flames of the heroic intifadah of the Palestinian people and forcing them to bow before imaginary plans and decisions all of which are intended to distract attention from the intifadah and its objectives.

The recent Arab Summit in Casablanca issued a resolution calling on the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities vis-à-vis the crimes of the Israeli occupation and its practices against the Arab people in Arab and Palestinian occupied territories, including the possible imposition of sanctions against Israel. Furthermore it reaffirmed the bases of the Arab peace plan adopted at the twelfth Arab Summit, held in Fez.

That is what we are calling for today: for the Security Council to shoulder its fundamental responsibilities. Let us move forward on the basis of the Arab peace plan. It is a just plan. Let us move forward on the basis of international law as enshrined in the resolutions of the United Nations. Until that aim has been achieved, the Security Council must demand that Israel respect the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 1949, on the protection of civilian persons in time of war. It must call for an end to the random killings, the beating of civilians, the raiding of their homes, the demolition of their homes, and their expulsion from their land, and it must ensure the immediate return of those who have already been deported.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Let us recall that the resolutions of the Palestinian leadership calling for a comprehensive political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which were supported by Arab leaders at the Casablanca Summit, as well as for continuation of the peaceful Palestinian intifadah, all clearly indicate the confidence of the Palestinian people in the justness of its cause and its unbending will to exercise its national right to self-determination and the establishment of its own Palestinian State on its own land. That is supported by international law, and that is the objective towards which we shall determinedly work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Kuwait for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): It give me great pleasure to extend to you, Sir, congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I wish you every success in the discharge of your task.

On this occasion I also express great appreciation and gratitude to the Ambassador of the United Kingdom for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during his presidency.

The Council has again been convened in a series of meetings and consultations to consider the grave situation prevailing in the occupied Palestinian territories in the light of the persistence of the occupation authorities in their brutal oppressive practices and policies against unarmed Palestinians. We think there is no need for us to repeat the examples that have been given of the forms of oppression engaged in by the Israeli occupation authorities. There is no longer any need for proof or narration, since murder, torture, displacement and even the

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

perpetration of mass murder and other crimes have all become daily occurrences that no one can conceal or justify, leaving no doubt that Israel pursues a policy of State terrorism, and unmasking the hideous face of zionism and its racist policies, which have a counterpart only in bygone times and in those now barricaded in their last bastion in southern Africa.

Since the representative of Palestine and the Chairman of the Arab Group have in their statements at the beginning of this debate dealt in some detail with the crimes that have been perpetrated by the Israeli occupation authorities, directly or in collusion with the Israeli settlers, we wish now to affirm the following.

First, it is an established truth - a truth that can be neither circumvented nor denied since it has even become axiomatic - that for as long as the Israeli occupation exists in the Paletinian territories the resistance aimed at ending the occupation is legal and legitimate. The Israeli occupation authorities are incapable of understanding the truth: that the Palestinian popular intifadah in the occupied territories will survive and achieve its objectives in full, and that regardless of the number of brutal means of oppression used by the Israeli forces of occupation or the Israeli settlers, they will not bring to their knees the sons of the peaceful and unarmed Palestinian people struggling for their freedom. Rather, such means will strengthen the resolve and determination of the Palestinian people to resist the forces of occupation equipped with the most modern and deadliest of weapons. Here is clear evidence of the great gains that have been acheived by the struggling Palestinian people since the escalation of the popular intifadah in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Secondly, the policies and practices of the Israeli occupation authorities against unarmed Palestinians have reached a stage at which it is no longer possible

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

for Israel's friends to remain silent. Actually, they have already begun speaking of the violation of the human rights of the Palestinians, though their positions have yet to be translated into action that would lead to the ending of Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories. We want to see their statements being matched with deeds, not being made just for the sake of pacification or to contain the impetus of the intifadah. Only then will their statements of position be credible to us.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Thirdly, the uneven showdown between the Israeli occupation authorities and their heavily armed forces, on the one hand, and the unarmed sons of the Palestinian people, on the other, imposes the legal and ethical responsibility to provide full protection to those living under occupation. Indeed, the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 clearly affirms the need to provide such protection. If, as the Council has constantly affirmed, the Convention is applicable to the population of the occupied territories, then the next logical step would be to translate that position into concrete reality. Before the Council is a report of the Secretary-General indicating the means for providing such protection.

At this point we are entitled to wonder whether the Council's position towards the party which has been preventing it from adopting measures that would provide protection for Palestinians in the occupied territories and which has stood idly by, as though the Palestinian dead and wounded, including women, children and the elderly, were mere statistics, means that the Council sees no wrong in the shedding of Palestinian blood at the hands of the Israeli occupation forces and the Israeli settlers.

Indeed, we are entitled to wonder whether the use of tanks and other deadly weapons by the Israeli occupation forces against unarmed Palestinians has not moved the conscience of those who support Israel and generously supply it with the most sophisticated weapons in their arsenals.

Similarly, since the Palestinians have been called terrorists for having taken up arms in their legitimate resistance to occupation and in their just struggle for self-determination and the establishment of independent Palestinian statehood, and since their request for international protection has not been met, are we to conclude that those who prevent the international community and the Security Council from putting an immediate end to the slaughter of Palestinians actually bless that slaughter?

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Fourthly, Israel's rejection of the clear resolutions of the Council affirming that the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 applies to the population of the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, categorically affirms the reality of Israeli policies based on aggression, occupation, annexation and settler colonialism. We need not remind the Council of the laws by which Israel annexed Jerusalem and the Golan, or of the Zionist dream of establishing a "Greater Israel". Israel's annexationist acts have declared null and void by the Council. We mention them merely to show that the imposition of racist discriminatory measures, such as the demand that the Palestinians wear badges, should come as no surprise. Not only do those measures recall nazism and its practices: they also unmask the real face of Israel's rulers, their policies regarding the Palestinian people, and Zionist designs for the region.

In the light of the aforementioned facts, we renew the hope that this debate will lead to a speedy end to the policies and practices of the occupation authorities and to termination of the occupation before the prospects for peace in the region are lost. Only thus will the Palestinian people regain confidence in the Council's ability to champion its cause and its right to self-determination and the exercise of sovereignty in its own independent State.

If the taking of serious and urgent steps to convene an international Middle East peace conference, under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is the internationally agreed upon requirement for the achievement of a political settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict, it is incumbent on the Council, pending the achievement of such a settlement, to adopt such immediate measures as would provide protection for the Palestinians under the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

Dare we entertain such a hope?

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Democratic Yemen for his kind words addressed to me.

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): All of the previous speakers during this and previous meetings have condemned Israel and its acts of brutal repression perpetrated against defenceless civilians and the inhabitants of the other occupied Arab territories - all, with the exception of one, the representative of the Zionist occupying forces and the Israeli settlers in occupied Palestinian territory.

It was predictable that he would defend those acts. What dismays us, however, is that the representative of the racist, Fascist, occupying forces, whose hands daily are stained with the blood of women and children of all ages, can blithely justify such crimes.

The Security Council was not created to uphold internationally condemned crimes of genocide. No, the Council was established to defend international peace and security and to put an end to aggression everywhere. The Israeli occupation being an act of aggression, it is the Council's duty to put an end to both.

The Israeli representative has attempted to distort the truth, using a favourite method of the Zionists: he claims that the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories have no rights - that only the Israeli settlers and occupiers have legitimate rights and the law on their side.

Just imagine what would be the destiny of mankind if these distortions of the truth were to prevail. By virtue of this reversal of values, the popular resistance has been described as the acts of terrorists. According to the proponents of that theory, the European popular resistance against nazism during the Second World War was an act of terrorism, too.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The resistance in the occupied Arab territories of the West Bank and Gaza, in the Syrian Arab Golan and in southern Lebanon is a popular resistance against foreign Fascist occupation - that is, Israeli occupation and its terrorist agents, the Israeli settlers.

The Zionists brought terrorism to the Middle East, and that terrorism does not go back only to the year of birth of the representative of Israel but to the birth of zionism at the end of the previous century, for zionism was born of the ideology of colonialism, racism and racial discrimination, an ideology that led to the occupation of Palestine. That movement encouraged Jews from all over the world to emigrate to Palestine and commit acts of terrorism against the Arab inhabitants and force them to leave their land.

Before zionism, Jews in all Arab countries lived in complete harmony with their Arab inhabitants; but the problem arose with the birth of zionism. That problem grew over the years and took on extremely serious terrorist dimensions after the Second World War and the adoption of the General Assembly resolution partitioning Palestine and creating what is called the State of Israel. War followed war. I am not going to lecture on history, but wish merely to set straight the history distorted by the Israeli representative. It is at that time that Israel's expansionist wars against its Arab neighbours began. Israel has persisted in making war; it is always Israel that has taken the initiative in starting wars in order to acquire new territory.

In order to usurp more territory, Israel has always resorted to terrorism. I shall not list all the massacres perpetrated in Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories, but I would remind the Council of the attack on the King David Hotel, during which hundreds of men and women were killed. When questioned, the man responsible for that tragedy, Menachem Begin, said: "We had to carry out that

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

terrorist act in order to implement our plan". Thus they are practising terrorism to implement their plan. What is that plan? It is the establishment in the region of a "Greater Israel", and the occupation of Arab territories. That was why they committed the Deir Yassin, Nahallin, Quibia, Sabra and Shatila massacres, and continue to this day to carry out further massacres.

Peace cannot be founded on such a terrorist premise. Those who practise a policy of terror do not truly want peace. Each time the Arabs come near the goal of peace, they are met only with further Israeli escalation of repression and terror. Why?

That question has often been posed, and the answer is a simple one: Israel does not want peace. What Israel wants is more land and expansion through settlements. That is its policy in the occupied Arab territories. The names of those occupied Palestinian territories have even been changed - they now call them Judea and Samaria. The Golan was annexed in the full view of the world, and contrary to the will of the international community. Israel occupied southern Lebanon and established a so-called security zone, which is nothing other than occupation and an attempt to establish a link with Lebanon since Israel has its eyes on the water resources of southern Lebanon.

Israel's territorial ambitions know no boundaries, and if the Security Council does not adopt the measures dictated by its mandate and provided by the Charter, Israel will continue to pursue its policies. Unless the Council succeeds in putting an end to this escalation of terror and death on which the Israeli occupying authorities and the settlers are now engaged in the occupied Arab territories, there can be no peace in the region.

The Arabs will not flinch; they will pursue their struggle, as is their legitimate right.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

Peace in the Middle East can be based only on the following. First, total and unconditional withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, for this is an occupation, and an end to occupation cannot be subordinated to any pre-conditions. Any attempt at setting pre-conditions for ending occupation is tantamount to a desire to continue the occupation. Secondly, the Palestinian people must be enabled to exercise its inalienable national rights, first and foremost the right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State on its national soil of Palestine. Such a settlement must be arrived at within the framework of an international conference under United Nations auspices, in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the Organization.

That is precisely what Israel rejects. What is wrong with this basis: withdrawal by Israel; the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights; and the convening of an international conference on the Middle East under United Nations auspices? The answer is clear: it is that Israel does not want peace.

Everything the representative of Israel said in his statement constitutes only an attempt to pull the wool over our eyes. But the Security Council will not allow itself to be side-tracked from the reality of the situation in the region: Israeli expansionism and Israel's lack of a real desire for peace.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The representative of Israel also spoke of Syria's role in Lebanon. He did so with a plethora of details. As usual, he simply wished to distort the truth.

Syria is in Lebanon, that fraternal country, at the request of the legitimate Government and authorized by the other Arab countries, to help bring about a solution, to help all the Lebanese parties, without any discrimination, to reach agreement and settle their problems.

Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982. It was a barbaric invasion, which devastated the land and decimated the people. Everybody recalls the destruction of the city of Beirut, the hardship left behind by the Israeli invaders and the massacres that were committed. Israel has so far refused to implement Security Council resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and has refused to withdraw from Lebanese territories. It is therefore an occupying Power, an occupying force in Lebanon.

I will not go into the details of the daily acts of aggression in Lebanon - on land, at sea and in the air, the bombing of defenceless civilians, the destruction of houses, the killing of children - for the media report on these matters day after day.

Israel has tried to gain control of Lebanon, to establish hegemony over it. But the Lebanese national resistance has managed to thwart those manoeuvres and has thrown Israel out of Lebanese territory. Israel has pulled out of most of the country, but Lebanese resistance continues, and efforts are continuing to be made to liberate the last square inch of Lebanese territory. They will succeed, regardless of the material or military assistance that Israel receives. Israel cannot defy the ferocious will of the Lebanese people.

The objective of the representative of the occupying force of Israel in raising the subject, while we have been considering the odious, Nazi-type crimes

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

perpetrated by Israeli troops, is to divert attention from the crimes that we have been discussing. But that attempt is doomed to failure. He has not been successful in diverting our attention, for the whole world has been receiving reports of those Nazi-like and Fascist-like crimes.

Syria is not a party to the conflict taking place in Lebanon. As I have said, Syria is there to help its brothers to settle their disputes.

I regret having taken so much time at this late hour, but I felt I had a duty to shed some light on the facts, given the untruths put forward by the representative of Israel.

The PRESIDENT: In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will take place this afternoon, Thursday, 8 June 1989, at 3.30.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.