

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1720th MEETING: 11 JUNE 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1720)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)	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.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 11 June 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Yakov MALIK
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1720)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929).

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Security Council to a new Security Council document which is directly related to the examination of the situation in the Middle East. The document [S/10944], which was issued at the request of the representative of Guyana, Ambassador Jackson, contains the resolution on the Middle East question adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries at Georgetown, Guyana, in August last year. It should be noted that paragraph 6, which refers to the assistance of the non-aligned countries to take all necessary initiatives for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories, includes, *inter alia*, a reference to the fact that the Security Council is the international forum which should take such action.

2. In accordance with decisions adopted by the Security Council at previous meetings, I intend, with the Council's consent, to invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Chad, the Syrian Arab Republic, Nigeria, Algeria, Morocco, the United Arab Emirates, Somalia, Guyana and Mauritania to take part, without the right to vote, in the Council's consideration of the question of the situation in the Middle East.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took places at the Council table and Mr. S. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. H. G. Ouangmotching (Chad), Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. O. Arikpo (Nigeria), Mr. A. Bouteflika (Algeria), Mr. M. Zentar (Morocco), Mr. A. Al-Pachachi (United Arab Emirates), Mr. H. Nur Elmi (Somalia), Mr. R. E. Jackson (Guyana) and Mr. M. El Hassen (Mauritania) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Security Council that as President of the Council I have received letters from the representatives of Kuwait and Qatar containing requests that their delegations should be invited to take part, without the right to vote, in the consideration of the item on the agenda for this meeting of the Security Council. In accordance with established practice and the provisional rules of procedure, I propose to invite the representatives of Kuwait and Qatar to take part, without the right to vote, in the Council's consideration of the question of the situation in the Middle East. Since there is no objection, it is so decided. Accordingly, I invite the representatives of Kuwait and Qatar to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber. I shall invite the representatives of Kuwait and Qatar to take their places at the Council table when it is their turn to speak on the question under discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Y. Jamal (Qatar) and Mr. A. Y. Bishara (Kuwait) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): The first speaker on the list for today's meeting is the representative of Kuwait, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table to make his statement.

5. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): May I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you warmly and cordially on the assumption of your duties as President of the Security Council for this month. I feel confident that the constructive manner in which you are guiding the Council's proceedings augurs well for the work of this august body at this grave juncture, and I am sure that under your experienced captaincy the proceedings will arrive at the shores of sensibility.

6. Scores of resolutions, injunctions often flavoured with condemnation or the word "deplore", have not been able to kindle a light of hope for the Palestinians, who are the primary victims of the Zionist State of Israel. Conciliation

missions have shuttled back and forth to no avail; personal representatives have crossed distances in order to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Middle East tragedy. The result is nil. Nor has Israel shown any readiness to redress the wrongs it has inflicted on the Palestinians, nor have the Palestinians—who constitute the main party to the dispute—abandoned their determination to go back to their homeland from which they were forcibly evicted.

7. The passage of years has not eroded the legitimate rights of the Palestinians; neither has it convinced the Israeli Government of the necessity for accommodating the people of Palestine. Thus deadlock prevails. It is this solemn occasion, in fact, that urges me to delve into the genesis of the problem. Without grasping the roots, understanding the genesis, identifying the crux of the issue, the Security Council will not be able to diagnose the disease that has permeated the region for more than two decades. Any endeavour to cure the symptoms while ignoring the root is bound to crumble, as the past years have shown.

8. What are the roots of the matter? The root of the tragedy is the denial of the rights of the Palestinians in their homeland. A people comprising about 2½ million is not given the opportunity to exercise its legitimate right of self-determination. Around half of them live in the abominable shanties of the camps, on international alms—and, on many occasions, a rather reluctant rather than generous charity. The injustice inflicted on them stems from the Zionist character of Israel.

9. The creation of a Jewish State entailed the displacement of the indigenous Arab majority. Thus different methods designed to evict the Palestinians were employed. Terror, force, and sometimes blandishments, among many other things, achieved their end.

10. Years of dispersion have not stifled the yearnings of the Palestinians to return to their homeland. The future does not bode well in this respect. Thus the conflict continues, with Israel denying the rights of the Palestinians in their land, and the latter clinging tenaciously to their indisputable rights. Why does Israel negate these rights. The answer lies in its Zionist character that prevents the development of a State in which non-Jews can live, as well as Jews, or even a State in which non-Jews—and this means, most particularly, Palestinians—can live at all. This exclusivist character, which insists upon the maintenance at almost all costs of a large Jewish majority, cannot allow for the repatriation of Palestinian refugees.

11. The Zionist emphasis upon the continued existence of a demographically Jewish State, which is embodied in Israel's framework, makes that so. The so-called Israeli Declaration of Independence does not declare the existence of a sovereign, independent State for those who live there: it rather declares a Jewish State for all the Jews of the world, about 12 million of whom reside outside and only slightly over 2.6 million in Israel. Almost all Jews can become citizens of Israel merely by going there and opting for such citizenship. By Zionist definition, then, Israel's citizenship or nationality base cannot allow any significant numbers of non-Jews to become citizens or nationals.

12. General Moshe Dayan, for example, made this clear again after the 1967 war in replying publicly to a news reporter's question about Israel's ability to absorb the Arab population in the recently occupied territories. General Dayan said, tersely and succinctly:

"Economically we can, but I think that is not in accord with our aims in the future; it would turn Israel into either a bi-national or poly-national Arab-Jewish State instead of the Jewish State, and we want to have a Jewish State. We can absorb them, but we won't be in the same country."

13. Former Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion stated the same idea at another time:

"... Israel"—he said—"is the country of the Jews and only of the Jews. Every Arab who lives here has the same rights as any minority citizen in any country in the world, but he must admit the fact that he lives in a Jewish country."

14. Prime Minister Golda Meir put it even more clearly and lucidly in a debate in the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, on 25 June 1969. She said:

"I want a Jewish State with a decisive Jewish majority which cannot change overnight... I always believed [this] was plain Zionism."

15. Besides maintaining a large majority by legislation, the Israeli establishment has within the context of its Zionist character confiscated non-Jewish Arab land and kept a majority of land in Israel in Jewish hands. From 1948 to 1967, scores of Arab villages disappeared altogether and many hundreds of thousands of acres of Arab land were confiscated under the absentee property law and land requisition laws, passed in the Knesset from 1950 to 1953. In many towns, houses of Arabs were confiscated in 1948 because their owners had left them for some days in order to be in safer quarters. Fields in villages were taken away because of the owner's absence from his property for some few days.

16. After the establishment of Israel, all government land and almost all confiscated land was given to the Jewish National Fund. This amounts to over 90 per cent of Israeli farmland. Jewish National Fund land may not be sold or leased to Arabs.

17. Since the end of the June 1967 war Israel has begun to build strictly Jewish settlements in many parts of the occupied territories. Thus the Palestinians, who are the heart of the issue, have no place in their homeland. This fact is due to the exclusivist structure of Israel. Their aspirations are denied, their legitimate rights abrogated and their determination derided.

18. Mrs. Meir stated the following in an interview with *The Sunday Times* of London on 15 June 1969:

"There was no such thing as Palestinian people in Palestine considering itself as a Palestinian people and we

came and threw them out, and took their country away from them. They did not exist."

19. It is clear from such a statement that the Zionist leaders of Israel are adamant in their rejection of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Thus the incompatibility of Israel's present policy with the inalienable rights of the Palestinians constitutes the major obstacle to the attainment of peace. It should be remembered that between December 1947 and May 1948—that is, prior to the termination of the British Mandate—the Zionists attacked and occupied the Arab towns of Jaffa and Acre and many Arab villages. They also attacked and expelled the Arab inhabitants of Tiberias, and hundreds of Arab villages in the proposed Jewish State. The massacre of Deir Yassin took place on 9 April 1948, more than a month before the ending of the British mandate, and this resulted in the terror-stricken flight of many Palestinians, so that by 15 May 1948, 325,000 Palestinians had already fled or been expelled. That was before the declaration of independence of Israel.

20. Arie Eliav, former Secretary-General of the Israeli Labour Party, and Knesset member, wrote:

"The problem of the Palestinian Arabs is the source of the entire dispute. It is the root of the sickness, and it's because of these people that three wars have been fought. It is a festering sore which drips blood, their blood and ours, which poisons the Arab world and ourselves. A leader who wants to heal it will not flinch from using the surgeon's knife in order to lance it, so that it can be cleaned. By rubbing empty phrases on this running sore, or condemning anyone who tries to examine it, we will make no progress towards an accurate diagnosis."

Let the Israeli Government heed this healthy and sound advice.

21. On 11 December 1948, the General Assembly voted, in its famous resolution 194 (III), for the return of the Palestinians to their country and compensation to those who were unwilling to go back.

22. In General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949, on the admission of Israel to the United Nations, only after

"Noting furthermore the declaration of the State of Israel that it 'unreservedly accepts the obligations of the United Nations Charter and undertakes to honour them from the day when it becomes a Member of the United Nations',

"Recalling its resolutions of 29 November 1947 and 11 December 1948 and taking note of the declarations and explanations made by the representative of the Government of Israel before the *ad hoc* Political Committee in respect of the implementation of the said resolutions",

did the General Assembly admit Israel to the United Nations.

23. Thus, the admission of Israel into the United Nations was conditional on its implementation of resolution 194 (III) pertaining to the repatriation of the Palestinians, and on its acceptance of the continued validity of resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 on partition. Israel, having secured United Nations membership, spurned those resolutions and disregarded their provisions. It retreated from its declaration that obliged it to observe those resolutions.

24. The present mood of Israel towards the Palestinians is best reflected in Mrs. Meir's interview with the BBC. She was asked if she would sit with the Palestinians. She replied: "No, because we have no negotiation with the Palestinians. They have nothing to offer us and we have nothing to offer them." That was reported in the *Israeli Digest* of 13 October 1972, on page 1.

25. It is this congenital inability of Israel to realize the depth of the Palestinians insistence on repatriation, coupled with its exclusivist structure, that has made a just peace so elusive. For us, peace and the rights of the Palestinians are so intertwined, so indivisible, so inseparable, that the denial of the latter obliterates the former. The respect of the rights of the Palestinians constitutes one of the two pillars of a durable peace.

26. The strict adherence to the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force is the second pillar for a durable peace in the region. This principle cannot be tampered with. Its sanctity is emphasized in the United Nations Charter and in international law. It is the basic principle that governs relations between States and ensures their territorial integrity. It is a fact of life that there is no complete security of States in the world and that territory alone does not ensure any State's security. In the final analysis, security is the outcome of mutual understanding among neighbours. Moreover, no nation is secure by virtue of might alone. No State maintains absolute security for itself with utter disregard of the security of its neighbours.

27. Security means reconciliation, understanding and mutual harmony with the surrounding States. It does not mean the imposition of the concepts of secure borders of one State on its neighbours. Israel wants Jordan, Syria, and Egypt to cede portions of their occupied territories in order to obtain for itself the maximum of secure borders at the expense of the security of its neighbours. This theory held by Israel means that any State wishing to expand need only to invade a neighbouring State, occupy its territory and impose its territorial demands by means of superior force, and then proclaim that it has the natural right to hold this territory because it is secure and defensible. Israel's theory is completely illegal and contrary to the United Nations Charter, and if it is allowed to prevail, then the world will turn to the law of the jungle. Israel itself will suffer from the horrible consequences of establishing peace based on annexation. A prominent international lawyer, Mr. Gerhard von Glahn, wrote the following in his book *Law among Nations*:¹

¹ New York, The Macmillan Company, 1965.

"The coming into force of the United Nations Charter ended, in this writer's opinion, the legality of . . . title to territory through conquest. The relevant provisions of the instrument"—especially Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter—"make it abundantly clear that, from a legal point of view, the use or threat of the use of force, in violation of obligations assumed under the Charter, to obtain territory from another State is clearly prohibited to all States Members of the Organization."

28. Israel has its own interpretation of international law with regard to borders. It has become an international celebrity in defying the universally acknowledged principle of the inviolability of the territorial integrity of States. Mrs. Meir, in an interview with Louis Herin of *The Times* of London, on 12 March 1972, made the following points on the boundaries Israel would require for a settlement. First, Israel must have Sharm-El-Sheikh, which dominates the Strait of Tiran, and have access to it. Sinai must be demilitarized. There should be a mixed force to guarantee demilitarization. Second, Egypt could not return to Gaza. Third, the border around Elath, Israel's port on the Gulf of Aqaba, must be negotiated. Fourth, Israel would not relinquish the Golan Heights. Fifth, Jerusalem must remain united and part of Israel. Sixth, the Jordan river must not be open for Arab troops to cross. Israel must have something there and perhaps on the heights behind. Seventh, it was opposed to an independent Palestinian West Bank. Eighth, the final borders on the West Bank must not divide but connect Israelis and Arabs. It is clear from such a map that Israel is determined to impose a conqueror's peace upon the Arabs. It is not an offer but a provocation. No Arab will accept such a *diktat*, nor would any other peoples accept a similar one.

29. General Dayan, a soldier noted for his prolific statements on borders, said, as reported by Reuters on 5 April 1971:

"If choice is withdrawal to the pre-Six-Day-War borders or war . . . I would prefer not to withdraw. War along the present line would be preferable."

30. The insatiable covetousness of Israel for territory is underlined more succinctly by General Ezer Weizmann, former Air Force Commander, who said, as reported by the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* on 9 November 1971:

"If given the choice, I would prefer more of Sinai and fewer Phantoms than more Phantoms and less Sinai."

31. As the report of the Secretary-General shows, Israel's answer to the Jarring aide-mémoire openly stated that it "would not withdraw to the pre-5 June 1967 lines" [*S/10929, para. 84*].

32. The former Secretary-General wrote:

"I wish moreover to note with satisfaction the positive reply given by the United Arab Republic to Ambassador Jarring's initiative. However, the Government of Israel has so far not responded to the request of Ambassador Jarring that it should give a commitment on withdrawal

to the international boundary of the United Arab Republic.

"... I appeal, therefore, to the Government of Israel to give further consideration of this question and to respond favourably to Ambassador Jarring's initiative." [*Ibid., para. 88*].

33. The former United States representative, Charles Yost, wrote in *Life* magazine, in its issue of 9 April 1971:

"It has been my strong impression, growing out of the four-Power talks . . . that the Arabs have in fact been ready for a year and a half to make such a peace and undertake such commitments—as Israel had been demanding for more than 20 years. The Egyptians have accepted the commitments requested by Jarring. The Israelis have not. If they do, the negotiations can proceed rapidly to a settlement . . . If the Israelis do not accept, the negotiations will before long break down, fighting will resume, on a small scale at first but inevitably escalating."

34. According to *Newsweek* of 6 December 1971:

"The Nixon Administration regards Israeli inflexibility as the main cause for the diplomatic stalemate that has afflicted the Middle East for the last four years."

35. An editorial in *The New York Times* of 8 October 1971 stated that:

"... the Jarring talks are stalled by Israel's own failure to give a more positive response to Mr. Jarring's queries of last February".

36. This is the verdict of world public opinion on Israel's adamant rejection to fulfil the requirement for a durable peace.

37. Israel's insistence on direct negotiations is not an honest deployment of a genuine desire for peace, but is a decoy for Arab surrender. It wants to disregard the United Nations Charter, the United Nations resolutions and the will of the world community. It wants to use its superior military power and bargaining position to impose its own harsh peace terms on the Arabs. Israel has been primarily concerned in the past, as well as now, not so much with what procedure should be used to attain a peace settlement, but with how much territory it could annex and how few Arab refugees it would be required to repatriate. Harping on the need for direct negotiations has been merely a pretext and excuse to do nothing and to hold on to all territories occupied illegally in 1948 and in 1967.

38. An Israeli writer and editor, Simcha Falapan, wrote in December 1971, in the *New Outlook*:

"Mr. Abba Eban keeps declaring that the best way to a settlement is direct negotiations between Israel and its neighbours. It is a fact, however, that the Arabs refused such negotiations for the same reason that Israel proposed them: in direct negotiations, Israel has the advantage of playing out to the full the weight of a military

occupation, while the Arabs do not have the advantage of bringing into the play their economic and political influence throughout the world."

39. The Arabs have a genuine fear of the expansionist nature of Israel. That fear existed from the early days of the conflict, and has accumulated throughout the years as irrefutable evidence of Israel's expansionism demonstrated itself. Not only had Israel sought to expand into areas assigned to the Palestine Arab State before the outbreak of the war on 15 May 1948, but it actually made its greatest territorial gains in that period during the second and permanent truce which the United Nations had established. On 14 October 1948, Israel deliberately mounted its offensives in the Negev and in the Galilee areas despite the United Nations permanent truces in order to conquer more land and to expand as much as possible. That campaign was called the "tenth plague".

40. Acting Mediator Ralph Bunche reported to the United Nations [*S/1042 of 18 October 1948 and S/1071 of 6 November 1948*] that the offensives had been deliberately planned by Israel and were completely unjustified, despite Israeli claims to the contrary. The Security Council had met to consider the matter and on 4 November 1948 had adopted resolution 61 (1948) calling for respect of the truce and an Israeli withdrawal to the lines of 14 October 1948. Israel refused to abide by it.

41. On 22 December 1948 Israel again attacked in the Negev to gain even more land, and again, according to Mr. Bunche's report [*S/1152 of 25 December 1948*], without justification, even after 1948, Israel continued its expansionist policy. Despite the United Nations opposition, it seized control of most of the Syrian-Israeli demilitarized zone, and in 1955 all of the El-Auja demilitarized zone. This horrendous record of expansionism, which climaxed in 1967, has exposed the true nature of Israel.

42. General Dayan declared to some American Jewish College students on the Golan Heights in 1968:

"During the last one hundred years our people have been in the process of building up the country and the nation, of expansion, of giving additional Jews additional settlements in order to expand the borders here: let no Jew say that the process has ended, let no Jew say that we are near the end of the road."

That was reported in *Maariv* of 7 July 1968.

43. The question that arises here is this: Why does Israel have expansionist designs? The answer is to be found in one of the central concepts of Zionism legislated into the State's character. It is the concept of "Aliyah". "Aliyah" is the idea that all Jews should emigrate to Israel. On 24 November 1952, the Knesset enacted a piece of legislation known as the World Zionist Organization Jewish Agency for Palestine Status Law. That law emphasizes that recruitment for Jewish immigration is the "central task of the State of Israel". This recruitment, again to use the words of the law, "requires constant efforts by the World Zionist Organization to assist immigration of masses of Jews from around the world into Israel". If that call for

immigration within the context of the "Aliyah" concept were to prove successful—that is, if all, most or even many of the roughly 12 million Jews now residing outside Israel were indeed persuaded to emigrate to Israel—expansion by that State would become an absolute necessity.

44. The tragedy of the Middle East has been in the lap of the United Nations since 1947. This august body took the decision to partition Palestine into two States. It was that decision that bolstered the morale of the Israelis and equally inflicted a great injustice on the Arabs. The United Nations is not alien to the problem. Its responsibility for the attainment of peace based on justice is undeniable. Its obligation to the principles embodied in its Charter is inescapable. It is now at the crossroads. It either meets the challenge of peace or succumbs to the temptation of inertia. Years of hostility have accumulated rancour, bitterness and alienation. The United Nations is duty bound by its moral and legal commitments to embark on a serious and unrelenting effort to attain peace in the region. It has special responsibility towards the Palestinians who were dispossessed because of its decision to partition their homeland. It has a solemn responsibility to ensure scrupulous observance of the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force.

45. The Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, in the statement he delivered on 25 May 1973 at the Tenth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), said:

"The intractable nature of the problem may be largely due to the fact that fundamental principles of the Charter are involved: the sanctity of the territorial integrity of Member States, the right of every State to be secure within its territorial boundaries and the inalienable right of self-determination of peoples. These principles are of crucial importance in the formulation of any peace agreement."

That is an accurate diagnosis of the problem. The observance of the principles forming the two pillars of peace—namely, non-acquisition of territory by force and the inalienable right to self-determination—is so essential, so indispensable, so overriding, that in its absence peace becomes an evasive mirage never obtainable though assiduously sought.

46. The negation of either of these principles makes peace more remote; respect for both brings about a durable peace. The area needs peace that endures, peace that safeguards the interests of all, peace that takes into account the legitimate rights of the evicted people of Palestine. No peace that overlooks this incontrovertible fact will last. No peace that abrogates strict adherence to the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force will be able to withstand the urgings of revenge. No peace will be achieved through pressure for capitulation. History has shown that peace based on arbitrary solutions is bound to crumble. The causes of the Second World War are instructive and that instruction should be heeded.

47. 'This series of meetings is historic in the sense that the Arabs and peace-loving peoples look to you with the eyes

of expectancy. Your decision is exceedingly crucial. It either plunges the area into the morass of chaos and turmoil or kindles a light of hope after decades of sombre resignation and despair. The Security Council should act to arrest the deterioration of the situation in the area and reverse the trend therein so that people may have hope in building a better future. The message brought by Egypt is so serious that there is now no room for inaction or levity. The peoples of the Middle East are at the end of their patience. It is up to you finally to furnish them with some real hope of attaining a just peace. Occupation should not continue. The *status quo* is intolerable. You will either shoulder your responsibility as a body entrusted with the maintenance of peace or bear the onus of what will evolve in the future. There are already enough signs of alarm to spur the Council to act firmly and expeditiously. The situation is fraught with danger. The area is entitled to your assistance in allaying the fear arising from perpetual tribulations and aggravations.

48. I speak with concern about the future because if a just peace is not obtained the course of events will inevitably engulf the Arabs and the Israelis and others in a bloody confrontation. As it is now, the situation threatens international peace and security. Continuation of the occupation by Israel of Arab territories in flagrant contravention of the United Nations and its resolutions constitutes an unprecedented challenge to the world's security and order. Such a challenge will have catastrophic consequences.

49. The international community is obliged to take measures designed to bring about Israeli withdrawal from Arab territory and the achievement of peace based on justice. International détente is a sham when some peoples are languishing under the yoke of occupation. We should not be deluded by the state of "no war, no peace" in the area. The absence of the thunder of cannon and the explosion of bombs is not a sign of the prevalence of normalcy.

50. The Security Council must bring momentum to the efforts devoted to peace. If it fails, it will incur the wrath of the international community and incurably ruin the Organization. It is up to you to take the decision that injects into the area the hope for peace—a peace that respects the Charter and its provisions. Or, if you fail, the United Nations and all it represents will crumble. I trust you will act in a constructive and responsible way commensurate with the gravity of the situation.

51. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Security Council that I have just received a letter from the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Omar Sakka, requesting that he be given an opportunity to take part in the discussion of the question on the situation in the Middle East. In accordance with established practice and the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, I intend to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take part, without the right to vote, in the consideration by the Security Council of the question of the situation in the Middle East.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. O. Sakka (Saudi Arabia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

52. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): The next speaker on the list for today's meeting is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table.

53. Mr. BOUTEFILKA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has already devoted a number of meetings to the problems of the Middle East. Its debates and its resolutions are evidence of the complex nature of a situation which, because it persists and deteriorates, constitutes a formidable threat to international peace. If more often than not the Council has met under the pressure of events in order to quench an outbreak of fire or shore up a breach in an always precarious balance, in addition to making a necessary evaluation of the situation, the present series of meetings is designed to carry out a general examination of the question of the Middle East, to make a reappraisal of the facts and an evaluation of the efforts that have been made and, finally, to define a new approach and prepare the means to be put into operation in order to try to reach a satisfactory solution. I say this to show how important we feel the debate is upon which we have just embarked here and how appreciative we are of the courtesy of the Council, which has been good enough to allow us, my colleagues and me, in pursuance of the mandates we have been given not by our respective countries but rather by the Tenth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU to participate in the debate and to make the view of Africa known.

54. I should like, Mr. President, to express my satisfaction at seeing these debates take place under your guidance. The ties of friendship and esteem which have long existed between us and the relations of fruitful co-operation which are developing so harmoniously between your great country and mine are not the only reasons that we feel this satisfaction. It is also based on the great talents that we have come to appreciate in you, as we have come to know you, and on the long experience that you have had with international problems and, in particular, with the problem with which we are dealing today. We are convinced that under your presidency this series of meetings devoted to one of the most delicate and most burning problems of the world today will take place at a level to ensure what all of us expect of the Security Council.

55. For more than 25 years the policy of various United Nations bodies has been devoted strenuously to divesting the Palestinian question of its fundamental facts and fending it off with a humanitarian alibi. At the Security Council level, in particular, circumstantial accommodation has prevailed over global concepts, and in the course of these meetings the Council has deliberately dealt with the question in a piecemeal fashion. This approach was doomed inevitably to lead to an impasse and, in the last analysis, to consolidate a *de facto* situation flowing from the repetition of Israeli aggression which attained its high point in 1967. The concatenation of events since that time has daily placed us before the painful demonstration of the

flight of the international community before its responsibilities.

56. At the outset, the international context, which was still subject to the constraints of the post-war period, was certainly favourable for the shameless exploitation of the feeling of guilt, which resulted in the substitution of one injustice by another injustice and in the designation of Palestine as the dumping ground for the many and reprehensible crimes of the West. This injustice towards the Palestine people, consecrated by the United Nations despite the fundamental principles of its own Charter, could never be considered an irreversible fact, particularly since the courts of that time, by their dimensions, their orientation and their immediate concerns, were in no way empowered to decide on the creation of an artificial State, which could be nothing other than the anti-homeland of the Palestine nation.

57. This problem devolved from this fundamental contradiction, which was already included in the Balfour Declaration. It is a problem which remains without solution and one which affects the national existence of an entire people and places the whole of the Middle East in a state of continuing and dangerous tension. Why Palestine? The choice was certainly not fortuitous. The close conjunction of imperialist strategic calculations and the objectives pursued by Zionism could culminate only in an ideology of domination. Used to that end, in favour of deals still not free from colonial concepts of the past, the implantation of Israel in the very heart of the Arab nation thus acquires its full significance in this strategic area, to which, by long imperialist tradition, precise functions have been assigned.

58. The real role of the Zionist State is unceasingly confirmed by repeated aggressions, terrorist actions, provocation implicit in the craze for power and, above all, the systematic application of a vast plan for the annexation of territory. True, the objectives of this policy enjoy a large measure of flagrant support from international accomplices, in order to ensure the supply of raw materials and power to the industrial Powers, to control all movement for emancipation which might endanger acquired positions in a region which is particularly sensitive, since it is situated at the crossroads of three continents, and thus to preserve a launching point for planetary strategies.

59. Resorting to manipulation in the guise of neo-colonialism proved itself to be unsure, so imperialist control created for itself a suitable tool for which South Africa already constituted a prototype of known quality. By its nature, by its projections, Zionism offered a useful basis for the establishment on Palestinian soil of an imported State, with moving frontiers to which was assigned this specific mission which flows directly from its vocation.

60. What is today called the crisis in the Middle East is above all the dispossession of the Palestinian people of its homeland and its inalienable rights. To overlook the origins of the problem, to throw a veil of forgetfulness over the real cause of tension in the Near East in order to dwell only on its side effects, is deliberately to take the wrong course and inevitably to condemn oneself to failure; it is tanta-

mount also to committing oneself solely to seek a semblance of balance which sacrifices people to the interests of power.

61. But false solutions, while they might nourish the illusion of those who want to entertain them, could in no way stifle the will of peoples for liberation. When distinguished international bodies find themselves confusing the sacred rights of the Palestinian people with decisions that run counter to nature and that are to say the least open to question, injustice is so flagrant that it becomes revolting. Such ambiguity has no result other than to give the Palestinian people another source of frustration, a fountain of awareness all the more acute because it is so healthy. Thus if, cut off in full flight by British colonialism and pursued without mercy by Zionist colonization, the Palestinian people—which has for a long time paid the cost of international arrangements, and always to the benefit of its oppressors—has taken the firm determination to free itself by its own means, in so doing it is assuming a historic mission by becoming the catalyst of forces in ferment throughout the region which would not fail to bring into play in the interests of justice all of the humanitarian and economic potential that they represent.

62. In any event, the Palestinian people more than any other people—I say, more than any other people—has become the incarnation of the bad conscience of mankind.

63. The 1967 aggression was supposed to have been decisive, but far from achieving the goals it had set, it has rather only served to bring out the existence of a Palestine nation which has been affirmed with increased force and vigour in order to impose its image at the international level and on the battlefield as the fundamental element in any over-all and lasting solution for the situation in the Middle East.

64. Moreover, experience has shown the futility of military methods and means of force in the face of the resistance of peoples for whom time remains the staunchest ally. Palestinian resistance, like that of other dominated peoples who have preceded it in history, can in turn extend over years and even over generations, but sooner or later it will finally make its purpose a reality as it has already made that objective a reality in the right.

65. For all those who still refuse to understand the historic nature of this phenomenon to seek refuge in illusion is the worst aberration, particularly since the vast disproportion of material means involved in the confrontation leads one to believe in the permanence of the fait accompli. The struggle which the Palestinian people is carrying on to ensure its own survival is not a sign of despair—far from it—and its sacrifices of today are just so many decisive arguments in favour of the justice of its cause, the legitimacy of its struggle and the certainty that its national aspirations will be realized.

66. Two anniversaries noted and celebrated recently with a few days' interval between them have just given the world an opportunity to compare two different concepts: one based on the emergence of reborn forces guided by hope and faith, and the other inspired by the mad vision which confuses itself with the resurgence of a new imperialism. It

associates ostracism and religious messianism with permanent aggression and expansionist aims. Is it not a fact that the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the creation of Israel in annexed Jerusalem, in tortured and captured Jerusalem, has led to military demonstrations which are so incompatible with the first vocation of the City of Peace? Is that not one more clear affirmation of the nature of a State which, contrary to all allegations, has chosen to live by war and for war?

67. The tenth anniversary of OAU, celebrated in dignity and with fervour, in its turn has been another powerful manifestation of this will of Africa, Africa which is always vigilant, stung by insults, attentive to injustice, prompt to unmask hostility and aggression and to suffer deeply from these elements. The event indeed was shadowed only by our sad realization that the page of the colonial era in history has still not been turned. And here is all of Africa which continues to be tried and beset on all sides by Portuguese colonialism, by South Africa, Rhodesia and Israel. So many problems to be solved, similar in their genesis, comparable in their nature and complementary in their end purpose. You will agree with us that, as far as the continent is concerned, we have a serious source of concern and that undoubtedly it involves for Africa its security, its emancipation, and its vocation for unity.

68. On all these problems, OAU was obliged to have only one policy, a common policy which would reflect its determination to complete the decolonization of the continent and ensure effective solidarity to those peoples whose national territory was annexed or simply had been amputated. In so doing, the Africa of today, because it represents a third of the United Nations, constitutes a vast reservoir of capital to be invested in fidelity to the noble ideals of the international community, to a just cause—above all when it is its very own cause. The more the positions of Africa on the colonial question are defined the greater is its capacity to protect itself and to confront the various dangers steadily besetting it as if it were only a testing ground.

69. Precisely because they have such vast possibilities, it is not mere chance that the African countries, which have barely emerged from the trials of colonialism, see their will to liberation counteracted by the reappearance of the forces of domination and exploitation. No matter where we look, the same forces, supported by the same metropolitan countries, tend to perpetuate their grasp on sensitive areas; South Africa and Israel, have set themselves up as bases for aggression, and they respond to each other like two poles of the same system to which the same role of guardian of imperialist interests is assigned.

70. At a time when the complicated problems of the post-war period are beginning to be solved in dynamic concerted agreements, the situation in the Middle East stands as an object of deals and bargaining, which are not always designed, unfortunately, to extend the benefits of peace to this region of the third world. I clearly call this the third world because we are both in Africa and in Asia. We are not indifferent to the problems of the Gulf and the Red Sea, and we are carefully watching the evolution of the energy problems. In short, what could be less reassuring

than a situation which, far from abating daily meets more of the conditions apt to make it contagious and explosive?

71. If a solution in accordance with the demands of justice and peace were not to be implemented by the Council, it would no longer be possible to control the flames which inevitably will engulf all the Middle East. The fragile balance that you have been able to preserve heretofore, in the "no peace, no war" situation could hardly be more vulnerable. Either you will consecrate the fait accompli and the victors of today will not necessarily be those of tomorrow, or there will be a return to a more equitable appreciation of responsibilities which are naturally held by high international bodies, and without delay we must prepare the necessary remedies.

72. The African Heads of State have considered this situation at great length, primarily in the course of their most recent Conference. True, the interest they have in the evolution of the problem of the Middle East is nothing new, and they have even attempted to help to solve it and to facilitate the search for a satisfactory and lasting solution. The failure of their efforts is most certainly one of the direct consequences of the impotence that heretofore has been characteristic of international institutions, shaken as they are by their own contradictions, frozen in a status of permanent hesitation—in a word, condemned to inertia. Yet, although imperfect, the Charter does grant certain obvious prerogatives to this Council.

73. The profound aspiration of the peoples of Africa, the large majority of which have just acceded to independence and national sovereignty, is peace, which continues to be the primary prerequisite to their development.

74. Indeed there are too many similarities between the States of the Middle East and the young African States for the continuing tension not to remind them by its foreseeable consequences of the threat to which these young States may be exposed tomorrow. Moreover, beyond the peace to be restored to the Middle East, their constant concern is that peace should extend throughout the earth, so that Africa can better ensure its own development and make its contribution to the elaboration of a new humanism throughout the world.

75. Their major concern will always be, inspired by the actions of the United Nations, to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict, particularly on the basis of the following provisions: the inadmissibility of acquisition of territories by war, the necessity to work for a just and lasting peace, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied in the recent conflict; and, above all, the just settlement of the problem of the Palestine people.

76. The hopes for peace which the African States share with the international community are founded very specifically on the acceptance of these provisions by Israel. That is why they have welcomed the efforts of Ambassador Jarring to resolve the differing points of view on the priorities that should be granted to the various commitments to be undertaken.

77. It is within the framework of complete support for these efforts that the OAU Assembly at its June 1971 session, set up a committee of 10 Heads of African States to help in the search for a solution. The mission which Africa unanimously entrusted to the Committee of Wise Men was a mission of peace. For the messengers of Africa, it was obviously not a question of replacing Mr. Jarring in his role as mediator, much less of putting themselves in the place of the Security Council. Unfortunately, this African initiative did not receive the reception it deserved. Aware of the danger arising from a deterioration is the situation prevailing in the north-eastern part of the African continent, because of the continuing aggression perpetrated against Egyptian territory and other Arab territories, a danger which constantly threatens the security, the territorial integrity and the unity of our continent, the African Heads of State at the end of their mission congratulated Egypt on its co-operation with the Committee of 10 and on its positive attitude and its persevering efforts to restore peace to the region.

78. Noting with satisfaction that the Arab Republic of Egypt had spared no effort to reach a just and lasting solution—an effort marked by the constructive co-operation of that great African country with international bodies and OAU, and in accordance with the Charter of OAU—they reaffirmed their active and total support for Egypt in its struggle to recover its territorial integrity completely and by all possible means.

79. Moreover, they energetically condemned the negative position taken by Israel vis-à-vis the mission of the 10 Heads of African States and Israel's obstructionist position. It was with deep concern that they noted that despite the many resolutions of the United Nations and OAU enjoining Israel to withdraw from all occupied African and Arab territories, Israel not only persists in its refusal to implement those resolutions, but does its utmost to practise a policy tending to create in those territories a situation of fait accompli to serve its expansionist goals. Once again they call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied territories, declaring null and void the changes made by Israel in those territories, and they undertake not to recognize any change likely to lead to a fait accompli or to undermine the territorial integrity of the countries which are victims of Israeli aggression.

80. The tragedy of the Palestinian people was also of concern to the African Heads of State, who recognize that respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is an essential element in any just and equitable solution, just as it is a factor indispensable for the establishment of a lasting peace in the region.

81. I think that this gives me an opportunity to deal with a reproach that some, probably acting in good faith, have directed towards the Arab States which, despite their considerable wealth, allegedly have not made the necessary effort to integrate the Palestinians into their own economic and social systems. I would say, first of all, that in taking such an approach we would be dealing very cheaply with the national feelings of a people, its vital attachment to its homeland and the pride that it has in its origins. This

doubtful logic would be tantamount, in the final analysis, at a different level, to requesting the independent States of Africa, in the name of the right of asylum and of African solidarity properly understood, to absorb into their own peoples the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, as well as the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, which to the present day remain crushed under colonial domination and racial segregation, in order to settle speedily and radically the problems which have confronted the continent for many years. By the same token, one would cheaply assuage the international conscience if the ridiculous nature of such a proposal did not reveal its simplistic nature.

82. The African Heads of State have also underlined the danger to the security and unity of the continent posed by the continuation of Israeli aggression which could impel the States members of OAU to take, at the African level, individual or collective political and economic measures against Israel. The fact is that they are convinced that Israel is encouraged to persevere in its aggression and to perpetrate acts of terrorism by the massive military, economic and other forms of aid, as well as by the political and moral support provided it by the United States of America, upon which they call urgently to put an end to such an attitude.

83. The vast power of the United States and the role it therefore plays in international affairs cannot be brought into play in the problem of the Middle East if it continues to practise a partisan policy which makes it incompetent to hold the position of arbitrator which it would like to assume in the conflict. Every day it becomes all the more clear that the United States-Israel alliance is set off against the rest of the international community, whose decisions remain without effect in the search for a satisfactory solution. Undoubtedly, the vast interests of that great Power, both in Africa and in the Arab world, will one day be appraised more correctly.

84. The constant refusal of Israel to bow to the resolutions of the Security Council, and its persistent attitude contrary to the position taken by all bodies of the United Nations are all the more inadmissible since Israel is, in the final analysis, nothing but the mere creation of this Organization.

85. That position of OAU is, of course, the manifestation of the natural solidarity of the African countries towards a member of their community which has been the victim of an act of aggression, and a part of whose national territory is still under foreign domination.

86. But this solidarity is only a partial explanation of a position which is based, above all, on principles fundamental for the African countries. OAU has always come out in favour of the preservation of the territorial integrity of States and against all forms of aggression which might be inflicted upon any member of the world community, regardless of who that member is. That is all the more reason why it could not accept conquest carried out through the use of force, or allow an aggressor to retain the benefits of an action condemnable under international law. Moreover, what we are dealing with here is primarily a colonial problem to which is applied the action of African

countries which put the national liberation movements on their continent on the same footing with the resistance movement of the Palestine people which is struggling tenaciously to recover its homeland and to have its legitimate and inalienable rights prevail.

87. The importance of this series of meetings will be measured by the ability of the Council to again take the situation in hand, to tackle in all of its dimensions the problems raised by the aggressive policy of Israel in order to draw the lessons from action which heretofore has been faltering, made up of half measures, compromises and concessions harmful to the search for peace based on justice. Today, more than ever, the Security Council should resolutely give evidence of the breadth of its vision and engage in healthy self-criticism in order to free itself from the original sin on which is founded the pursuit of the objectives of zionism.

88. The Security Council has adopted resolutions and perhaps it is time to consider the effect they may have produced and the reception that they have been given. Since the role of the Council could not stop at the adoption of a resolution, should it not therefore concern itself with the implementation of that resolution and impose respect for its decisions? The provisions of Chapters VI and VII of the Charter do precisely give the Council the means of assuming its responsibilities correctly and of ensuring that all the members of the international community submit themselves to its authority.

89. Everyone seems now to agree that the satisfaction of the inalienable right of the Palestine people is essential to any just and lasting settlement of the crisis of the Middle East. The struggle it is carrying on with self-sacrifice, courage and determination, while laying this down as the primary element for a final solution, has brought to the surface the representatives authorized to speak on its behalf, to make its view known and to defend its national interests. Is it not time to pay attention to its claim and to suggest to those who call for a dialogue that they can find in that people the valid person with whom to talk, with whom they should discuss the arrangements for a true settlement? In any event it is clear that peace can never be restored to the Middle East until the people of Palestine are given a possibility, like other peoples and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, to exercise its right to self-determination. It is because that right has been ignored that various attempts at settlement

of the conflict heretofore have found themselves in an impasse. It is because this was ignored that people continue to go round and round in a sterile game of ambiguous interpretations, thereby strengthening even the thesis of those who do not want to see in the explosive situation which prevails in the Middle East anything but a chain of action and reaction, thus placing the persons whose territory has been occupied and the occupiers, the aggressors and the person against whom aggression has been committed, on the same level of responsibility.

90. The time to act has certainly come and the will should be expressed at the end of the Council's work. This is what Africa expects of the Council today. It is also what the world as a whole expects as a result of its deliberations.

91. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I am very gratified to have maintained long-standing relations of friendship and acquaintance with Mr. Bouteflika, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria. It was my great honour to deal in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union directly with questions of relations between the Soviet Union and Algeria from the earliest days of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Algeria. I am therefore happy to note that since that time and to this date the relations of friendship, mutual understanding and co-operation between the Soviet Union and Algeria have been—and I am deeply convinced will continue in future to be—developed and strengthened. I can assure the distinguished Minister, Mr. Bouteflika, of the following: where the Soviet nation is concerned, our Government and people will continue in future to make every effort to develop and strengthen friendship and co-operation with Algeria.

92. The representative of Israel has requested the floor to exercise his right of reply. Would he perhaps be so kind as to postpone his statement until the next meeting, or does he wish to exercise his right of reply now?

93. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, as I do not enjoy the privilege of speaking one third of the time that the Arab spokesmen do, I inevitably have to resort to the use of the right of reply, but if this debate is to continue in the afternoon, I shall be glad to reply to the speakers who preceded me later on today.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.