



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2125
13 March 1979

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 13 March 1979, at 3.30 p.m.

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| <u>President:</u> | Mr. HARRIMAN | (Nigeria) |
| <u>Members:</u> | Bangladesh | Mr. RAHMAN |
| | Bolivia | Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ |
| | China | Mr. LAI YA-LI |
| | Czechoslovakia | Mr. HULINSKY |
| | France | Mr. LEPRETTE |
| | Gabon | Mr. N'DONG |
| | Jamaica | Mr. NEIL |
| | Kuwait | Mr. BISHARA |
| | Norway | Mr. ALGARD |
| | Portugal | Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA |
| | Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | Mr. TROYANOVSKY |
| | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Mr. MARSHALL |
| | United States of America | Mr. PETREE |
| | Zambia | Mr. SIKAULU |

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 of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 4.45 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 23 FEBRUARY 1979 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF JORDAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/13115)

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table; and Mr. Abdel-Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Tueni (Lebanon), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. Hussen (Somalia), Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Hungary, Indonesia and Sudan in which they asked 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 accordance 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. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia) and Mr. Sahloul (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of item 2 of the agenda.

Mr. DISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, I should like to pay you a compliment for your patience. I know how tedious it can be to preside over a protracted debate like this one, having myself just emerged from the bruising pace of a similar protracted debate.

It is gratifying that the Council should be considering the situation in the occupied Arab territories. In the last 12 years of occupation, drastic changes have taken place. In 1971 the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories submitted its annual report in which it stated:

"At the heart of the Middle East problem is the "Homeland doctrine" enunciated by the Government of Israel and supported by the Opposition." (A/8389, p. 32).

The Special Committee was referring to the Zionist doctrine of Eretz Israel, which means the right of Jews to settle, control and inhabit all the land of Palestine regardless of the opposition of the indigenous Palestinians. From 1967 to 1977 this doctrine was implemented under various excuses. It was stated that these settlements were necessary for defence purposes. But, with the advent of the extremist Begin Government, excuses changed, took a different course, and the true nature of Israel's creeping annexation was unmasked. It is important to note that Mr. Walter Etam, the Chairman of the Israeli delegation in 1948, notified Mr. Mark Ethridge, the Chairman of the United States delegation to the Palestine Conciliation Commission, that:

"The principle of self-determination should be observed for the Arabs of Palestine. The future of Arab Palestine should be left to its inhabitants."

That was mentioned in Mr. Mark Ethridge's report to the Secretary of State and published in 1977 in a book entitled Foreign Relations of the United States for 1949. That was said in May 1948, but it was said to gain international support; it was not sincere. Ben Gurion, writing in the Introduction to the Government Yearbook for 1952, had this to say:

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

"Every State consists of a land and a people. Israel is no exception. But it is a State identical neither to its land nor to its people."

He went on to say:

"It has already been said that when the State was established, it had only 6 per cent of the Jewish people. It must now be said that it has been established on only a portion of the land of Israel."

In 1948 Israel was telling the world that it wanted self-determination for the inhabitants but at the same time informing its local public opinion that Eretz Israel had not been accomplished and that the State was built on only a portion of the land.

Prime Minister Begin was quoted in The Middle East of London of October 1978 as having said:

"The settlement programme is an absolute necessity prompted by the requirements of national defence for facing the threats of our enemies. I made a proposal - and I am repeating it now - to set up residential quarters for Jews in the whole of the liberated Eretz Israel - Jericho, Hebron, Bethlehem, Ramallah, Nablus, Jenin, Tulkarm, Qalqilich, Gaza, Rafah and other towns."

In 1967 the Israeli Government issued what was called "the Law of Ordinance, Amendment No. 11, of 27 June 1967", in which it proclaimed:

"The law, jurisdiction and administration of the State should apply in any area of the State of Israel designated by the Government order."

And immediately thereafter the Government of Israel issued the order extending the law, jurisdiction and administration of the State to a part of the then occupied territory, namely, East Jerusalem. So the first victim of the doctrine of Eretz Israel was East Jerusalem.

Reacting to that decision, The Jerusalem Post, in its edition of 13 July 1967, described it as follows:

"A decisive turning-point in the history of the Jewish people and of Israel has taken place before our very eyes. Our ancestral heritage has been liberated and Jerusalem redeemed to become once more a city that is one."

In 1977 the Begin Government assumed power on the basis of a programme that included 26 points. I should like to quote four of them:

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

"1. Recognition of the unity of the destiny and the common struggle for existence of the Jewish people in the land of Israel and in the Diaspora;

"2. The Jewish people has an eternal historic right to the land of Israel, the inalienable inheritance of its forefathers;

"3. The Government will plan, establish and encourage urban and rural settlement on the soil of the homeland;

"10. The Knesset has empowered the Government to apply by administrative order the law, jurisdiction and administration of the State to all territory of the land of Israel as shall be determined by administrative order."

Foreign Minister Dayan was quoted in the New York Post of 29 July 1977 as saying:

"I do not know anything more productive and constructive for peace than living together with the Arabs, and that is what we do there in these settlements."

But he had another enlightening and revealing interview with the Jewish Chronicle of London in May 1977, when he said:

"Arabs and Jews can co-exist, but only under Jewish rule."

The crux of the matter is the doctrine of Eretz Israel, the right of Israelis to occupy all the land of Palestine regardless of the wishes of the indigenous Palestinians.

Many speakers have in the course of this debate referred to the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the occupied Arab territories.

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

The Chairman of the Special Committee, the Ambassador of Sri Lanka, spoke on 20 November 1978 before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly. He said:

"The conclusions reached by the Special Committee on the basis of this information are given in chapter VI [of its report], and those speak for themselves. The Fourth Geneva Convention, which is applicable to the occupied territories and which affords protection of civilian persons under military occupation is not being implemented by the Government of Israel. Consequently, the civilian population does not enjoy any protection whatsoever from the violations of its human rights by the occupying Power. The claim that this Convention is being applied on a pragmatic basis is untenable. It is more exact to state that it is only by coincidence that some, if any, of its provisions are being respected by the Government of Israel. Indeed, the essential provisions of that Convention are being flouted by the Government of Israel as a matter of policy. In particular, I refer to its articles 27, 47, 33 and 53".

The General Assembly votes every year almost unanimously - with, naturally, the abstention of Israel - on the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the occupied territories. There is a denial of basic human rights in the occupied territories. Palestinians and others are being deported, prevented from returning to their homeland, and their properties are being confiscated in order to allow more room for Jewish settlers. It has been stated in the course of this debate that there is a programme of strangulation by thirst being pursued by the Government of Israel, which is working hard on the diversion of water sources towards Jewish settlements.

The General Assembly adopted two international covenants on human rights unanimously, including the vote of Israel: the International Covenant on

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Both Covenants open with the same sentence: "All peoples have the right of self-determination". Furthermore, in that first article of the two international Covenants, it is stated in paragraph 2 - which, again, is identical in the two Covenants: "In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence".

One of the former Prime Ministers of Israel described the position of Israel by quoting a Russian proverb - and if this is not really a Russian proverb, I would ask the representative of the Soviet Union to correct me. Levi Eshkol said that Israel wanted the dowry but not the bride. The dowry is the land; the unwanted bride, the Palestinians and other Arabs. In other words, Israel wants to empty Palestine of its population, to depopulate the land by ways and means which are contrary to international law, to human rights, to the norms of justice. The policy of Jewish settlements followed by Israel is designed to invite Jewish adventurers - mostly financed, unfortunately, by American money - to replace the indigenous Palestinians.

The following was contained in an editorial published in The New York Times on 23 July 1978:

"Mr. Begin asks whether he has not been generous enough in postponing Israeli claims of sovereignty in the West Bank and offering 'self-rule' to the million Palestinians there and in Gaza. Why has Jordan failed to negotiate from that point? Probably because Jordan, like a growing number of prominent Israelis, understands the fine print in the offer. While Arabs rule their own communities, Israelis financed by their Government and protected by their army would continue to buy and settle West Bank lands so that when the question of sovereignty is next examined, they will have completely altered the face of the region".

(The New York Times, sect. 4 (The Week in Review), p. 18)

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

That was in The New York Times, which has no special sympathy for the Palestinians.

The problem which Israel faces in the occupied Arab territories is that the Palestinians, after 1967, stayed put; they did not move; they did not succumb to the terror which they faced in 1948. This fact has created a thorn in the flesh of the Zionist concept, which wants the land without the people. There were some who said, "Let us incorporate the whole area without giving the political rights to the indigenous Palestinians". There were others who wanted to create bantustans around the big cities in the occupied territories without giving the right of citizenship to the annexed areas. There were still others, among them the present Minister of Agriculture, who said, "Get rid of the whole population". Admittedly, all these solutions and ideas were never found adequate.

One should ask why Israel places itself above the law, why it takes international law into its own hands, regardless of the norms of international law and the United Nations Charter. Israel does not want even to be criticized for what it does in the occupied Arab territories. It considers the area to be a liberated one, and therefore no one, including the Security Council, has the right to question what it does therein. Nothing illustrates this attitude better than the two statements made by the representative of Israel, yesterday and on Friday last. He spoke about Pakistan in Asia, and he ended up in Cuba, in Latin America. But he did not touch upon the item under consideration.

Many speakers have referred to the norms of international law and their violation by Israel. There is more than violation of international law. The West Bank and Gaza are victims of a newly introduced concept based on mystical affinity. In this modern age, a new argument is replacing the United Nations Charter in the occupied territories. Furthermore, new language is being introduced. The West Bank is called Judaea and Samaria; Jerusalem is said to be unified, not annexed. In 1967 and thereafter, Israel talked about war of defence; now it has become war of liberation. The Israeli Government

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

refers to its expansionist design in the West Bank and Gaza as a thickening of present Jewish settlements. It does not acknowledge the confiscation of Arab land; instead, it says that this land is closed off. This is new language, which I really do not understand.

I referred earlier to what Foreign Minister Dayan dubbed coexistence between Jews and Arabs in the West Bank and Gaza. What kind of coexistence is Israel talking about when it has been made clear that such coexistence must be under Jewish rule - as Mr. Dayan demonstrated in his interview with the Jewish Chronicle of London. In fact, Israel wants the coexistence in the West Bank to take the pattern of the relationship that exists between a rider and his horse, a master and his docile subject. We are advocates of coexistence, but it should be among equals, and it should be all over Palestine, wherein Jews, Christians, Palestinians could live together as equals, in harmony and partnership. But the pattern of coexistence which Israel wants, and which Mr. Dayan defended, gives it the right to have the cake and eat it.

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

The Security Council must act decisively on this question on three grounds, which I shall enumerate. The establishment of Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories and the annexation of Jerusalem are, first, immoral; second, illegal; and, third, warmongering. Those settlements are immoral because they violate the two covenants I cited earlier, one on civil and political rights and the other on cultural, social and economic rights. They deprive the Palestinians and other Arabs of their water, on which they have survived for thousands of years. They deprive the Palestinians and other Arabs of the soil they have tilled and cultivated for thousands of years. They deprive the Palestinians and other Arabs of their basic human rights concerning family reunion. In short, they are immoral because they are the edifice of inhumanity.

My second point is that they are illegal. They are so because they violate the Fourth Geneva Convention. They breach international law; they violate the United Nations Charter. They are there in collision with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. They are maintained and being expanded by brute force. They have been established against the wish of the lawful owners of the territories.

My third point is that these Jewish settlements are warmongering. I have said that they are immoral and illegal. My third point is that they are warmongering. They are a prescription for a military confrontation. They do not contribute towards peace. They are not conducive to peace. On the contrary, they are signposts for disaster, as Lord Caradon, one of our former colleagues, described them in one of his articles in The Times of London. They are the outcome of the military occupation which feeds them and keeps them. Therefore my delegation expects all the members of the Council to tell the Israeli Government that these settlements are null and void, illegal, immoral and warmongering.

The representative of Israel has stated in the course of the debate that this debate is intended to impede the process of the peace talks. I heard him very clearly yesterday. My answer is that nothing impedes peace more than these Jewish settlements. Nothing murders any prospect of peace more than the expansionist policy of Israel. And nothing invites war more than the continuation of this process of displacing the Palestinians. These modern predators of Arab land must realize that their pronouncements about peace will cut no ice with the international community until they recognize the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and statehood in the occupied territories.

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

I have restrained myself. I have used moderate language. I do not like to go beyond that because we attach great and serious importance to this debate.

My delegation is of the view that the Council should go beyond the reiteration of general principles and that action should be contemplated. The proposal of Jordan for the establishment of a commission of the Council to investigate the situation in the occupied Arab territories and the submission of a report on its findings thereafter is in the view of my delegation unimpeachable. It means that the Council, after 12 years of ruthless occupation by Israel, is serious in taking action rather than reaffirming general principles which Israel never respects. It is for that reason that my delegation supports the proposal of Jordan for the establishment of a commission of the Council.

Finally, the world is entitled to know what goes on in the occupied territories. There is a black-out on debate on this issue in the United States, but that was expected. We do not cater to the pleasure of any person, of any side, of any country. But we must act in a manner that is reconcilable with the United Nations Charter and its provisions.

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

The next speaker is the representative of Israel, upon whom I now call.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, it is unfortunate that at a time of major world crisis you are being required to preside over a barren ritual that has been repeated so often in the past. As the world contemplates the ever-rising death toll in South-East Asia, violence in different parts of East Africa, fighting between South and North Yemen and several other grave threats to international peace and security, we have been summoned here, at the whim of Jordan and its allies, to consider an artificial issue, a matter that does not constitute any threat to world peace and security - unless, of course, these Governments are looking for any pretext to feed and fan their belligerency.

Indeed, the role which the Security Council is today led to play behoves us seriously to question whether its tasks and functions, as defined by the United Nations Charter, are not being deliberately undermined by some Member States. Let us

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

consider just the past 12 months, during which we have witnessed a number of conflict situations which have seriously endangered international peace. Let us remind ourselves that over this short period the Security Council has been unable or unwilling to take effective steps to stop the fighting in the Horn of Africa, in Zaire, or in Chad, where Libya has effectively annexed a large part of that country and continues to intervene in its internal affairs. In Lebanon, a Syrian occupation army remains in place after having perpetrated large-scale brutalities on the indigenous population; Moroccans, Algerians and others are embroiled in the Western Sahara; and in several other regions we have witnessed armed invasions and acts of aggression that have resulted in tens of thousands killed and hundreds of thousands, if not millions, turned into refugees. We have witnessed thousands of square miles of territory being occupied by foreign forces, the destruction of incalculable property and the gross violation of human rights. In several cases, as in South-East Asia, involving both large and small Powers, these explosive situations have threatened to engulf ever larger areas with potentially awesome and horrifying consequences.

Yet in every case these serious conflicts either have not found their way on to the Security Council agenda or they have been left unresolved with the Council unable to act. There can be no more urgent task for those concerned with the role of the United Nations than to consider why this is so and what can be done about it. In his report to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly on the work of the Organization, and in several of his press conferences, the Secretary-General has offered some important insights. Several Member States have also voiced their concern and expressed a variety of views on what might be done.

Frustration sometimes produces moments of truth. At the risk that the immediate past President of the Security Council may object to the proposition that the truth remains the truth only when it is universally applicable, I would nevertheless like to quote his remarks in this forum last month. He said:

"... we should not be selective in our concern over issues that threaten peace and security in the world. We must strive to place international interests above our narrow national interests if we want to be faithful to the provisions of the Charter. It is also wise to draw a line between impartiality and passivity. Impartiality must be strictly observed."

(S/PV.2118, pp. 37 and 38)

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Had the evil of selectivity not been allowed to plague the Security Council it would most certainly have been able to adopt a more balanced and effective approach to many international crises, including the Arab-Israel conflict. In fact, the Council's record on the Middle East has generally revealed a two-fold selectivity -- both in choice of topic and in the substantive discussion itself. In deciding which aspects of the conflict to put on the Council's agenda, the Council has consistently ignored Israel's grievances while eagerly seizing upon issues of interest to the Arab States. When debates were held, the issue was frequently prejudged, taking full account of the Arab position while turning a deaf ear to that of Israel.

What objective observer, scanning the Council's resolutions of recent years, would maintain that the one-sided and lopsided resolutions of the Council accurately reflect the complexities of the Arab-Israel conflict? In the last 30 years, Arab Governments have violated every conceivable universal treaty, convention, United Nations principle and requirement in relation to Israel. They have repeatedly broken every cease-fire and armistice agreement. But when was the last time that the Security Council passed a resolution criticizing any Arab State for any such violation against Israel? Certainly not in the last decade; not in the last two decades, nor even in the last quarter of a century. Yet, with what facility can those same Arab States summon the Security Council on any trumped-up charge against Israel and obtain the passage of a resolution concocted by them or their eager supporters. It is in this setting that Jordan has staged the present debate on the apparent assumption that, given the failure of the Council to reach any decision on the major issues threatening international peace and security, certain members will be only too ready to seize this opportunity with a view to flexing the Council's muscles.

I would therefore ask that Council members recognize this exercise for what it is, as having nothing to do with the responsibilities entrusted to the Council under the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, had there been any readiness by the instigators of this debate to recognize the Jewish people's inalienable right to self-determination, national sovereignty and independence, had there been any will on their part to live in peace with Israel, the issue before us would not have arisen in the first place.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Only because we are faced with a group of States that have rejected peace out of hand and only because these same States remain obsessed with and totally committed to a campaign of relentless hostility - or, as they call it, "rejection" - is every issue being manipulated and blown up out of all proportion to its importance in the conflict. As Professor Fred Gottheil of the University of Illinois told the Committee on International Relations of the United States House of Representatives on 12 September 1977:

"Jewish settlements on the West Bank is an issue today only because the existence of Israel is an issue... the issue of Jewish settlements in the West Bank today is simply one thin layer that emanates from and partially conceals the core of the conflict, namely, the non-recognition by the Arab States of Israel's right to exist".

As our war-torn region inexorably moves towards peace, Jordan has identified itself openly with this rejectionist position by participating in the Arab summit meeting in Baghdad from 2-5 November 1978 and by subscribing to its bellicose declarations and designs.

This Security Council session has been consciously timed with the explicit purpose of disrupting and subverting a particularly sensitive stage of the current peace process, in accordance with the stated aims of the Baghdad Conference. For the last few weeks, the Jordanian press and radio have been advertising this design. It cannot be a mere coincidence that Jordan, which in past years has shown that it is capable of controlling its territory, served as a base and staging post for a PLO terror plot calculated to coincide with President Carter's visit to Jerusalem. Last Saturday, 10 March, four armed terrorists crossed the Jordan River on a mission of murder and seizure of hostages for the purpose of criminal ransom. Their attempt was foiled by the Israel Defence Forces, and the leaflets found on their bodies made their aims perfectly clear.

Lest there be any misunderstanding about these aims, the head of the terrorist PLO spelt them out in the rally held yesterday in Beirut when he said:

"Carter, Sadat and Begin should understand that we will burn everything. This area is the area of volcanoes - yes, the area of volcanoes as well as oil. I want to tell Begin that when Arabs explode their volcano there will be only Arabs in this part of the world. Our people will continue to keep aflame the torch of revolution with rivers of blood until the entire occupied homeland is liberated - not just part of it".

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

These are the views that the Council is being asked by some to subscribe to. These are the views of the terrorist organization that has been accorded irregular privileges in this building, including the opportunity to participate in our deliberations in clear violation of the United Nations Charter and of the rules of procedure.

As the concluding statement of the Baghdad Conference of last November makes clear, the issue is not the settlements but the illegal challenge to the existence of a State Member of the United Nations. Hence, if this Council were to live up to its Charter obligations, it would have long ago dismissed this kind of request and it would have addressed itself to the real threat to peace and security, namely, the Arab refusal to recognize Israel's right to exist and the Arab refusal to negotiate with Israel. Had the Council acted in this way from the early years of the conflict, it would have helped to save the peoples of the Middle East from much turmoil and suffering, as well as to enhance greatly its own standing and prestige.

The real issue before us is not as has been represented by the Jordanian representative and those who have joined him in this debate. Rather, it is the same fundamental issue that lies at the root of the Arab-Israel conflict and of all its various manifestations, namely, the stubborn refusal to acknowledge the Jewish people's right to statehood and independence in its homeland.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The inseparable bond existing between the Jewish people and its homeland, Eretz Israel - the Land of Israel - including Judaea and Samaria, is an integral part of the world's history and cultural heritage. The association of the Jewish people with the Land of Israel, unique in historic circumstances, has become an integral part of world history, inextricably entwined in the texture of world culture. Here at the United Nations constant attempts have been made over the past 30 years to obscure this inseparable bond that exists between the Jewish people and the Jewish homeland. But no amount of distortion and fabrication in this building can undo so central a fact of the political, spiritual, cultural and religious history of the world.

The historical dimensions of the eternal Jewish ties with the Land of Israel have been described by the prominent British historian and theologian, Mr. James Parkes, who stated on page 10 of his book, Whose Land?, that:

"The land of Israel is intertwined far more intimately into the religious and historical memories of the Jewish people; for their connexion with the country has been of much longer duration - in fact it has been continuous from the second millenium B.C.E. up to modern times - and their religious literature is more intimately connected with its history, its climate and its soil. The Land therefore has provided an emotional centre which has endured through the whole of their period of 'exile', and has led to constant returns or attempted returns, culminating in our own day in the Zionist Movement."

Unlike the two other major religions, Mr. Parkes continues:

"Judaism is tied to the history of a single people and the geographical actuality of a single land."

That can be found on page 136 of his book.

This self-evident truth also found its expression as a matter of course in the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, which stressed "the historical connexion of the Jewish people with Palestine and ... the grounds for reconstituting - I repeat: reconstituting - their national home in that country." The Mandatory Power was also entrusted with the duty to encourage "close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes."

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

A function of this profound historical and spiritual tie of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel has been the existence of an uninterrupted Jewish presence in the Land since ancient times. But the right of the Jewish people to its land is also sustained by more recent realities. In Jerusalem, for example, Jews have constituted a clear majority for at least the last century and a half. At the end of the British Mandate in 1948 Jews accounted for more than two thirds of the population of the Holy City. During the Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967 stagnation set in and there was considerable emigration from it, since Jordan discouraged economic development in Jerusalem with a view to ensuring the primacy of Amman. Particularly hard hit were the Christian residents under Jordanian occupation, and their numbers decreased significantly during that period. It is worth mentioning in this connexion that in 1965 Jordanian legislation was passed restricting the development of Christian institutions by cancelling their right to acquire land in or near Jerusalem. When Jerusalem was reunited in 1967, the number of its non-Jewish residents was about 70,000 - roughly one quarter of the population. The non-Jewish population has risen since to about 95,000.

In referring to present-day Jerusalem, the representative of Jordan asserted that the distance from Bethlehem to Ramallah was 40 kilometres. The truth, of course, is, as any map will show, that the real distance is, and has always been, 22 kilometres - about half of what he asserts. The representative of Jordan apparently needed this gross exaggeration to advance his preposterous claim that the city of Jerusalem now constitutes one fifth of Judaea and Samaria. Again, the facts are that the total area of Judaea and Samaria is 6,000 square kilometres. The area of Jerusalem is 108 square kilometres - that is, less than 2 per cent of the area of Judaea and Samaria. Expressed in statistical terms, this clearly means that the credibility rating of the representative of Jordan stands at about 9 per cent. The remaining 91 per cent must clearly be relegated to the realm of fantasy, imagination and worse. Indeed, whoever listened to his statements in this discussion must have come away with the feeling that the statistical rating of the Jordanian representative's credibility has been rather generously and charitably

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

computed. This, of course, applies also to the flood of other figures with which he so liberally punctuated his remarks and which must regrettably be considered as an underestimation by him of the Council's intelligence.

In Hebron and Shechem (Nablus), Jewish communities existed from the thirteenth century until the present century. In the case of Hebron, the ancient Jewish community ceased to exist in the mid-1930s only after scores of its members - including many theological students - were brutally massacred by their Arab neighbours in 1929. The attackers did not spare women, children or the elderly. They destroyed Jewish houses, razed synagogues and burned Torah scrolls, bringing a centuries-old Jewish presence to a temporary halt. This brutal pogrom was yet another illustration of that spirit of tolerance and brotherly love of which the Jordanian representative spoke so animatedly last night. Villages such as Atarot, Neva Ya'akov, Bet Ha'arava, Qallia, Revadim, Massuot Yitzhak, Ein Tzurim and Kfar Etzion existed in Judaea and Samaria until 1948. South of Gaza, Jews lived in villages like Kfar Darom and Be'erot Yitzhak.

The continuous Jewish presence in Judaea and Samaria, as well as in the Gaza district, was brought to an abrupt but temporary end by the aggression of the Arab armies in 1948. The Jordanian occupying authorities drove out every Jew remaining in the Jewish quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem - and, for that matter, anywhere in Judaea and Samaria. What they achieved by the naked use of force, they formalized in their laws.

Article 6, paragraph 3, of the Jordanian Nationality Law of 4 February 1954 expressly prohibits Jews from holding Jordanian citizenship. Another Jordanian enactment stipulates that the sale of land to a Jew is punishable by death, a sentence already pronounced in Amman on several residents of Judaea and Samaria. Not only do such laws constitute unadulterated anti-Semitism reminiscent of the infamous Nuremberg Laws of Nazi Germany, but they also stand in flagrant violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the international law of human rights in general.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The present Jordanian allegations are thus nothing other than a public reaffirmation of that same policy of official anti-semitism.

Those who have rightly shown such sensitivity to discrimination on the basis of race, colour or creed would undoubtedly recognize that anyone who asserts that it is illegal for a Jew to live in Judaea and Samaria just because he is a Jew, is no better than an advocate of apartheid. Racist expressions such as "Judaization" and "de-Arabization" are disturbingly reminiscent of the "Judenrein" policy of the Nazi Nuremberg Laws, banning Jews from certain spheres of life for no other reason than that they were Jews.

However, discrimination on the part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has not been directed solely against Jews. For all the solicitousness which it today pretends to show towards its Palestinian brethren, Jordan's record in Judaea and Samaria from 1948 to 1967 was such that it should disqualify that country from requesting this debate at all. In the 19 years during which it illegally occupied those areas, the Jordanian Government deliberately curtailed their economic and educational development so that they could not compete with the primacy of the territory which became the Kingdom of Transjordan in 1946 and which previously had been the eastern part of mandated Palestine. Hence from 1948 to 1967, agriculture in the areas concerned was kept at a subsistence level. Industry was virtually non-existent and no infrastructure was developed. The Jordanian occupation authorities oppressed the local population and brutally suppressed the riots which broke out at frequent intervals. During those 19 years, scores of Arabs in Judaea and Samaria were killed and hundreds wounded by the Jordanian army.

The attitude of local residents towards the Jordanian occupiers can be readily gauged by an interview with Arab residents of Judaea and Samaria which appeared in the Beirut daily, Al-Hawadith, on 23 April 1971:

"Those arriving from the West Bank define the situation thus:

'We have not forgotten nor will we ever forget the type of rule which degraded our honour and trampled the human feelings within us, a rule which they built by their inquisition and the boots of their desert men.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

We have lived a long period under the humiliation of Arab nationalism, and it pains us to say that we had to wait for the Israeli conquest in order to become aware of human relationships with citizens.'"

Jordan's real attitude towards the Palestinian Arabs persisted after 1967 - and if proof is needed one has only to recall the ruthless killing of thousands of Palestinian Arabs in Jordan in September 1970.

In contrast to this dismal record, the State of Israel has carried out in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District an immense and constructive programme of development marked by human concern and respect for the Arab identity of the inhabitants.

The population of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District, which was 965,000 in 1967, has risen by about 20 per cent, now reaching a figure of approximately 1,150,000 inhabitants. Health and medical services have been greatly improved, resulting in a sharp decrease in the death rate and a considerable increase in the birth rate. So much for the depopulation fantasies of the Jordanian and Kuwaiti representatives.

Education for this population has been expanded. The number of children in schools rose from 222,000 in 1968 to 375,000 in 1975. The number of institutions of learning increased from 987 to 1,299. Two universities and two colleges are functioning where none existed before 1967. The number of teacher-training seminaries has increased tenfold. So much for the de-Arabization fantasies of the Jordanian and Kuwaiti representatives.

Contrary to allegations which have been made here, the water system in Judaea and Samaria has only been improved since 1967. The supply of drinking water has in fact been tripled since 1967. Moreover, with the use of modern irrigation methods, the area of irrigated land cultivated by the Arab population has increased 160 per cent. With improved drilling and pumping installations, Arab farmers are now assured of a more stable and regulated flow, and this has been a major contributing factor to the spectacular agricultural progress which has taken place over the past decade.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Agricultural output and the industrial growth rate have both risen by about 11 per cent a year and, since 1967, income from agriculture has increased 2.6 times in real terms. The significant mechanization of agriculture is shown in the fact that the number of agricultural tractors rose from 130 in 1967 to 1,750 in 1976 - an increase of 1,300 per cent. Unemployment has been practically eliminated. In the Gaza District it has fallen to 0.6 per cent, including the refugees. The gross national product has increased at an average annual rate of 14 per cent.

Income and standard of living have risen most significantly. Private individual expenditure per capita, calculated at constant 1968 prices, has risen in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza by nearly 100 per cent. Income per capita has risen even more, indicating the creation of considerable savings. Here are some figures indicating economic and social progress: the number of automobiles licensed in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District rose from about 5,000 in 1967 to over 25,000 in 1976. Only 2 to 5 per cent of the population of the territories in question had television sets or electric refrigerators in 1967. The figure today is well over 30 per cent.

Of the 16,600 officials in charge of administration, 16,000 are Arabs. The civil and religious laws are applied by Arab magistrates. The towns and villages in Judaea and Samaria are administered by municipal councils elected by secret ballot. Elections were held in 1972 and 1976. In 1976 women voted for the first time.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The relevant electoral law reserves to the Government the right to name additional members of the municipal councils and to choose the mayors. That was the practice during the Jordanian occupation. Israel has never tried to influence the election results, no matter what the political opinions of the voters or the candidates were. In 1976, participation in the voting was 85 per cent, despite the methods used to intimidate the population into boycotting the elections.

There is complete freedom of the press. Several Arab newspapers are published in Jerusalem. Everyone is free to listen to the radio programmes of his choice and to watch any television programmes from Jerusalem, from Cairo, from Amman, from Beirut or from Damascus. Freedom of religion and worship is fully guaranteed. The holy places of each of the religions are administered by the representatives of those religions.

Two bridges over the Jordan, becoming more and more crowded every day, ensure a link between the Arab population and the countries of the Arab world. There is movement in both directions. Arab students of the territories in question can go to the Arab countries of their choice to study and can return to their homes at will.

From 1968 to 1976, 5.5 million persons crossed the bridges in both directions. In 1977 alone, more than 1 million persons and almost 60,000 vehicles crossed the Jordan. Of the persons who crossed, 63 per cent were inhabitants of the territories, 30 per cent were inhabitants of various Arab countries, and 7 per cent were tourists.

That is the general picture of this so-called Zionist hell, which exists only in the perverse imagination of Israel's enemies. I could go into further details and cite figures at greater length, but I think that the foregoing information suffices to dispose of the ludicrous contention regarding "de-Arabization".

I have already referred to the inalienable right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel. A corollary of this is the right to live in any part of the Land. We do not regard ourselves as foreigners in those areas. The Israeli villages in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District are there as of right and are there to stay.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

It has never been the aim of Israel to exercise control over the lives and activities of the Arab inhabitants there. We seek to live as equals with them, not to replace them.

Incidentally, many of the present-day Jewish villages in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District have been established on Jewish-owned land, expropriated in 1948 by the Jordanian or the Egyptian Government. Most of them have been set up on government and public land which had been barren for centuries. In those very few instances in which private land has been involved, acquisition for public purpose was in accordance with the pertinent Jordanian law and full compensation was offered.

The present Israeli villages in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District are inhabited by about 10,000 individuals. To assert, as does the Jordanian representative, that that number, in the midst of 1.15 million Arabs, constitutes a "demographic change", "erosion", "cannibalization" and what not, is both ludicrous and racist.

The right of Jews to live in Judaea and Samaria has also been challenged here by some on legal grounds. I have already alluded to this aspect earlier and I should now like to dwell on this matter at greater length.

As is well known, with the termination of the Mandate over Palestine on 14 May 1948, the armies of seven Arab States, including the Transjordan Arab Legion, illegally crossed the international boundaries in clear violation of general international law and in breach of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibits the use or even threat of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. The armed aggression of those Arab armies was aimed at crushing the fledgling State of Israel and the Governments which dispatched them had the effrontery to make formal announcements of their illegal action to the Security Council.

Referring specifically to the communication sent by Transjordan to the Security Council, the representative of the United States stated that the position of the King of Transjordan was characterized by:

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

"... a certain contumacy towards the United Nations and the Security Council. ...

"The contumacy of that reply to the Security Council is the very best evidence of the illegal purpose of this Government in invading Palestine with armed forces and conducting the war which it is waging there. It is against the peace; it is not on behalf of the peace. It is an invasion with a definite purpose. ...

"Therefore, here we have the highest type of evidence of the international violation of the law: the admission by those who are committing this violation." (Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 72, 302nd meeting, pp. 41-43)

The representative of the United States also stated, and that was in May 1948, that the communications sent to the Council by Transjordan and by the other countries whose armies invaded Palestine:

"are the best evidence we have of the international character of this aggression." (Ibid.)

The Ukrainian representative told the Council on the same occasion that the purpose of the

"... armed intervention in the internal affairs of Palestine is to destroy the State of Israel by force of arms and to bombard the peaceful cities of Israel under the pretext of restoring order." (Ibid. No. 76, 307th meeting, p. 13)

The representative of the Soviet Union pointed out, again on the same occasion, that:

"The USSR delegation cannot but express surprise at the position adopted by the Arab States in the Palestine question, and particularly at the fact that those States - or some of them, at least - have resorted to such action as sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine." (Ibid., No. 71, 299th meeting, p. 7)

Incidentally, the Soviet representative who made that statement was none other than Mr. Andrei Gromyko, and the national liberation movement he was referring to is none other than Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The violation of the international boundaries of Palestine by the Arab armies having constituted an act of armed aggression, the consequent illegal occupation by them of any territory previously forming part of the mandated territory of Palestine could not give rise to any legitimate claim of sovereignty - Ex injuria, jus non oritur. Thus, the purported "annexation" of Judaea and Samaria by Jordan in 1950 was in violation both of general international law and of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement of 1949. It is not without interest to note in this connexion that even the Arab League in 1950 threatened Jordan with expulsion from its ranks because of that purported "annexation".

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

On 5 June 1967 King Hussein spurned an official message from Israel, delivered through the United Nations intermediary, inviting him to stay out of the six-day war which began that day. Instead, the Jordanian occupants of Judaea and Samaria opened fire on Jerusalem and all along the armistice lines with Israel and, as a result of their renewed aggression, lost control of Judaea and Samaria. Thus, when the Israel Defence Forces entered Judaea and Samaria in June 1967, in the course of repelling the renewed Jordanian aggression, they ousted from those territories an illegal invader who enjoyed, at the most, the rights of an occupant. However, the rights of such an occupant under the International Law of Belligerent Occupation are self-terminating upon the conclusion of the occupation and no rights whatsoever survive for him thereafter.

Eminent authorities of international law throughout the world have repeatedly stated in recent years that, in the light of the facts and the applicable law, Israel has better title to any territory of the former Palestine Mandate than any other State. These distinguished authorities include Professor Eugene Rostow of Yale Law School, Professor Elihu Lauterpacht of the University of Cambridge, England, Professor Julius Stone of the University of Sydney, Australia, and Professor Stephen Schwebel of Johns Hopkins University, member of the United Nations International Law Commission. The latter, in an article published in 1970 in the American Journal of International Law (volume 64, pp. 344-347), rightly stated that:

"Where the prior holder of territory had seized that territory unlawfully, the State which subsequently takes that territory in the lawful exercise of self-defence has, against that prior holder, better title."

Professor Schwebel then concluded that:

"Israel has better title in the territory of what was Palestine, including the whole of Jerusalem, than do Jordan or Egypt."

The argument has also been raised that the presence of Israeli villagers and farmers in Judaea and Samaria constitutes an obstacle to peace. Let me point out right away that, owing to Jordan's "Judenrein" policies, there was not one Israeli farmer living in Judaea and Samaria between 1948 and 1967, and yet there was no willingness on Jordan's part at that time either to conclude peace with Israel.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Moreover, far from constituting an obstacle to peace, the Israeli villages are in fact a vital deterrent to war. Even a cursory glance at a map of the region shows clearly that along Israel's narrow central coastline, where 80 per cent of Israel's population lives, the distance between the pre-1967 armistice lines and the Mediterranean Sea averages between 9 and 15 miles, or about the distance from the northern tip of Manhattan Island to the World Trade Center. Until 1967 all of Israel's major towns and cities were within range of medium Arab artillery and Jerusalem was within light mortar range of Arab forces. Villages of the kind we are discussing have proved to be an effective form of early warning system.

If anything, recent developments on our eastern front have only vindicated Israel's long-standing security concerns and confirmed the importance of the villages in that regard. Aside from Jordan's refusal to enter into negotiations towards a peaceful settlement, and the belligerent statements emanating from the Baghdad summit, we have seen an unprecedented military build-up by Syria and Iraq, which, recently, according to Newsweek magazine of 12 February 1979, included a Soviet promise of the most sophisticated MIG-25 fighter planes.

The purpose of this massive arms escalation has been underlined by the rapprochement between Syria and Iraq and their joint pledge to work together towards a "full military union" against Israel, as reported by the Washington Post of 27 October 1978. Those developments are correlated with the parallel rapprochement between Jordan and Syria and Jordan's recent but highly publicized reconciliation with the terrorist organization known as the PLO.

It is clearly the objective of those making up the "Eastern Front" to try to have the territories leading to the outskirts of Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv cleared of any Israeli presence which may stand in the way of their bellicose designs.

No one would, I think, deny that the present situation in those territories raises many problems which can only be solved through direct negotiations. Had most Arab Governments - and not least of them Jordan - been prepared to follow the road of peace rather than ongoing hostilities, these problems could have been satisfactorily solved long ago.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Jordan and its rejectionist allies are, by their own admission, bent on subverting the peace process in the Middle East. Israel, however, cannot accept that the opponents of peace have a right to obstruct this process. Together with Egypt, and with the aid of the United States, Israel agreed last September to the Framework for Peace in the Middle East, based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967). That Framework envisages, inter alia, negotiations for the establishment of an elected self-governing administrative council for the inhabitants of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District, the final status of those territories and their relationship with their neighbours to be negotiated at a later date.

Once the self-governing authority is freely elected by the Arab inhabitants of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District, the Israeli military government and its civilian administration will be withdrawn from those areas and the Israel Defence Forces will be redeployed in those areas and maintained for defence purposes.

As President Carter rightly stated in Cairo, before the People's Assembly of Egypt last Saturday, 10 March 1979:

"Those who attack these efforts are opposing the only realistic process that can bring real peace to the Middle East. Let no one be deceived. The effect of their slogans and their rhetoric is to make them in reality advocates of the status quo, not of change, of war, not of peace, of further suffering, not of achieving the human dignity to which the long-suffering people of this region are entitled. There is simply no workable alternative to the course our nations are following together."

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

If Jordan were indeed sincere in its concern for the well-being of the Palestinian Arabs, it would no doubt consider responding to the invitation extended to it to enter negotiations, as envisaged in the framework for peace, rather than resorting to the dubious and sterile tactics which have inspired this debate.

The Jordanian representative referred also to Jerusalem and did so in an intolerant and parsimonious vein with regard to the role of Jerusalem in Jewish history and the role of the Jews in the history of the city. Jerusalem has known many foreign rulers during the course of its long history, but none of them regarded it as their capital. Only the Jewish people has always regarded it as the centre and sole focus of its national and spiritual life. The Jews of Jerusalem have the longest unbroken historical association with the Holy City. The city of Jerusalem has been the heart and soul of the Jewish people since King David, 3,000 years ago, established it as the capital of Israel. Jerusalem has been the centre of Jewish life, hope and yearning, and Jews for thousands of years have prayed daily for their return to Jerusalem, and have reaffirmed the Psalmist's oath:

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither. Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I do not remember you, if I do not set Jerusalem above my highest joys." (Psalm 137:5-6)

As the representative of Israel, let me therefore repeat here again that Jerusalem, one, undivided and indivisible, shall remain for ever the capital of Israel and of the Jewish people.

At the same time, the Government of Israel has always been conscious of the fact that Jerusalem is of deep concern to other faiths also. Its religious and historic sites are precious to Christians and Moslems, as well as to Jews. Israel is mindful of the historic treasures and manifold spiritual heritage of Jerusalem.

Israel's policy with regard to Jerusalem's holy places is governed by the Law on Protection of Holy Places, of June 1967. Under this law, unrestricted access to holy places is guaranteed to members of all faiths.

In this regard, it is relevant to recall that for 19 years, between 1948 and 1967, Israeli Moslems were barred by Jordan from praying in mosques in the Old City of Jerusalem. They gained access to them only in 1967, when the city was reunited.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Millions of Moslem and Christian tourists and pilgrims - in addition to Jewish visitors - have visited Jerusalem since 1967 and have prayed and worshipped freely at its mosques and churches. All these visitors can attest to the complete freedom of access to and worship at all the shrines holy to the adherents of all faiths - something unprecedented in the history of the city. The assertions made by the representative of Jordan in this regard are but a further confirmation of his credibility rating.

Once again, it is an affront to history that Jordan should complain to this body about Jerusalem. For Jordan stands condemned as the first country in modern history to bombard the Holy City. It will be recalled that it was Jordan which, intent on destroying the fledgling State of Israel and on unlawfully grabbing territory for itself, attacked Jerusalem in 1948, in clear defiance of the principles of the United Nations Charter. It placed Jerusalem under siege and opened fire on its inhabitants and on its historic and religious sites. Jordanian forces attacked and destroyed the densely populated Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem's Old City with mortar shells and seized the eastern part of the city, including the historic walled section which contains religious shrines holy to Jews, Christians and Moslems.

Between 1948 and 1967 Jerusalem was a city cut in two by barbed wire and minefields. In flagrant violation of the 1949 Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement, Jordan barred access by Jews to their holy places and cultural institutions. Further, the Jordanian Government began to eliminate systematically every trace of Jerusalem's Jewish past. Fifty-eight synagogues - some of great antiquity, like the 700-year-old Hurva Synagogue - were wantonly destroyed and desecrated. Those that were not razed to the ground were converted into toilets, stables and henhouses filled with dung-heaps, garbage and carcasses. In the process, hundreds of holy Torah scrolls and books, reverently preserved for generations, were plundered and burned to ashes. On the Mount of Olives, a hallowed spot for Jews for centuries, 38,000 of the 50,000 tombstones in the ancient Jewish burial ground were torn up, profaned, broken into pieces and used as flagstones, steps and building materials for public latrines and Jordanian army barracks. Large areas of the cemetery were levelled and converted into parking areas and gas stations. Through

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

the devastated remains of the graves, the Jordanian Government cut an asphalt road to provide a short cut to a new hotel built irreverently on the top of the Mount of Olives.

During that entire period, as these foul acts of desecration were being perpetrated against places holy to the Jewish people, the world remained silent. When, may I ask, was there a Security Council meeting while Jewish synagogues were burned, Jewish graves defiled and Jewish shrines closed off?

Whereas the Jordanian Government destroyed the ancient Jewish Quarter in the Old City, drove out all its inhabitants, and subsequently barred Jews from entering, even as tourists, Jerusalem today is an open city, open to all its residents - Jews, Moslems and Christians - and to members of all faiths from all nations. It is open even to those who claim to be Israel's enemies. To date, millions of tourists from all over the world, including hostile Arab States, have visited Jerusalem and have been afforded freedom of access and worship at their respective holy places.

In referring to Jerusalem, the representative of Jordan, as well as some other speakers, has injected into our discussions a shrill note of religious prejudice, fanaticism and intolerance. All of us are aware of the dangers inherent in such an approach, especially in a world replete with diverse creeds, ideologies and cultures. It is surely the duty of all of us, and of the United Nations, to contain the flames of religious fanaticism, and not to fan them.

Since the heart of the Middle East conflict remains not the Israeli presence in Judaea and Samaria but the refusal of many of our neighbours to recognize the basic national rights of the Jewish people, I cannot conclude without a reference to that issue. While much is being claimed here and elsewhere in the name of the Palestinian Arabs, we shall undoubtedly hear little about the Jewish people's inalienable right to the land of Israel and its rights to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty. It should therefore be recalled that even after our independence was crushed by the legions of imperial Rome 19 centuries ago, the Zionist passion - the longing to return to Zion - remained the focus

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

of Jewish national culture. In prayers, in literature, in daily customs and on the Sabbath, on festivals and on holy days, in the grace over meals, in marriage ceremonies and in mourning, Jews constantly expressed their hope for and belief in the return to Zion and the reconstruction of their homeland. Throughout those long centuries, there remained a physical continuity of Jewish life in the land of Israel, often in the face of the most adverse of circumstances.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

In the words of the Meccan newspaper Al-Qibla, in an article published on 23 March 1918, inspired by and reflecting the views of Sherif Hussein of Mecca, guardian of the Moslem Holy Places, and great-grandfather of the present King of Jordan,

"The resources of the country" - that is, Palestine - "are still virgin soil and will be developed by the Jewish immigrants. One of the most amazing things until recent times was that the Palestinian used to leave his country, wandering over the high seas in every direction. His native soil could not retain its hold on him ... At the same time we have seen the Jews from foreign countries streaming to Palestine from Russia, Germany, Austria, Spain, America. The cause of causes could not escape those who had the gift of a deeper insight. They knew that the country was for its original sons" - in Arabic, li-abna 'ihal-asliyin - "for all their differences, a sacred and beloved homeland. The return of these exiles to their homeland will prove materially and spiritually an experimental school for their brethren who are with them in the fields, factories, trades, and in all things connected with toil and labour."

When the present Government of Hashemite Jordan and its neighbours come to recognize the wisdom of Sherif Hussein's views, the Council will be relieved of debates like this one and the peoples of the area will be able to move rapidly towards a negotiated, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

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

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, let me first of all extend to you my felicitations on your assuming the office of President of the Council for the month of March and wish you every success. Your dedication to the cause of Africa, your passion for justice and your vigorous advocacy of what you believe in are qualities that surely inspire confidence.

May I also add to the record my delegation's tribute to the memory of Ambassador Jamil Baroody, who until the very end served the United Nations as well as he served the country he represented. His voice was always raised uncompromisingly in the cause of peace and justice. He will be specially missed

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

during the current debate, because above all the cause of justice for the Arab people of Palestine was closest to his heart. In that context I should like to recall that Ambassador Baroody was largely responsible for translating the Charter principle of self-determination into a legal right.

I note that my neighbour on the right regards this meeting as a barren ritual. At the risk of displeasing him, I am participating in this ritual briefly in the certain knowledge that his own contribution to its barrenness, in terms of time at any rate, is more than considerable.

The item under consideration by the Council is perhaps one of the most crucial questions for world peace, because it concerns the question of Palestine. It is at the very root of the conflict in the Middle East, and without its just solution, there will be no termination of the state of belligerency, much less will there be a state of peace.

The fact that Jordan, the immediate neighbour of Israel in more than one sense, has brought this item before us is of special significance, for the edifice of peace cannot endure without the participation of Jordan and the Palestinian people in its construction. The representative of Jordan has given the Council a vivid and well documented account of the magnitude and extent of the encroachments of Israel in the occupied Arab territories as a deliberate act of policy designed to perpetuate Israel's occupation of Palestine in a form and manner which has elsewhere been called "settler colonialism".

According to the Permanent Representative of Jordan, 80 Israeli settlements have been established, 29 per cent of the land in the West Bank has been confiscated, and there has also been "a massive hijacking of its water resources", to quote his own words. The reason given by Israel for the pursuit of this policy is said to be security and military requirements, a reason which in our view has no justification in law, and it must therefore be held that these acts of Israel constitute a flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, to which Israel is a party.

We have also listened with close attention to the other party more intimately involved, the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who stated quite simply that the question involves the very survival of the Palestinian people. The representative of Egypt gave us a long recitation of the many

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly that have been ignored or violated by Israel. Other representatives of Arab States have also spoken with great seriousness about the situation in Palestine, from which the majority of its inhabitants have been forced out, their homes and lands usurped by an alien occupying State and its citizens, and every act of the occupying Power is aimed at the destruction of the very identity of Palestine, as if the Palestinian people were a "non-people".

The United Nations and its organs, especially the Security Council, have a clear duty to prevent this ultimate injustice. It is necessary to recall the essentials of the history of the question of Palestine, which has engaged the attention of the international community since the beginning of this century, thereby becoming an important part of international responsibility. Through the ages the history of Palestine has been a succession of foreign occupations even to this day, and it was to remedy this grossly unjust situation that the League of Nations assumed responsibility for its future, and so did the United Nations.

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

Since the so-called Balfour Declaration, the wrongs, illegalities and injustices done to the Palestinian people have multiplied. And since the United Nations came to be seized of this question, every act of Israel against the Palestinian people in the occupied Arab territories has been declared null and void by the United Nations. We are thus burdened with a growing accumulation of nullities, and one might well inquire whether these nullities are to constitute the portfolio of peace.

Are we now, perhaps, entering the stage in the United Nations when the fact of the very existence of Palestine is being allowed to be questioned? Even the Balfour Declaration spoke of Palestine as a separate entity and stipulated that nothing shall be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the Arab community in Palestine. Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations acknowledged as far back as 1919 that the Palestinian Arab community had reached the stage of development of an independent nation. That was 60 years ago. In 1948, the General Assembly stated that, together with Israel, an independent Arab State shall come into existence in Palestine. That was 30 years ago.

Since then, the people of Palestine have been prevented by Israeli occupation from exercising in Palestine their natural and inalienable right to independent existence in a State of their own. This denial of justice provoked the Palestinian people to resist the occupying Power and resort to armed struggle; and presumably, therefore, they are being taught a lesson - and lessons nowadays tend to be less than academic.

The existence of the Palestinian people in Palestine rests on more than a promise of God. Fortunately for us, we have to depend not on gods, but on the Charter of the United Nations and on principles of modern international law to resolve the questions before us. The consensus of the civilized community today is that conquest is not a source of title to territory or to the exercise of power to deprive the people of their inalienable national rights. No one, not even the United Nations, may deny the Palestinian people their inalienable right to their own State in their own land. The Palestinian people have never given their consent to the establishment of any settlements by the Israeli occupying power.

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

Peace cannot be established by compromises that are in violation of principles of justice. I may recall here Einstein's definition of a bad compromise: it is something done for real or external gain, but one that is inherently unreasonable. It is inherently unreasonable for the Security Council to shut its eyes to the political fact of the existence of the Palestinian people in their own land and to their legitimate aspirations to exercise their inalienable national rights.

Sometimes one hears the argument that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) speaks only of a just settlement of the refugee problem, as if that is all that there is to the question of Palestine. Nothing could be more monstrous than such an inherently unreasonable interpretation. One must remember the genesis of this question in the United Nations, and it is the creation of two States in 1948 -- one of which is to be an Arab State in Palestine. All resolutions of the United Nations, including Security Council resolution 242 (1967), should be interpreted within that original frame of reference. Otherwise, they would all be devoid of any reason whatsoever.

In any case, the point at issue now is simply the withdrawal of Israel from territories occupied in the conflict of 1967, which include Palestinian Arab territory. My Prime Minister and Foreign Minister have repeatedly reaffirmed the support of the Government of India for the just cause of the Palestinian people and to their inalienable national right to a State of their own.

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

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

Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): Mr. President, I am most grateful to you and to the other members of the Council for having afforded my delegation the opportunity to participate in this debate.

Before I proceed to the question on the Council's agenda, I should like to extend to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, particularly since you represent a country, Nigeria, with which Somalia, my country, enjoys close and brotherly relations.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

Your presidency comes at a time when issues vital to peace in the Middle East and Africa are to be discussed. I have had the privilege of working with you on other bodies of the United Nations, so I know your characteristic flair and ability, and I am confident therefore that you will conduct the proceedings of the Council with the magnanimity that is characteristic of your attitude.

I should like also to take this opportunity to express to your predecessor, Mr. Abdalla Bishara of Kuwait, my delegation's admiration of the exemplary manner in which he directed the work of the Council in the month of February, during which the Council was called upon to consider one of the most difficult problems it has ever come across.

The initiative taken by the Government of Jordan in requesting a meeting of the Security Council to consider Israel's policy towards the City of Jerusalem and other occupied Arab lands was most timely and necessary. We are indebted to the representative of Jordan, who, in his statement at the opening of this Council's meeting on last Friday, 9 March, provided us with an important, factual and analytical picture of the dangerous situation that continues to prevail in the region. Our appreciation is due also to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) for his lucid and informative exposé.

There is no question about the truth and validity of the charge that Israel has steadily carried out, over the past 11 years, policies designed to alter and eventually obliterate the religious, historical and national character of Holy Jerusalem. It is equally clear that these policies are part of a wider plan to create a "Greater Israel" by absorbing large portions of occupied Arab territories through Jewish settlements.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

The evidence to support these charges can be easily obtained from the pronouncements of Israeli leaders and from other Israeli sources, as well as from the extensive and detailed evidence amassed by the Jordanian representative. The evidence obtained by the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Arab Territories, and by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People are also available for the consideration of the Council.

Unquestionably, the settlement policy of the Israeli Government, which is being implemented throughout the occupied Arab territories according to a master plan, is incompatible with a sincere desire for a just and lasting Middle East peace. It is a policy which violates international law, violates the human rights of the population against which it is directed, and deliberately places serious obstacles in the way of several imperatives for a comprehensive Middle East settlement. I refer, of course, to the necessity for Israel's withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and the necessity for the restoration of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to nationhood in Palestine - imperatives which are rightfully supported by international consensus.

Israeli policies towards occupied Jerusalem must be of particular concern to the international community. This city, which is an historic trust of mankind - a city sacred to Moslems, Christians and Jews alike and, therefore, to a large proportion of the world's people - is now being turned into a tasteless and overcrowded urban monstrosity. The concentration of new Israeli settlements in and around the Old City is aimed at destroying its Arab and Islamic character and isolating its Arab citizens from other Arab communities. In this connexion, it is pertinent to recall the maps which have been made available to the Council in substantiation of the complaints under consideration. In its drive to serve these illegal political interests, the Tel Aviv Government is destroying the authentic religious, cultural and ethnic life of the Holy City, which flourished in rich diversity in the past.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

This debate should take on added urgency from the fact that the matter before the Council is not a new one. It represents the cumulative effect of policies openly initiated over 11 years ago and allowed to develop unchecked. As long ago as the fifth special session of the General Assembly, in July 1967, Israel's illegal actions with regard to Jerusalem and other areas were brought to world attention and condemned. In resolution 267 (1969) this Council, in a unanimous decision, called urgently on Israel to rescind forthwith all measures which tended to change the status of Jerusalem and to refrain in future from all actions likely to have such an effect. In the same year this Council adopted resolution 271 (1969) in response to the burning of Al-Aqsa Mosque - a resolution which recognized that any act of destruction or profanation of Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in Jerusalem, or any encouragement of, or connivance at, any such act might seriously endanger international peace and security.

In this connexion, it is pertinent to note that The Hague Regulations require an occupying Power to take special care to protect historical, religious and educational monuments, buildings and articles. And yet the demolition of sacred historical sites in occupied Jerusalem continues; the undermining of the foundations of Al-Aqsa Mosque through archaeological diggings continues, and the daily violation of the centuries-old Holy Ibrahim Sanctuary in Hebron continues.

In the light of the evidence detailing the continuing desecration of Islamic Holy Places by the Israelis, it is incredible that the censuring of Israel by UNESCO should have been seen in some quarters as an unjustified attack on Israel. It was, of course, a legitimate response to the Israeli plan for the destruction of some of the foremost religious and historical legacies of the Islamic world, and to Israeli policies which deprive millions of Moslems the world over of the exercise of religious duties central to their faith. The fact of the matter is that a nation which claims a God-given right to exist, as we have heard a few minutes ago, which tries to project itself as an example of moral and religious righteousness, is guilty of the most callous and barbaric actions against the Holy Places of Islam and against the human rights of Arab people.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

Unfortunately, misconceptions about the true nature of the Zionist State and its policies still exist, even among members of the Security Council, who are in possession of all the facts. Perhaps it would be useful to cite here yet another Security Council resolution on Jerusalem - resolution 298 (1971). This resolution deplored Israel's failure to respond to past United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem and confirmed in the clearest possible terms that all legislative and administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem, including expropriation of land and properties, transfer of populations, and legislation aimed at the incorporation of the occupied section, were totally invalid.

As members of this Council are aware, the Arab States, in succeeding years, have persistently sought to keep these matters before the Security Council by frequent communications stating the facts and voicing their concern and just anger over Israel's sacrilegious, annexationist and colonizing policies, and its violations of the human rights of the Arab population under Israeli occupation.

The fact of Israel's deliberate and sustained defiance of principles of the Charter, of covenants governing the conduct of international affairs and of the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council is undeniable. We have seen Israel's contempt for international law in the illegal annexation of Jerusalem, in the avowed intention to annex other areas and in the policy of "creating facts" - in other words, colonizing occupied Arab territories, either by new Jewish settlements or by the "thickening of existing ones".

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

We know, too, of the actions specifically condemned by the Hague Regulations and by the Geneva Convention of 1949. Israel has made no secret of its expropriation and destruction of Arab property; of the expulsion of Arab people from their homes; of the transfer of the civilian population of Israel into occupied Arab territory; of the sweeping away of prevailing local laws and customs; and, in short, of its efforts to change the political, demographic, geographic, religious and national status of the occupied territories and particularly of Jerusalem.

These actions and attitudes are further highlighted by the General Assembly's reaffirmation that the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, to which Israel is a party, applies to all occupied Arab territory, including Jerusalem. Israel's occupation provides a unique opportunity to measure the performance of an occupying Power against the standards set by that Convention. We know the extent to which Israel has failed to meet those standards. Its performance is particularly ironic when it is recalled that the provisions of the Convention were adopted largely as a result of the treatment of Jews under the Nazi régime before and during the Second World War.

Regrettably, a number of States - including Israel's powerful supporters - allow themselves to be diverted from the central issues of illegal occupation and illegal annexation, and give credence to the emotional reasons cited by Israel for uniting Jerusalem under exclusive Israeli rule and for colonizing other areas of Arab territory.

If credit is to be given in international affairs to emotion, it is difficult to understand why Israel's emotional claims to Jerusalem are given more weight than those of Moslems and Christians. So far as the Islamic world is concerned, Jerusalem is no less a focal point of religion, culture and history for us, Moslems, than it is for the Jewish people. We believe, however, that the claims of religion and sentiment must operate within the framework of the system of international law upheld by the Charter of the United Nations. The legal situation with regard to Jerusalem is that there must be a return to the status quo before the 1967 war of aggression by Israel so that the final disposition of the Holy City can be arrived at within the context of an over-all Middle East settlement.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

My delegation sincerely hopes that all States will resist further attempts by the Israeli Government to legitimize its annexation of Jerusalem and other occupied Arab lands and will continue to refuse to comply with the demand that embassies be transferred from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. We trust, too, that this Council will continue to show the same unanimity it has shown in the past in declaring null and void Israel's attempts to change the status and character of Jerusalem.

Over the past 11 years, high-powered Zionist public relations measures have tended to obscure the grim reality of developments in Jerusalem and occupied Palestine. It is time to ask, for how long will the Israelis be allowed to use the spectre of the Nazi holocaust to divert attention from their own gross violations of human rights? We may well ask also, for how long will certain sections of world public opinion consider as a credible excuse, the cry of "anti-semitism" which the Israelis never fail to raise when their illegal and unjust policies are criticized? It was only yesterday, and again this afternoon, that the representative of Israel again resorted to these tactics.

It is certainly time to ask for how much longer will this Council continue to be satisfied with verbal condemnations of Israel's flagrant violations of international law. No country, with the possible exception of South Africa, has shown so much contempt for the decisions of the United Nations as has Israel. The responsibility of the Security Council to take prompt and effective action in this matter is particularly grave in view of the fact that Israel's policies undoubtedly pose a serious threat to international peace and security. My delegation fully endorses the three-point proposal put forward by the representative of Jordan, a proposal which I consider to be the very least that the Council can do in response to this most serious situation.

And, finally, my delegation hopes that the Council will not shirk its duty and will consider taking action, so that Israel will not continue its illegal and dangerous course with impunity.

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

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

Mr. SUWONDO (Indonesia): Mr. President, at the outset, allow me to express my delegation's warmest congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that, under your able and wise guidance, the Council's deliberations will be brought to a successful conclusion. Allow me also, through you, to thank the members of the Council for the opportunity given to my delegation to participate in the present debate.

My delegation would also like to avail itself of this opportunity to express its great appreciation to Ambassador Bishara who as last month's President of the Security Council presided over the Council's work with great skill, dedication and patience.

Before I turn to the issue under consideration, my delegation would like to extend its sincere condolences and heartfelt sympathy, on the passing away of Ambassador Jamil M. Baroody, to his bereaved family and to the delegation of Saudi Arabia. His manifold contributions to our Organization will be long remembered. We who have known him and worked together with him will miss him in the councils of the United Nations.

As is well known, this is not the first time that the Security Council has discussed the situation in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. In its past discussions, the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council were unanimous in their condemnation of Israel's policies and measures aimed at changing the physical, cultural, demographic and religious character of the occupied territories. The Council has called on Israel to desist from the encroachment upon Arab lands and property and from the establishment of Israeli settlements on those lands. The Council also agreed to keep the situation under consideration with a view to meeting again should circumstances so require.

(Mr. Suwondo, Indonesia)

In this connexion, my delegation has noted with concern some ominous developments since the Council last considered this question. The situation has undoubtedly deteriorated further and has assumed disturbing proportions. Israel has continued to establish new settlements and has expanded existing ones. Besides, there have been denials of human rights in the territories under occupation.

(Mr. Suwondo, Indonesia)

In this regard, on 21 February the Commission on Human Rights again deplored Israeli policies and practices and condemned Israel's breaches of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. We are also aware of the expulsions and transfers of Arab inhabitants; the ill-treatment of detainees; the pillaging of archaeological and cultural property; and the illegal exploitation of the natural wealth and resources of the occupied territories. Even educational institutions have become instruments of Israeli policy aimed at modifying the cultural identity of the people under occupation.

As we are fully aware, the policies and measures are not new and Israel has followed them since it occupied Arab territories in 1967. What is new, however, is the increasing determination to implement their persistent policies and practices of seizing land and resources with a view clearly to annex those territories which will jeopardize the very survival of the Palestinian people in their homeland.

It was these developments that led the representative of Jordan to call for a meeting of the Security Council to discuss the latest developments in the occupied territories. He explained these developments in detail when he addressed the Council. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), in his statement before the Council, also underscored the significance of these developments and expressed his hope that the Council would be able to end the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories, secure the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, as well as take appropriate measures to defuse the explosive situation in the region.

It is, therefore, clear that if Israel persists in its policy, then it will be solely responsible for the deterioration of the situation and the disruption of the processes of peace. These Israeli measures and coercive policies are inconsistent with the declarations by its leaders stating that they are desirous of achieving peace. Such actions cannot only result in circumventing the prospects for peace, but also constitute a dangerous course which could lead to the most serious consequences.

(Mr. Suwondo, Indonesia)

Apart from the illegality of the Israeli occupation of these territories, the mounting hostility from Arabs living in the occupied territories should serve as a warning to Israel that the territories could never be incorporated into the State of Israel. Thus, a prolonged Israeli occupation can only heighten tension in an already dangerous situation, thereby threatening the chances for a peaceful settlement. It is therefore imperative that Israel should recognize the harmful consequences of prolonged occupation and cease forthwith its designs aimed at annexation of these territories.

The Government and people of Indonesia fully support the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people and the Arab countries to liberate their sacred homeland and their territories from illegal occupation. My delegation regards as null and void all measures taken by Israel in the occupied territories. Israel should dismantle all its settlements as well as terminate the policies and measures that it has introduced in the occupied territories. My delegation reiterates its belief that peace cannot prevail in that region unless Israel withdraws from all occupied territories and recognizes the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish an independent State of their own. It is the return of these territories to their rightful owners that will pave the way for ensuring the territorial integrity and secure borders of all States in the region. Israel must also rescind all measures and desist from taking any further action intended to change the status of Jerusalem.

The Middle East conflict continues to be a perennial threat to peace, not only in the region but in the world at large. In view of the deteriorating situation that Israel has created in the occupied territories in flagrant defiance of international law and United Nations resolutions, we believe that the Security Council should pronounce itself in no uncertain terms by adopting a resolution calling for immediate and effective steps to rescind all illegal measures taken by the occupying authorities. The urgency for a permanent solution is self-evident. What is required is positive and determined action. My delegation would support any proposal which is aimed at ending Israeli occupation of Arab territories and which sets in motion the negotiations for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem, including the question of Palestinian Arabs.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): I should like to remind the Council that terrorism was imported and introduced into Palestine by the immigrants who came, legally or illegally, to Palestine during the Mandate. Facilities were provided by the British Mandate. It was Zionist formations that planted mines in the souks, the market-places and the Holy City of Jerusalem long before November 1947, resulting in the death of innocent children, women and men. The peace of the eternally Holy City of Jerusalem was shattered by the atrocities of Zionists, such as the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, seat of the civilian Mandatory Government, resulting in the cold-blooded murder of scores of civilian staff, Christians, Moslems and Jews, and the massacre of 254 children and women in the village of Deir Yassin near Jerusalem, perpetrated by the notorious terrorist Begin. In 1947, Her Britannic Majesty's Government, that is, the Mandatory Government, presented a memorandum to the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, under the title, "The outbreak of the Second World War". The memorandum reads as follows:

"Acts of terrorism committed by Jews ceased altogether with the outbreak of war and the armed Arab bands melted away before the end of the year. The Jewish Agency called on the Jewish community to offer its full assistance to the Mandatory Power and similar appeals were made in the Arabic press. In the course of the war, the Jews provided 27,000 recruits for the British services and the Arabs 12,000."

Two elements are worth emphasizing here. First, acts of terrorism committed by Jews vis-à-vis "armed Arab bands". I need not comment any further. The other element is that 27,000 Jews and 12,000 Arab recruits volunteered for service with the British during the Second World War. I am proud to say that I was among the 12,000. Our motive was to combat fascism, notwithstanding the horrors and oppression by the British Mandate, for let bygones be bygones. Yes, the fight against fascism transcended all other considerations. Scores of thousands of Arabs in Syria and Lebanon, the Transjordan Frontier Force and the Arab Legion of Jordan also participated in the war effort against the fascists.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Another paragraph of the memorandum of the British Government reads as follows:

"In 1942, a small group of Zionist extremists, led by Abraham Stern, came into prominence with a series of politically motivated murders and robberies in the Tel Aviv area. In the following year there came to light a widespread conspiracy connected with Hagana..., for stealing arms and ammunition from the British forces in the Middle East.

In August 1944 the High Commissioner narrowly escaped death in an ambush in Jerusalem. Three months later, on 6 November, the British Minister of State in the Middle East, Lord Moyne, was assassinated in Cairo by two members of the Stern group. A third illegal Jewish organization, the Irgun Zvai Leumi, was responsible for much destruction of government property during 1944. The outrages perpetrated by the Stern group and the Irgun Zvai Leumi were condemned by the official spokesmen of the Jewish community."

The Irgun Zvai Leumi is the gang that brought Menachem Begin to power.

Now, what was the mission of these formations that joined the British Army? Clearly, it was stealing arms and ammunition from the British forces in the Middle East. Can we conclude that they joined in order to steal for a dual purpose - stabbing the allied forces in the back and preparing to seize Palestine by force? One might ask whether I am implying a form of co-operation between the Nazis and the Zionists. Yes, I am.

In the Zionist Encyclopaedia, there is an item called "Ha'avara". The explanation of that item reads as follows:

"Arrangement for the transfer of money by German-Jewish immigrants to Palestine during the early part of the Nazi era... The mandatory authorities permitted only a limited number of quota immigrants without means but admitted 'capitalists' with assets of at least LP 1,000 (equal to £1,000) without restriction. At first, Jewish emigrants from Germany could withdraw LP 1,000 from their assets at the German Reichsbank. Soon, however, the German Government ceased to make foreign exchange available for Jewish emigrants. Other ways had to be found to release their assets.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

"On August 25, 1933, Eliezer Siegfried Hoofien, then the general manager of the Anglo-Palestine Bank (now Bank Leumi L'Yisrael)" - and I might say here that Bank Leumi of Israel owns buildings on Fifth Avenue in New York - "agreed with the German Ministry of Economics to use Jewish assets for the purchase of goods needed in Palestine. Known as the Hoofien transfer agreement, this arrangement formed the financial basis of an official Jewish emigration plan. In 1933 the Anglo-Palestine Bank established in Tel Aviv the Trust and Transfer Office Ha'avara Ltd., with a capital of LP 100 (then \$500)...

"The operations of Ha'avara included the promotion of German exports to Palestine" - and these were Nazi German exports to Palestine - "against payment in blocked Jewish funds, and the creation of the highest possible number of 'capital' lots of LP 1,000 per immigrant... By early 1937 the Reichsbank had sold some 34,000,000 Reichsmarks in foreign exchange, an amount roughly equivalent to the total proceeds from 'regular' German exports to Arabs and German gentiles in Palestine."

Much has been said about the holocaust. But to what extent did the Zionist movement and the Jewish Agency collaborate with the Nazis?

Malchiel Greenwald, a survivor of the holocaust, published a pamphlet known as Pamphlet 51, wherein he describes the acts of a certain Rudolf Kastner, who was the head of the Jewish Agency Rescue Committee in Hungary. This is what he said in that pamphlet:

"I have waited a long time to expose this careerist, whom I consider, because of his collaboration with the Nazis, an indirect murderer of my dear people.

"Who is this spokesman for the Ministry of Trade and Industry [of Israel]; who is this big-shot leader of the Mapai; who is this boaster of great achievements in the rescue of Hungarian Jews; who is this fellow who has been put high on the list of candidates of Israel's Parliament by the Government Party, Mapai?

"For whom, on whose account, Dr. Kastner, did you go like a thief in the night to Nuremberg to become a witness for the defence of SS Colonel Kurt Becher, the murderer of Jews, the man who wallowed in the blood of our brothers in Hungary? Kurt Becher - Economic Administrator of the Gestapo!

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

"Why did you save him from the death penalty, which he had so richly earned?

"You flew to Nuremberg to save a mass murderer of the Jews. What induced you to do that?

"What kind of gentleman's agreement was there between this murderer Becher and this man whom I accuse as a collaborator with Nazis?

"My God! Kastner's deeds in Budapest cost us the lives of hundreds of thousands of Jews!"

26 July 1948 a letter was sent by Kastner to Eleazer Kaplan of the Agency, reading as follows:

"Kurt Becher was an ex-SS Colonel and served as a liaison officer between me and Himmler during our rescue work. He was released from prison in Nuremberg by the occupation forces of the Allies owing to personal intervention."

There was much embarrassment in 1955. The Jerusalem Post, on 23 June 1955, following to say:

"The most you can wish for Dr. Kastner is that now, after having been found guilty of grave crimes, he will be brought to trial by normal procedure...". The Kastner case continued to embarrass the Zionist establishment; the incident came in March 1957, when a young man pulled out a gun and fired on him, who died later as a result.

Israeli journalist named Dr. Keren wanted to follow up on the Kastner case. He went to Germany with the intention of interviewing the infamous Kurt Becher. Days after his arrival in Germany, journalist Keren was found dead in a hotel. The diagnosis was "heart attack".

Let us go into this a little deeper. Itzhak Greenbaum, Chief of the Committee of the Jewish Agency, announced in Tel Aviv on 18 February 1943: When they asked me, 'Could you not give money out of the United Jewish Appeal funds for the rescue of Jews in Europe?', I said, 'No!'.

And I say again, 'No!' In my opinion, one should resist this wave which reduces the Zionist activities to secondary importance."

I am satisfied with having illustrated that much of the collaboration between Zionists and the Nazis.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

In my statement last Friday I called attention to the inherent threat to the survival of the Palestinian people and referred to the impending process of elimination by strangulation. In the spring of 1976 Israel Koenig, the Northern District Commissioner of the Israeli Ministry of the Interior, submitted a memorandum on the subject of how to handle the Palestinian Arabs in Galilee. Koenig reported:

"In the Northern District are concentrated most Israeli Arabs, whose sincerity and involvement among the Jewish population manifestly and prominently put into focus the problems that have already been created and the expectations in the near and distant future. One of the most worrying phenomena is the loss of patience of the average Jew towards the Arab citizen, and in certain cases a hostility can be felt, and any provocation might cause an uncontrollable explosion on both sides whose results might have negative consequences in Israel and especially abroad." How does Israel Koenig propose to go about the matter? He suggests:

"Expand and deepen Jewish settlement in areas where the contiguity of the Arab population is prominent, and where they number considerably more than the Jewish population; examine the possibility of thinning existing Arab population concentrations."

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Professor Israel Shahak, who spent two years in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, is now the Chairman of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights. He has written the following foot-note on the term "thinning":

"The agricultural expression, used in the Gaza Strip and other conquered territories in the meaning 'to expel, to remove'. An expression worthy of Eichmann, and accurately describing his first activities, for example in Austria in 1938-1939, where he was very successful in 'thinning' the Jewish population, whose 'concentration' and 'continuity' in many 'areas of Vienna' were thought objectionable by the Nazis".

"Woe to him who builds his palace on injustice, his chambers upon fraud, who forces other men to work for nothing, holding back their wages": Jeremiah 22:13.

Someone in this Council chamber unashamedly tried to speak about the rights of the Christians and protecting those rights. He completely forgot that a certain law was passed in Israel - its first reading was on 5 December 1977. That law bears the number 1313, and it is a violation of articles 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of which Israel is a signatory. What does that law say? It says:

"He who gives or promises to give money, an equivalent of money or another benefit ... in order to entice a person to change his religion, or in order to entice a person to bring about the change of another's religion: his sentence will be five years' imprisonment, or a fine of 50,000 Israeli liras.

"He who receives, or agrees to receive money, an equivalent of money, or a benefit ... in exchange for a promise to change his religion, or to bring about the change of another's religion: the sentence due to him is three years' imprisonment, or a fine of 30,000 Israeli liras".

I am sure that members of the Council are aware of the position taken by the United Christian Council in Israel against that law. Nevertheless, it is a law that was passed in Israel.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

But we do not even need to go into such things as that. Only the other day, Security Council document S/13139 was circulated. It contains a letter from Rabbi Uri Blau of the Neturei Karta - the Guardians of the City of Jerusalem - addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In that letter Rabbi Blau writes the following, inter alia:

"It is clearly the intention of the Zionist régime to fully secularize and defile the unique character of the Holy City, disregarding completely the elementary human rights of Jerusalem's citizens. The Zionist police force, which is under the direct control of the Begin Government, has been placed at the disposal of Teddy Kollek and his vicious allies to launch attacks on religious neighbourhoods. Anyone who appears to be religious, regardless of his citizenship, is subject to merciless beatings. Innocent bystanders, including American, English and Austrian citizens, old rabbis, pregnant women and children, have been hospitalized and jailed as a result of these wanton acts. Curfews are arbitrarily imposed, while police have on many occasions burst into synagogues indiscriminately and violently attacked Jews who were praying and studying. ...

"As citizens of Jerusalem, who have never accepted the annexation of the Holy City into the Zionist State, we implore Your Excellency" - that is, the Secretary-General of the United Nations -

"to call upon the Zionist authorities to cease immediately the construction of this stadium and the highway, which can irrevocably change the innate character of Jerusalem, which is a holy city to all mankind; to deter the Zionist régime from its campaign of terror and intimidation against the religious community; and to enable them to enjoy the elementary human rights which they have had for hundreds of years, and which certainly antedate the establishment of the Zionist State in the Holy Land". (S/13139, annex, pp. 3 and 4)

I cannot let this occasion pass without making the following brief remarks. While the Security Council convenes to consider Israel's disregard of and contempt for the Council's resolutions, and while the Government of the

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

United States of America reiterates its so-called position on Jerusalem - announcing its so-called respect for legitimacy - the President of the United States pays an official visit to Israel and conducts formal and official business in Jerusalem with the powers illegally controlling the City of Jerusalem. This visit proves to be a challenge to the Palestinian people in their own homeland. It proves to be a provocative act. It is justly interpreted as an attempt to liquidate the inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab population. That population rises up against the American attempt to liquidate the Palestinian Arabs, to liquidate the question of Palestine, to liquidate the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Palestinian Arab students participate in a peaceful demonstration, a demonstration of wrath. They organize peaceful demonstrations to bring forth a message to the unwelcome visitor. Israeli occupation troops open fire and a number of students are rushed to hospitals for treatment of the wounds sustained.

The unwelcome visitor happens to be a father. He has children. His own daughter could have been among the demonstrating students. I wonder how he would have reacted. I do know that, although he is an unwelcome visitor, he remains a father who cherishes his obligations as a father and would do anything to defend and protect his children. Yet he could not express his displeasure or disapproval. Does he feel responsible in any way for what happened?

Again, while the unwelcome visitor is still in the illegally occupied City of Jerusalem, his hosts - the Israeli forces - indiscriminately shell the Palestinian refugee camps across the frontiers in the North, at Nabatiyah, in southern Lebanon, where Palestinians have found shelter with their brothers. I am not aware that the visitor is moved or that his Government expresses any displeasure at this behaviour.

And finally, he announces that he and his accomplices have reached an agreement on the ingredients for peace. But the ingredients for peace in the Middle East are very well known. The peace must be comprehensive and just and must be based on the following factors: the inadmissibility of the

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

acquisition of territory by force and, consequently, the immediate and total withdrawal of the occupation forces; the right of the Palestinian people freely to exercise its inalienable right of return, its right to self-determination, its right to establish a sovereign, independent Palestinian State in Palestine; and the right of the Palestinian people to have its legitimate and sole representative: the Palestine Liberation Organization.

All those factors must be guaranteed. A just peace should aim at the creation of conditions for love, development and progress, and respect for the rights of peoples; and not at the prolongation and the giving of legitimacy to illegal occupation and the perpetuation of subjugation, oppression and the denial of rights.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now adjourn the meeting. I wish to thank the representative of Jordan for agreeing to forgo the exercise of his right of reply this evening, because of the lateness of the hour, and to include what he would have said this evening in his statement at the next meeting, to be held tomorrow at 11 a.m.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.