

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

**2134<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 22 MARCH 1979 UN LIBRARY  
NEW YORK

JAN 13 1983

---

UN/SA COLLECTION

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2134) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115) .....	1

## NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## 2134th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 22 March 1979, at 3.30 p.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2134)

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

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

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

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

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia, as well as the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the discussion 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. Thiounn Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. Hussen (Somalia), Mr. Sahloul (Sudan), Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian Soviet*

*Socialist Republic), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam), Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Saudi Arabia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

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

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them the text of a revised draft resolution [S/13171/Rev.2] sponsored by Bangladesh, Kuwait, Nigeria and Zambia.

4. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): The marathon is coming to an end, and I should like at this stage to make a few remarks.

5. In his lengthy statement on Monday, 19 March 1979 [2131st meeting], the representative of Israel made a few remarks about my country and my delegation. He accused us of partisanship and, therefore, in his view, we are disqualified from participating in the proceedings. He accused us of manipulating the Council.

6. I have listened to the Israeli representative making his numerous statements with, I would say, uncharacteristic patience, simply because there were many speakers and the rights of reply were too long. This is the right time to tell him the following—and I shall indeed give him what he expects me to offer.

7. First of all, we are partisans of peace based on genuine self-determination for the people of Palestine. We are partisans of the Charter, of United Nations resolutions. In this respect we are not alone; we are in the good company of no fewer than 40 representatives who have spoken to emphasize three points: the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination in accordance with the Charter; the occupation by brute force of the West Bank, Gaza and other Arab territories, contrary to international law and in contravention of the Charter; and the applicability of the

Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,<sup>1</sup> to the occupied territories. Those are the three salient points which were emphasized and highlighted by no fewer than 40 speakers.

8. On the last point—that is, the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the occupied territories—even Israel's best friends, among whom is, I would say, Israel's benefactor, have no hesitation. The Israeli representative's point on partiality and partisanship therefore does not hold water.

9. He spoke about the right of Jews "to coexist with the Palestinians and not to replace them". But he deliberately avoided telling us that General Dayan in May 1977 said to the *Jewish Chronicle* of London as I pointed out in my statement last week [2125th meeting] that coexistence must be under Jewish rule. Is that coexistence or subjugation? Is it coexistence among equals or, as I said in my statement, coexistence between the rider and the horse? Does Israel expect the world to accept such logic? The logic which Israel has been and is still using against the implementation of General Assembly resolution 194 (III)—which has been emphasized so much here—on the return of Palestinian refugees to their land is that the clock cannot be turned back. But it is obvious that Israel wants to turn the clock back 13 or 14 centuries on the grounds that Jews have lived in Judaea and Samaria and that the land is part and parcel of Eretz Israel. For the Palestinians, the clock cannot be turned back even for a few years; for the Jews, the clock can be turned back for 14 centuries.

10. The representative of Israel referred to coexistence, but coexistence is a two-way traffic. If Israel is keen on coexistence in the West Bank and Gaza, then let it be in all of Palestine wherein Palestinians and Jews can live together. After all, Palestinians were the indigenous people who inhabited all of Palestine before 1948.

11. The Israeli representative took exception to the statements that criticized his Government. He thinks that Israel is not answerable to anybody, to any organization, even to the one that accepted it on conditions that have never been fulfilled. And in his rights of reply he enjoyed linguistic globe-trotting, travelling as he did linguistically from the confines of China to the Caribbean and, more than that, he played the role of self-appointed champion of international human rights. This, in my view, is strange. To me it is an insult added to injury. For none of the participants in this debate comes from a country that was established on the denial of the rights of the indigenous population. None of the speakers comes from a country that was built on the displacement of one people that was consigned to the darkness of refugee camps.

12. The Israeli representative spoke about the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. I was surprised. I wonder what Mahatma Gandhi would have said if he had been involved in or had lived through the tragedy of the Palestinian people.

13. The Israeli representative spoke about the water resources in the occupied territories. I would like to remind

him of the following. Paragraph I of section I of General Assembly resolution 1803 (XVII) of 14 December 1962, entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources", declares that:

"The right of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources must be exercised in the interest of their national development and of the well-being of the people of the State concerned."

Paragraph 7 declares:

"Violation of the rights of peoples and nations to sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources is contrary to the spirit and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

It is significant that Israel voted in favour of that resolution.

14. I have before me a fresh dispatch from Reuters, which states the following:

"Israel intends to launch a major settlement project on the occupied West Bank of Jordan after the signing of a peace treaty with Egypt next week, the State television of Israel reported. The television report said at least 10 new outposts would be established in the West Bank in the near future.

"The report said that Prime Minister Begin had assured the Coalition National Religious Party of imminent massive settlement activity on the West Bank to secure its support for the peace treaty in a vote by the Knesset earlier today."

I shall not read out the whole dispatch.

15. The Israeli representative spoke in rosy terms about the situation in the occupied territories and I got the impression that the Palestinians live in a modern paradise. In my view, that is the language of pre-colonialism, when occupation was glorified and foreign domination glamorized. That is the logic of the dark ages, the logic that is adduced and supported by arrogant military superiority.

16. If he is confident, as he portrayed to us, that a new heaven exists in the occupied territories, then I am sure that his Government will be in a better position to receive the commission of the Security Council referred to in the draft resolution before the Council. The commission will find out whether there is in the occupied territories heaven, rosy heaven, less rosy heaven, hell or something in between. Why then is he afraid, or is his Government afraid, of the commission and why has his Government so far adamantly refused to admit the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories in order for it also to conduct a complete investigation?

17. The Israeli representative spoke about manipulating the Security Council. I must confess that he gave me more power than I deserve. The Council consists of mature and experienced representatives of responsible Governments. Who can manipulate 15 members of the Council? It is an insult to make such a statement. Members of the Council have convictions and believe in the correctness of the issue.

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

The majority have so far supported the merits of the draft resolution.

18. The representative of Israel said to us, in effect: the occupied territories are ours; they belong to us by virtue of old affinities that are mentioned in the Bible; whether you accept it or not, they are ours and we shall continue our colonization and expansionism. That is the message which he gave us.

19. It happens that the Council holds a different view. In the view of the Council, Israel must withdraw from territories occupied by force. In the view of the Council, the dissertation on the benefits of occupation does not cut much ice. In the view of the Council, the national rights of the Palestinians must be respected. The problem is then not between Jordan and Israel, as the Israeli representative has been trying to portray it, but between Israel and the Council. And surely the Council is not at fault. It is Israel that is at fault. Therefore, action by the Council is justified along the lines embodied in the draft resolution before the Council.

20. The intention of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution is to take the bull by the horns. Israel is behaving in the occupied territories like the proverbial bull in a china shop. It is high time to discipline its action. It is high time to involve the Council in an investigating mission that will visit the occupied territories and thereafter report to the Council about what goes on there.

21. I understand that the representative of Israel is in a difficult situation. He is defending the indefensible, trying to advocate the illegal, speaking on behalf of the immoral, posing as the proponent of the warmongers and, what is more, portraying Israel as a paragon of human equality.

22. He said that Jews do not intend to replace Palestinians. That is a macabre distortion of the truth. When European Jews started to come to Palestine at the close of the last century, they came with the same motto: "Co-existence, not replacement". In fact they did replace the Palestinians. They evicted them from their ancestral homeland, so much so that in April 1948, before the outbreak of hostilities, there were about 300,000 evicted Palestinians who were consigned to refugee camps. And what people thought of as a small cloud in the 1920s became a thunderstorm in 1948. That is the logic that is now being used and reinforced in the occupied territories. In 1968 there was a handful of Jews in the territories; in 1979 there are thousands of Jews, and the number will snowball. That is the problem which the Palestinians are facing. It is the erosion of their territory carried out by superior military power.

23. Prime Minister Begin said to the Knesset, as reported in *The New York Times* of 21 March, that partial and imperfect autonomy applied to the inhabitants, not to the territories, that Israeli troops would remain therein indefinitely; that no Palestinian State would ever see the light of day. That is a strange concept of international relations. That is, in my view—to use the weakest unflattering adjective—a weird statement which merits immediate condemnation by the Council. The Government of Israel is acting in blatant defiance of the family of nations. Such a statement cannot pass unnoticed. What should the answer be?

24. We have already tried, with all decency, urging Israel, calling upon Israel, requesting and entreating it to rescind its measures so as to show the minimum respect for the Charter of the United Nations. We have exhausted the vocabulary for expressing discontent and indignation and have now reached the stage of action—and that action is outlined in the draft resolution in its present form.

25. Draft resolution S/13171/Rev.2 is the product of compromise. Its goal is to establish a commission, and for the first time in the history of the Middle East there will be a commission of the Council which will visit the area to examine the situation in the occupied territories. We know that nothing irritates Israel more than the Council's involvement. In our view, the establishment of a commission is reasonable, just and unimpeachable.

26. I conclude my statement with the hope that the revised draft resolution will be adopted. Its adoption will be a small consolation to the people of Palestine and other Arabs who have suffered from indescribable tribulations for 50 years.

27. Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): As our deliberations on the item inscribed on our agenda come to a close, events of particular significance in the Middle East have altered the perspective in which these deliberations began. For although the Jordanian complaint which led to the convening of the Council was limited and precise within the formulation of its objective, the historical and political framework of the questions examined, and indeed the momentum of the debate itself, have so broadened the dimension of the problems under discussion as to encompass the global situation of the Middle East conflict at the present time. This dimension cannot in fact be ignored.

28. We deeply regret the policies and practices pursued in the Arab territories illegally occupied by Israel and all measures taken affecting the Holy City of Jerusalem. By the same token we deplore Israel's refusal to admit the possibility that the aspirations of the Palestinian people might one day come to find institutional expression through a self-determined national entity.

29. But all that does not prevent us from sharing the feelings of hope which were reborn with the news that peace in the Middle East has become possible and that a first step in that direction was taken with the agreement between Egypt and Israel. Indeed, the Portuguese Government considers that agreement a highly positive factor in the evolution of a conflict which has divided peoples to which my country is bound by historical ties of friendship and whose moral and cultural values form so important a part of the common heritage of mankind.

30. The signing of a peace treaty in that region, limited and frail though it may still be, may in fact signal new innovative possibilities leading to a global, just and broader solution—a solution which has to ensure the Palestinian people's inalienable right to self-determination while also safeguarding the existence of the State of Israel, in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, the decisions of the Security Council and the principles embodied in the Charter.

31. Naturally, we do not entertain the illusion that the proposed treaty will provide an adequate global and definite answer to the problems of the Middle East; neither can the parties themselves be under that illusion. But it should not be forgotten that 30 years have elapsed since the creation of the State of Israel—30 years marked by war, hatred and destruction, during which no perspective of peace, however frail or remote, has ever been in sight. Such a perspective now appears for the first time.

32. Although the reservations and even the clear opposition which the agreement has encountered in wide international circles, namely in the Arab world, are understandable and worthy of respect, the Portuguese delegation deems it a duty to hail and support it as the beginning of a new path leading to the true peace that we all seek.

33. Having said that, I should like to repeat that the Portuguese Government views with deep concern the practices pursued by Israel in the occupied Arab territories and Israel's refusal to abide by the pertinent resolutions of the Council. That is the reason why we consider it justified that the Security Council should find ways and means to examine the situation created by those practices. However, this position should in no way be interpreted as expressing on the part of my Government any intention of minimizing the courageous peace initiatives pursued by President Carter and the results so far achieved, which we applaud and fully support.

34. Our position only reflects the apprehension of the Portuguese Government in the face of the complexity and dimension of the problems that the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel does not solve—and the solution of which seems to us to be absolutely essential to achieve a true, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East.

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

36. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and the members of the Security Council for granting me this opportunity to explain my Government's position on the question of the occupied territories and on Jerusalem.

37. The Government of Saudi Arabia has made it abundantly clear on numerous occasions that there can be no genuine peace in the Middle East without the complete withdrawal of Israel from all the territories occupied by it, and if the Palestinian people are not given all their legitimate and inalienable rights.

38. Of particular importance for Saudi Arabia, and indeed the entire Moslem world, which totals over 700 million persons, is the question of Jerusalem. The position of Saudi Arabia on Jerusalem—which is revered as the first Qibla in Islam—has been repeatedly made clear. It is inconceivable that these several hundred million Moslems would accept the suzerainty of the Zionists over Jerusalem.

39. The Zionist régime, besides changing the physical and demographic character of the occupied territories, is play-

ing havoc with the spiritual shrines of Jerusalem, which are revered by all monotheistic religions and mean so much to Moslems everywhere.

40. These Zionist practices in the occupied territories constitute a danger which in itself is living proof of aggressive intentions, an explicit manifestation being the lack on Israel's part of any withdrawal from these territories—Israel seeking thereby to impose a *fait accompli*.

41. We are sure that the Security Council will live up to its historic responsibility in the present situation. Although the Council has adopted many resolutions banning any measure to annex Jerusalem and has decided that all legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel which purport to alter the legal status of the city are invalid, and has called on Israel to rescind those measures forthwith, Israel has seen fit to ignore all these resolutions, which have remained dead letters.

42. Many resolutions have also been adopted by the General Assembly on the occupied territories, the last being resolution 33/113 B, which calls upon Israel to comply with its international obligations in accordance with the fourth Geneva Convention and to desist from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status, geographical nature or demographic composition of the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

43. Therefore, the need for concrete action by the Security Council has become urgent, especially in view of the very recent illegal measures taken by the Israeli Government for the establishment of Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories, measures which are scarcely conducive to a climate favouring the search for a peaceful solution in the region.

44. I should now like to survey in a succinct manner the situation in the occupied Arab territories and the inhuman treatment that the Palestinian people under occupation are receiving at the hands of the Israeli authorities. Perhaps no better example can be cited—an example that bears on the heart of this very problem—than a quotation from a statement by the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the People of the Occupied Territories, the representative of Sri Lanka. He stated the following on 20 November 1978 before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly:

“The conclusions reached by the Special Committee on the basis of this information are given in chapter VI [of its report], and these 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 against 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, 33, 47 and 53.”<sup>2</sup>

45. At this juncture I wish to cite a few examples of the brutal methods used by the Israeli occupying authorities against the innocent civilian inhabitants of the West Bank. A representative of the International Red Cross reported recently:

“On a visit which was carried out with the presence of an observer, 81 prisoners were found huddled in one cell. The prisoners all declared that they were not allowed to leave their cells, even to use the toilets or the washing facilities. They had to use the cell tap which was situated only 15 centimeters from the level of the floor.”

Another example was mentioned by Amnesty International in its report entitled *The Methods of Torture*. I quote from that report:

“(a) Police dogs let loose on the prisoner, who is usually handcuffed with hands behind back. The dogs are trained to throw the prisoner on the ground. The prisoner is then ordered to get on his feet, and so on.

“(b) Fingers placed on the end of an open door, and then the door is slammed on them.

“(c) Finger-nails are pulled out with ordinary pincers.

“(d) The prisoner is injected with pepper solutions.

“(e) The prisoner is injected with solutions which he is told induce instant insanity. He is shown what he is told is an antidote, which would be given to him if only he confessed in time.

“(f) A large metal container is fitted over the head and neck and held firm to the body by extension. The container is then hit with sticks on the outside, at first slowly and in routine fashion, and then with increasing tempo. The more battered the container, the more difficult it is to remove.

“(g) Matchsticks are inserted into the genitals. Sometimes they are lit.

“(h) A certain chemical substance (possibly a nerve irritant) is put in the hand of the prisoner, who is ordered to clench it. The substance gives the effect of an electric shock.”

46. As to the real intentions of the Israeli Government on the future of the occupied territories, perhaps there is no more revealing statement than the following quotation from *The Jerusalem Post* of 13 July 1967:

“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.”

47. What has been taking place in the occupied territories can be best described by citing the available figures on what the Israeli authorities have so far pillaged. According to these figures, Israel has taken about 62 per cent of the West

Bank's exports and provided 90 per cent of its imports, while the East Bank has provided a market for 37,000 of the West Bank's people to alleviate the suffering and compensate for the lost markets of the people under occupation.

48. The West Bank trade deficit with Israel is financed simply by its surplus with Jordan and by remittances of West Bank Palestinian workers abroad. The West Bank, in the present circumstances, offers Israeli industries an almost completely protected market, which results in the West Bankers paying higher prices for Israeli goods.

49. There is no need here to stress that the question of Palestine lies at the heart of the problem in the Middle East. Fulfilment of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, particularly Jerusalem, is the only way of restoring peace and security.

50. It is patently clear that the Israeli authorities have seen fit not only to violate the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people but also to contravene the provisions of international law as well as those of the Charter of the United Nations.

51. No member of this august body would deny that we all seek peace—not peace at any price but peace in conformity with the precepts of justice and the dignity of human beings, peace that would restore to the Palestinian people their inalienable rights and their right to live as a free people in their own country.

52. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom): It is over two years since the Council last met specifically to discuss the situation in the occupied Arab territories. At that time [1969th meeting], my delegation joined in the consensus statement which strongly deplored measures taken in those territories by the Government of Israel to alter their demographic composition with particular reference to the establishment of settlements. That consensus statement also underlined the international view that Israeli actions in and around Jerusalem, including the expropriation of land and properties and the transfer of populations, were invalid and called upon Israel to rescind measures previously taken and to desist from taking any further action which might change the status of that Holy City.

53. That statement, which has been supported by subsequent General Assembly resolutions adopted by overwhelming majorities, has clearly not been heeded. Indeed, as a phrase used by the Jordanian Permanent Representative in his letter seeking this Council meeting implies, there is increasing evidence of the continuation, and even expansion, by the Israeli Government of the policies deplored by the Security Council.

54. Last October the Israeli press and radio reported that Israel was to begin immediately a programme of expansion and consolidation of existing settlements in the West Bank. The United Kingdom Government stated publicly at the time that they have always been opposed to settlement activity which could make a negotiated solution to the over-all problem in the area more difficult. This remains my

<sup>2</sup> A/SPC/33/PV.29, p. 7.

Government's view. We have constantly made plain our view that Israel should acknowledge the application of the fourth Geneva Convention to the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the other territories which it occupies. We recognize that a fully satisfactory and lasting solution to the problems of the occupied territories can be achieved only in the context of an over-all settlement. However, as the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany said in the General Assembly debate on 26 September 1978,<sup>3</sup> when speaking on behalf of the nine member countries of the European Community, our view is that any over-all settlement must be based, among other things, on the need for Israel to end the territorial occupation which it has maintained since the 1967 war. It follows, therefore, that we strongly believe the pursuance by the Government of Israel of its current settlements policies poses a major obstacle to peace.

55. Since we began this debate over a week ago the news has broken that, following an admirable and courageous effort by President Carter, the Governments of Egypt and Israel are on the verge of signing a peace agreement. My Government has supported the Camp David process from the beginning, and we welcome this development. But we welcome it as the start, the first step in the struggle to achieve a genuine comprehensive settlement to the over-all problem. My Government's views on the prerequisites for a comprehensive settlement are well known and have not changed. The test of the imminent peace agreement will come in the months ahead, and the issue we are currently discussing in this Council—Israeli settlements in the occupied territories—will clearly be of crucial importance. Indeed, if the present settlement policy of the Israeli Government were to continue, it is the view of my Government that the peace process now started would be gravely jeopardized.

56. It is, however, precisely because of the peace efforts that my Government has reservations about the proposal to send a Security Council mission to examine the situation in the occupied territories. In principle we support the concept of sending fact-finding missions to troubled areas. We have made this clear on many occasions. But we are concerned that on this occasion a mission such as that proposed in the draft resolution before us might only serve to complicate the peace efforts currently under way. My Government would prefer to see the Israeli Government recognize the strength of feeling on this issue and to see all concerned strive to build on the progress already achieved before considering alternative approaches. For that reason we have decided to abstain from voting on the draft resolution before us.

57. Before concluding, I should like to emphasize that our decision to abstain should in no way be read as acquiescence in, or the condoning of, the policies of the Government of Israel in the occupied territories. Indeed, my Government appeals to the Government of Israel to desist now from any measures to increase its settlements and to avoid jeopardizing over the next few critical months the prospects for a comprehensive peace settlement in which all countries and peoples can join.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 8th meeting.*

58. Finally, may I say that it is a source of great regret to my delegation that we are today obliged for the third time in the past three months to criticize in this forum the activities and policies of the Government of a country with which the United Kingdom has for so long had close relations. If, however, it is true that criticism offered by a friend is the most valuable and most to be respected, we offer our views gladly and hope the message will be clearly understood by the people and leaders of Israel.

59. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): My delegation has listened with great attention to the statements that have been made by the representative of Jordan and the representative of Israel. We have noted with particular interest the extensive and well-documented references made by the representative of Jordan regarding non-compliance by the Government of Israel with the previous Council resolutions and the relevant provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention. We believe that facts that have been brought to the notice of this august body by the representative of Jordan are cogent and deserve careful study and thorough examination.

60. In this connexion, I should like to quote from the speech of the representative of Jordan of 19 March:

"The second point made by the representative of Israel was that my information was incorrect. Very well, if that is what he believes about it, why does he not have the courage to prove me wrong by accepting a neutral commission made up of members of the Security Council, all of whom are men of integrity? We are willing to have all those members, friends of Israel, go and see for themselves and prove who is right and who is wrong." [2131st meeting, para. 132.]

61. My delegation believes that the commission which had been provided for in the draft resolution under consideration, to be appointed by the President, should visit the occupied areas so that the members can see things for themselves and make an on-the-spot examination of the factual situation, and we expect that Israel in this regard will be more co-operative than in the past. Further, in the view of my delegation, the commission should, as well, consider interviewing those Palestinians who have been affected by the action of the occupying Power and who are not now in their country but are refugees in neighbouring countries.

62. In conclusion, my delegation believes that the commission, if it is established, will have heavy and onerous responsibilities, and it is our firm conviction that, given co-operation, it can discharge its responsibilities duly and effectively only by visiting the areas and thereby helping the cause to make the true situation understood, thus helping the cause of peace itself.

63. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I call.

64. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I am grateful to the representative of Kuwait for confirming once again, through his statement today, that he is indeed the undisguised spokesman for the Arab countries in the Council, unable to let pass an opportunity to advocate their policy of denying Israel's rights to peace and security. This is only to be expected from a State

which is formally on record as having rejected resolution 242 (1967). Indeed, all this is in the name of the true spirit of partisanship of the Charter of the United Nations.

65. The representative of Kuwait has attempted to juggle the posture of impartial adjudication with his true role as the mouthpiece for the Arab group in the Security Council. He has denied that role on previous occasions and claimed that he comes not as a partisan of Arabs but as a partisan of the Charter. As a self-styled partisan of the Charter, he would know, I am sure, that as a party to a dispute he should refrain from voting on any matters connected with that dispute, unless, of course, he can assure us that he is no longer a party to the Arab-Israeli dispute. After all, Article 27 (3) of the Charter provides that in decisions of the Security Council, under Chapter VI, "a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting".

66. The Government of Kuwait spares no effort to show that it does not lag behind any other Arab Government in its active militancy against Israel. It is the Kuwaiti representative who sponsored the draft resolution for the Council to adopt, and who commended it to Council members. To say the very least, this procedure casts moral and legal doubts on the whole process. Surely, both good taste and respect for the Charter demand that a partisan of the Charter observe Article 27 (3).

67. Incidentally, the assertion that Kuwait and the group of States which it represents in the Council are partisans of the Charter sounds rather hollow, considering the fact that that group of Arab States has over the last 30 years violated, with regard to Israel, every purpose and principle of the Charter. They have ignored, in respect of Israel, Article 2 (1) of the Charter—which stipulates the principle of the sovereign equality of all Members of the Organization, Article 2 (3), which lays down the duty of States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, Article 2 (4), which prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, and so on.

68. I crave the Kuwaiti representative's indulgence for making such inconvenient and what he would no doubt call distasteful observations.

69. In his statement the representative of Kuwait was predictably solicitous about Palestinian sensibilities. Indeed, memories in the Council are sometimes short, for it is not so long ago that the Kuwaiti Government took measures which, in the view of United States officials at the time, were designed "primarily to control the large Palestinian community in Kuwait". I quote from *The New York Times* of 1 September 1976:

"Under these measures, foreigners are forbidden from becoming Kuwaiti citizens and thus are forbidden to vote or hold public office, no matter how long they have lived in the country. Similarly, by law a foreigner cannot operate a business in Kuwait without a Kuwaiti holding a 55 per cent share."

It would appear that Jews and Arabs coexist with greater ease in Israel, where such restrictions do not exist.

70. In its edition of 8-19 September 1976 the *International Herald Tribune*, reporting a crackdown on the press in Kuwait and assessing press conditions in the Arab world in general, observed:

"Ironically, it is in East Jerusalem, under Israeli rule, that the Arab press is least restricted. The Arabic language dailies regularly oppose policies of the Israeli Government."

71. The PRESIDENT: There are no other speakers at this stage; I shall therefore make a statement in my capacity as representative of NIGERIA.

72. In making this statement, I would wish to say from the outset that, as is very clear to everyone, Nigeria has always attempted to be even-handed and fair in all aspects of its foreign policy. I was very glad that the United Kingdom has joined in this even-handedness.

73. I do believe that one of the greatest problems of our age has been that of world power influence to control both the Cape routes and the Canal routes to the East, and this problem has manifested itself not only in racist domination in the Cape but in the Middle East as well.

74. Having said that, I would also say that the foreign policy of Nigeria is based on classical principles—one of protecting the territorial integrity of our country in ensuring that there is stability in our region, and in stretching a hand of fellowship to all our neighbours. It is not a question of moral justification of a policy; it is a question of a realistic approach to what is in our enlightened self-interest, and we do hope that in the discussion today, which Nigeria will join, this principle may be taken into consideration.

75. I have gone into this preamble for a number of reasons. The first reason is that I have observed that the Israeli delegation, rather than applying their minds to the subject that is before us, have taken one State after another and brought in extraneous aspects of their own domestic policies. I believe that, even though I am speaking on behalf of the delegation of Nigeria, I should draw attention to the fact that in the Security Council we should aspire to maintain the high standards that should be the privilege of such a body.

76. For more than a decade, the Israeli presence in Arab territories seized in the June 1967 war has become institutionalized and transformed into sprouting Jewish settlements that are spreading over the entire area. These vexing settlements are to be found everywhere, namely, in the plateau north-east of the Golan Heights in Syria; along the Jordan Valley; at other points on the West Bank, including occupied Jerusalem—since renamed Judaea and Samaria, in violation of all known norms of constitutional propriety; in the Gaza Strip and in Sinai from the Mediterranean coast to the southern tip of the peninsula at Sharm el Sheikh. These settlements represent, in the view of the Nigerian delegation, a strong element in a conscious and explicit policy of acquisition.

77. The settlements themselves are the final outcome of a carefully laid process, starting with military or paramilitary

outposts, and thereafter developing into semi-permanent or permanent settlements. The entire exercise itself naturally involves flagrant violations of the elementary and basic human rights of the Arab population in the occupied territories. In the circumstances, it is therefore manifestly evident that it is these settlements, tied to the Palestinian problem, that lie at the very roots of the continuing crisis in the Middle East. I personally have attempted to interpret this as brinkmanship for bargaining purposes, but the eventual permanent nature of these settlements has befogged me.

78. The search for a solution of the problem in the Middle East continues to be with the international community after more than three decades, and judged against this background—that the settlements are indeed the greatest obstacle to a durable peace in the region—my delegation believes that any realistic search for peace must take into account what has been going on in the occupied areas.

79. To achieve a durable peace, the ongoing process of establishing new settlements must be halted, and dozens of others—all illegal—must be dismantled. I believe that thereafter, all Palestinians—and I wish to emphasize this point: all Palestinians—both inside and outside the occupied territories must be guaranteed unfettered freedom to enable them to return to their homes after three decades and exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a politically defined homeland of their own.

80. In order to appreciate fully why the attainment of a durable peace is contingent upon Israel's unconditional withdrawal from the territories seized by naked force and aggression, one has to reflect on the record of the occupying Power in these territories since 1967.

81. Here I might digress a little. I listened carefully to the representative of Israel in trying to distinguish between occupation and benevolence. I believe that occupation, as prescribed in the Geneva Convention, means occupation through war, and not permanent settlements; and the arguments which he adduced to indicate that there was a benevolent régime in those territories are fundamentally against the spirit and letter of the Geneva Convention.

82. The policy of establishing Jewish settlements on Arab lands was initiated by the government of Levi Eshkol in 1967 and pursued with growing enthusiasm under his successor, Golda Meir, of blessed memory. I remember reading the book, *My Life*,<sup>4</sup> and I recall that even among the Jews she distinguished between members of the Labour Zionist movement and others, and there was even an element of discrimination among the Jews themselves. The October war of 1973 brought that policy to a halt momentarily, exposing the false assumptions, or pretexts, on which it was based. But even before Israel had buried its dead from that war, the policy was resumed early in 1974 and pursued with renewed vigour.

83. Thereafter, the Israel Labour Government embarked on a twenty-year plan—1975 to 1995—with the main objec-

tive of establishing an Israeli presence in strategic areas of the West Bank, including Arab Jerusalem. This plan is already in an advanced stage of implementation, as the Israelis are already in control of an estimated 70 per cent of the cultivable land in the Jordan Valley. They have also developed an extensive infrastructure involving the creation of a wide network of all possible social services to serve and connect the colonies in the settlements in the area. The Israeli objectives in the pattern and location of the illegal settlements are thus twofold: first, to cut off the West Bank's populated areas from any physical contact with Jordan; secondly, to contain the Palestinian population by surrounding it from the north, the west, the south, and now, from the east, by two belts of Israeli settlements.

84. As regards the high-rise residential fortresses that form a ring around the Palestinian population of Jerusalem, the strategic objectives appear to my delegation to be twofold: first, to prevent the physical expansion of the Palestinian population of Jerusalem and the accumulative and progressive seizure of that city, and, secondly, to create a psychological feeling of living in a ghetto, in order to cause the Palestinians to emigrate and consequently facilitate full Israeli settlement and control of the Arab sector of the city.

85. As though to emphasize the priority given to the objective of acquisition, the Israelis set aside huge sums of money, the latest being an appropriation of \$40 million—it sounds little—only last January for expanding present Jewish colonies and improving their infrastructure.

86. The policies of the Israeli military administration in the occupied territories are therefore both callous and indefensible. My use of the word "callous" is deliberate because the settlements involve the systematic eviction of Arab families from their lands directly and indirectly, as elucidated earlier, and cutting them off in consequence from their only sources of livelihood.

87. The policies are presented as morally defensible because on every occasion eviction has been justified under the over-stretched formula of shoring up Israel's so-called security only to turn over the sequestered property to new Jewish immigrants. And, as if to further compound the humiliation meted out to the Arabs, Palestinian workers have indeed been observed constructing houses for Israeli immigrants, often on land which has been confiscated from Arab owners. Or worse still, Palestinian workers, like South African blacks, find themselves, in order to eke out a living and in order to survive with their families, working their erstwhile farms for their oppressors.

88. The cultural aspects of the Israeli occupation are equally disturbing. After all, nazism was basically a cultural identity and a travesty of freedom of expression based on racism and the notion of a superior race. According to Seth Tillman, a former staff member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Congress, all aspects of cultural expression, including drama, literary magazines and the press, are subject to rigid controls by the occupying Power. Dramatic scripts, for example, must be submitted to Israeli military censors for advance approval. All references to the Palestinian entity are forbidden and must not appear in any magazine. Repressive measures have been ap-

<sup>4</sup>G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

plied with increasing intensity since the inception of Israel's military occupation, but in recent times they have been directed heavily against intellectuals, students and potential political leaders, most especially against those who articulate Palestinian national aspirations. I do not know whether this man from the Congress is reflecting the right spirit of what is happening but we do believe that congressmen in this country have some integrity.

89. In effect, is the suppression of the Palestinian people a matter of race? Is it a cultural phenomenon? Is it a religious phenomenon? My delegation believes that it must be one of them, or probably all of them. Indeed, the sudden deportations and extended imprisonments are invariably carried out under a law of administrative detention, a heritage from the Mandate days and a law which the British used against Jewish partisans and which, ironically, the Israelis now use regularly against Palestinian intellectuals, students and activists.

90. I again ask, is it based on culture, or race, or both? When George Orwell wrote *1984* and *Animal Farm* he beamed his thoughts in one direction and we are beginning to see those thoughts becoming more universal in the context of what I have just described.

91. In the realm of international law there can be no question but that the Israeli settlements are illegal and that in continuing to establish them the Israeli Government is contravening specific international agreements. Apart from the fact that the policy of acquisition constitutes a defiance of United Nations resolutions and of the spirit of the Charter, there are also particular obligations—of which many representatives have spoken—imposed by article 6 of the fourth Geneva Convention—of which, happily, Israel is a signatory—on any occupying Power. By no stretch of legal imagination can that or any other provision of that Convention be interpreted as an authorization for a belligerent occupying Power to exempt itself from its voluntarily contracted obligation under that Convention. To affirm otherwise, as the Israelis have done in recent times, not only begs the question but goes to the heart of what I talked about earlier, namely that there is a difference between occupation in time of war and the permanent establishment of an Israeli presence.

92. No less excruciating to the sensibilities as well as to the intelligence of the Palestinian people, and indeed of the entire international community, is the Israeli contention that the people living under their military rule are happy and even free. I believe that we have heard this type of very strange logic put before us in the context of southern Africa. The Israelis try to pull a veil over our eyes by pointing to certain social services which they say they are providing, to jobs provided by Israeli enterprises, and, in addition, to the holding of free municipal elections—again this is the pattern which we learned about in southern Africa, but in the case of Israel we are happy to note that in fact most of the candidates that win these elections strongly support the Palestine Liberation Organization.

93. Even if these claims that social services and jobs are provided were wholly accurate—and there is abundant evidence to the contrary—they still would not alter the fact

that there is a colonial régime in the militarily occupied territories. Israeli references to Arab-Jewish "coexistence" on the West Bank may be used to advance a claim that the colonial régime is a benevolent one, but, benevolent or otherwise, it is still a colonial régime and a colonial régime in the sense of an occupying Power following warfare, which makes it worse. At least the colonialists had a pattern for leaving their colonial territory at some stage.

94. The "coexistence" of which the Israelis speak is, in any case, of a special nature since the settlements being established are exclusively for Jews. I have the impression that no Arabs are invited or permitted to live in them. I hope I am not wrong. That is clearly not a coexistence of equals but rather one between a dominant invader and a subordinate indigenous population which is to be kept docile by a combination of military force and political and economic inducements.

95. When I refer to southern Africa I always wonder why the carrot and stick process is not being used in many of the very excruciating deliberations which we have had during the last two years. The Israelis appear to do better than the Western Powers in this respect.

96. In the view of my delegation, there is nothing new about these techniques. They are the classic devices employed by the British in India and in many of the other classical colonial empires. There is little doubt that this system is more enlightened, humane and efficient than the brutal subjugation of populations practised by the Germans in Europe during the Second World War. It is, however, still colonialism none the less and of an anachronistic variety. All that is new about it is its revival in an age when the classical European colonial empires have all but disappeared from the surface of our globe—obviously except for settler colonialism in southern Africa.

97. Except for Israel itself, world opinion is now unanimous—we have seen this around this chamber—in its collective judgement that the Israeli colonialism in the West Bank is both illegal and an obstacle to peace. The evidence is conclusive but even in marshalling it one has the strong sense that the practical problem lies elsewhere.

98. As my delegation sees it, the practical problem undoubtedly lies in the bone-deep conviction of Israel's current leaders that the West Bank—"Judaea and Samaria"—is the patrimony of the Jewish people, the property of the Jews by biblical right, a gift from the Supreme Being which cannot be revoked by Arab "squatters", even "squatters" who have lived in the land for 2,000 years.

99. It is something of an oddity in the modern world to have territorial claims based on obscurantist religious grounds. To succumb to this philosophy would lead to international anarchy. I am sure that those who created Israel did not anticipate this dimension. And if we were to apply these obscurantist policies in redefining borders among nation-States, we must all understand that we could all trump up various devices by which to redraw our lines and our borders. I believe that the big Powers would have a

lot to do and say about it, should it become the pattern of international relations.

100. As I said earlier, security is also emphasized, and no one questions Israel's sincerity as regards its apprehensions for its security. After all, Israel is a fait accompli as a nation-State. But, since the Begin Government came to office, the emphasis has increasingly shifted to religious, biblical grounds, to the mystique of "Eretz Israel". That, one suspects, is where the real conviction lies; that is what fuels Mr. Begin's engine. It places Israel in direct defiance of the modern world's primary standard of equity for the drawing of international frontiers—the principle of self-determination, the rights of peoples, so far as is possible, to live within political jurisdictions of their choice. There being no practical way to reconcile the two standards—one ancient and religious, the other modern and secular—the Israelis have found themselves in a painful moral dilemma with respect to the Palestinian people.

101. Not many years ago we all sided with the Jews in condemning and fighting Nazi oppression when its victims were rapidly being exterminated. I was a little boy at that time, but I went to the villages to sing: "Hitler, a curse of Germans, is cruel and heartless; England, with God's guidance, will destroy him." And so I played a part in this process. This pogrom remains one of the greatest horrors of our generation. That was why a State was created for Jews.

102. It is not uncommon for victims and oppressors alike to become brutalized through the experience of oppression. This is what psychiatrists might call "psychogenic traumata". However, the Israeli nation is made up of people many of whom have been dehumanized and gone through this psychogenic phenomenon which I have talked about and, to say the least, have suffered and who, because of that suffering, should be more sensitized to the effects of oppression, discrimination, deprivation and even genocide. Unfortunately, they appear to be utilizing this psychogenic experience as the rationale for victimizing others who had nothing to do with their trauma and for violating their human rights. In the process, they appear to be transferring their pain. A few mavericks, such as Mr. Israel Shahak, have faced the dilemma squarely, acknowledging both the rights of the Palestinians and the wrongs done them by successive expulsion from their native land. And there are others, such as the former Chief of Military Intelligence, Yehoshafat Harkabi, who has urged his fellow Israelis to concede the right of the Palestinians to form a State. He has also asked the Israelis "to show sympathy for the Palestinian problems and suffering, to the making of which we have contributed". That is not all. An Israeli journalist, Meir Merhav of *The Jerusalem Post*, warns the Israelis that "the total and unconditional rejection of Palestinian self-determination is partly the result of a false perception of reality, partly the outcome of faulty logic and partly the product of an irrational mixture of mystical beliefs, aggressive romanticism and traumatic fears, which cannot be upheld in today's world". That appears to be the crux of the existing problem.

103. No matter how we look at the problem, and regardless of the angle from which the whole paraphernalia of

Israeli military occupation of Arab lands is viewed, one cannot but arrive at the same conclusion. Morally, the colonization of Arab territories occupied since 1967 following hostilities is wrong and is doing as much violence to the fabric of Israeli society itself as it is to the legitimate rights and aspirations of the people on which Israel seeks to impose its authority. Juridically, the occupation process is illegal, involving Israel in a constant battle of wits with the international community, from which Israel has become increasingly alienated. Politically, the annexation of East Jerusalem, the establishment of more and more settlements or the expansion of existing ones in territories from which the world has long decided that Israel will have to withdraw is futile and self-defeating; it merely perpetuates the very hostility which it should be Israel's first objective to disarm.

104. In the circumstances the international community can no longer afford to procrastinate on this long-standing evasion of its collective will by the State of Israel. The United Nations must now demand immediate compliance with its resolutions on the subject; unless Israel is prepared to face the appropriate measures provided under the Charter for continued defiance, it must abandon its plan to establish new settlements or expand old ones. The occupying military administration must also stop its ongoing censored policies of evacuation, deportation, expulsion, displacement and transfer of Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories. It must desist from further destroying or demolishing Arab homes and terminate its current mass arrests and torture of Arab civilians, in violation of the principles of natural justice and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Israel must respect the sanctity of the archaeological, religious and cultural sites belonging by birthright to the non-Jewish populations in the occupied areas and to many more across the world. All these should be a prelude to complete and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli occupation force to facilitate the return of dispossessed Palestinians in safety, honour and dignity to their homes in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

105. In securing the compliance of Israel, my delegation cannot but stress the central role which the United States Government could play in securing the aforementioned objectives. The principle of self-determination of peoples is specified in the Charter of the United Nations. It is, moreover, pertinent to remember that it is equally rooted in the American tradition. The United States Government has pursued a course of action, albeit outside the framework of the United Nations, geared towards the evolution of peace in the Middle East. I recall that when I first spoke about this,<sup>5</sup> I described President Sadat as the only man who understands, but probably born out of his due time. I hope he is not born out of his time.

106. If indeed the United States intends to play a credible role among all the belligerents, if its avowed objective is a durable peace and not a distorted one, then it has to be scrupulously even-handed in its basic approach to the sensitive issues prevailing in the area as a whole. In our view, it is no longer enough merely to describe the Israeli settlements

<sup>5</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 78th meeting.*

as illegal or as an obstacle to peace. The United States Government will have to consider firmer measures to halt the ongoing process of occupation of Arab territories by the Israelis. That is the least that should be done and it should be the beginning of a policy of articulation. I might be misjudging the situation, but I believe that I could be right.

107. The United States Administration, in the candid opinion of my delegation, now needs to pause and re-examine whether it can continue to acquiesce in Israel's actions in occupied Arab lands, in spite of positive pronouncements by the Administration in that direction. Washington will now need to reconsider Israel's present policies, which appear to tarnish the American heritage and democratic tradition built on the record of such fearless and legendary exponents of human rights as Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt. I believe that the present United States Administration, like its predecessors, has the requisite political leverage to compel Israel to comply with the pertinent United Nations resolutions for the attainment of a durable peace in the Middle East. That, in our view, would be America's most enduring and positive contribution to Israel's security since an Israel encircled by hostile neighbours and compelled to accept a humiliating peace will forever remain threatened.

108. In this connexion, I should like to make two further points. I am very happy indeed that the United States Administration has consistently spoken about majority rule and self-determination in southern Africa as well. Also, I must congratulate the Israeli delegation for the letters which it has recently sent to the Secretary-General stating that Israel has decided not only to observe the Security Council resolutions on the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, but also to discontinue all licences to supply any military equipment to South Africa.

109: I now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Security Council.

110. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The discussion in the Security Council, which on this occasion was convened at the initiative of the Jordanian delegation, has provided cogent proof of the fact that the situation in the occupied Arab territories continues to deteriorate. The discussion has also once again borne out the fact that the Israeli Government does not intend to heed the opinions of the Members of the United Nations or to take account of the actual situation prevailing in the Middle East. In its expansionist euphoria, it is obviously deliberately closing its eyes to the danger of an inevitable explosion. That explosion cannot be averted by posturing, by shirking responsibility or by mystification and private transactions, but only by a just and comprehensive settlement which would not circumvent the heart of the Middle East conflict, namely, a solution to the Palestinian problem.

111. The long and painful process of drawing up the draft resolution which we now have before us in document S/13171/Rev.2, and on which we are about to vote, has once again convinced us that a solution to the problem of the occupied Palestinian territories has by no means drawn any closer despite the separate deals of which we are all

aware. Nor can we conclude that a genuinely just solution to the Palestinian problem can be promoted by the draft resolution, which contains no clear-cut condemnation of the occupation of foreign territories and which does not even contain any clear language regarding the need to monitor the situation on the spot.

112. However, the Czechoslovak delegation will vote for this draft resolution because it represents the maximum which the representatives of the Arab countries could manage to obtain agreement upon in this particular situation. In this connexion, we are also mindful of the position which has been taken by the delegation of Jordan, which requested the present meeting of the Security Council to deal with the question of the situation in the occupied Arab territories.

113. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to a vote the revised draft resolution sponsored by Bangladesh, Kuwait, Nigeria and Zambia [S/13171/Rev.2].

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none,<sup>6</sup> with 3 abstentions.*

114. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to speak after the vote.

115. Mr. ROLÓN ANAYA (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution establishing a commission to determine on the spot the scope of the complaints of the Arab countries regarding the alarming problem of peace in the Middle East, currently in relation to Jerusalem and the settlements in Arab territories.

116. Strictly speaking, there were too many words and it was overwhelming to hear the marathon of statements, as someone has already said, to set up only one commission, limited in effective numerical strength to the categorical number of three.

117. My delegation repeats its preference for constructive actions and measures rather than a repetition of condemnation, and we wish to emphasize once again the reasons that we have already stated in the Council regarding the role of peaceful persuasion and objective understanding, which is of definite interest to Bolivia, to achieve peace in that convulsed region of the world.

118. One of the most important international principles for my country is respect for the territorial sovereignty of

<sup>6</sup> See resolution 446 (1979).

States. Any armed territorial occupation, any usurpation of territories or mutilation of sovereignty is totally contrary to the principles of the Charter, to the rules of civilized world consensus and international doctrine and practice which Bolivia has observed and continues to observe, a country which has never usurped territory and which, on the contrary, was the victim of encroachments, the major one of which left us without an outlet to the sea with which we came into being as a republic. My country will never accept that territorial usurpation.

119. In its unalterable policy of support for the peaceful settlement of disputes, Bolivia considers favourably the importance of the negotiations designed to achieve peace in the Middle East. Those efforts for peace, although incomplete and sometimes outside the framework of the Security Council, are, as we have already said, welcome as an initial step. They would have been more fruitful had they not pursued a piecemeal political solution but had they been more global and considered the problem of Palestine as pivotal for peace in the region, and, finally, had they contributed to, rather than excluded, United Nations efforts and more especially Security Council efforts.

120. In the resolution that the Council has just adopted, we establish only a mechanism to examine the situation, as the text says, and later for peace negotiations. Its procedure and objective are certainly valid, even if they are only purely procedural. We certainly cannot be against any mechanism set up by the Council itself, since we view with sympathy any efforts to achieve peace, including efforts outside the Council.

121. To return to the substance, Bolivia reiterates its conviction that lasting peace in the Middle East region can be attained only by means of joint and global action, without exclusions and omissions, within the framework of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which established Israel's right to exist with internationally recognized boundaries and recognized the rights of the Palestinian people.

122. We shall support whatever selection the President makes. And, although the resolution does not explicitly say so, we believe that the appointment of the commission of inquiry consisting of three members, within the consultations provided for in paragraph 4, will follow established practice; that is to say, the investigating group will be made up of representatives of various geographical regions, legal systems and religious creeds which coexist and complement each other within the Organization.

123. As regards the status of Jerusalem and the work of the proposed commission, Bolivia fully endorses the position of the Holy See that the Holy City should be given a "special status". For the same reason, my delegation supports and endorses the statement made by His Holiness Pope John Paul II who, according to press reports a week ago, expressed the hope that the city of Jerusalem would obtain sufficient guarantees to become a centre for harmony among the adherents of the three major monotheistic religions: Judaism, Islam and Christianity. Bolivia is also in favour of the preservation and safeguarding of the urban and historical complex of the Holy City.

124. My delegation had formal reservations on the text of the resolution that we have just adopted, the essential objective of which is the commission provided for in paragraph 4 and which therefore rendered unnecessary the tortuous repetition of accusations and condemnations.

125. Once again principles prevail over form. My delegation voted in favour of those principles.

126. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): My delegation has abstained on the resolution which has been adopted by the Security Council. Its content generally accords with the frequently stated position of the United States on settlements in the occupied territories. However, I must be frank in saying that there are certain elements of the resolution and certain aspects of the debate in this body which are disturbing to us.

127. First, I must point out that the confrontational debate which we have witnessed over the past week has done little to serve the cause of peace. In our view, the often intemperate and unwarranted language used by many members to criticize Israel has only tended to distract, to disrupt and to complicate the peace talks and the search for a just solution to the issue of settlements in the occupied territories. It has been a matter of particular concern to us that this should have been done when the peace talks were at such a critical stage. It is clear that some who have participated in these meetings were in fact less interested in promoting peace than they profess to be, and I must also note that derogatory references to American Jewish groups and citizens are insulting, unwarranted and resented.

128. I have to note in particular a number of references by speakers here to the Nazis and to nazism. One or another contemporary situation has been repeatedly described here as a form of nazism, as being analogous to the crimes of the Nazi period. These references serve no useful purpose whatsoever. They amount to a provocative and harmful form of name-calling. Those who are accused of nazism and who are, of course, conscious of the enormous differences between their own historical situation and the situation in Germany some 40 years ago, are led to a justified anger at this false and slanderous parallel, and those so slandered are led, unfortunately all too often, to retaliation in kind, with another slanderous parallel—which can only make more difficult the already difficult path to peace. I can only appeal for an end to this sort of harmful, indeed poisonous, rhetoric.

129. I must also point out that my Government has grave doubts about the utility of the creation of a Security Council commission to examine the situation regarding the settlements in the occupied territories. Now that Egypt and Israel have made a first important move towards a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East, we believe it is incumbent on the Council not to inject irritants into this process.

130. The position of my Government on the issue of settlements in the occupied territories is well known. As has been stated on a number of occasions at the United Nations and elsewhere, we are opposed to these settlements. We are opposed because we believe they could be perceived as prejudging the outcome of negotiations, and further be

cause we believe they are inconsistent with the fourth Geneva Convention and international law.

131. Clearly, the settlements question is a serious issue. It is worthy of sober and constructive efforts to find a solution. We are convinced that it must be dealt with as a part of the effort to develop a just, durable and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Moreover, we are convinced that it will be dealt with. As we move beyond the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty into negotiations for a comprehensive peace, the parties—joined by the United States—will be dealing with the question of settlements as well as with other issues involving the West Bank and Gaza, and with the Palestinian problem in its various dimensions. It is of utmost importance that the fact-finding commission created by this resolution not complicate and not impede the negotiations among the parties.

132. This tragic conflict in all its agonizing complexity has occupied the attention of the Security Council and the world virtually since the foundation of the United Nations. After four wars, countless deaths and innumerable brave and well-intentioned efforts to find a just and lasting peace, it has been the process begun last September at Camp David which has provided the first—and to this point the only—practical means of achieving the legitimate goals of all the parties.

133. Built upon the foundation of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), the peace negotiations now under way exclude no one, and no issue. They invite and encourage the full participation of all those—including the Palestinians—who accept as the object of these negotiations security, recognition and peace among neighbours. The accords developed in these negotiations lay out in detail principles and procedures to govern negotiations on the full range of issues within the Arab-Israeli conflict.

134. The process begun with the Camp David accords is an arduous one, however—one which has required enormous courage and dedication. Even as this debate began, President Carter was in the Middle East making a maximum personal effort to help the parties through a particularly difficult phase. And as we speak here today, representatives of the parties are discussing the last elements of the work begun so many months ago. This will lead to the signing of a peace-treaty between Egypt and Israel, a treaty which is a triumph of the principles on which the Organization is based. The process of negotiation which will follow from this historic event clearly offers the best opportunity for the just resolution of the issue to which we have addressed ourselves in this chamber over the past week or more. It is clear that the peace treaty represents only the beginning of that process, but it is equally clear that when the present work of the parties is completed, the world will have been brought significantly closer to a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. It is our profound belief that this development will one day lead to the fulfillment of the hopes and legitimate aspirations of all the parties. President Carter, at Cairo, committed himself personally to negotiations concerning the West Bank and Gaza and other issues of concern to the Palestinians, and he urged Palestinian participation.

135. It is difficult to believe that anyone, having witnessed the immense effort it has taken to bring the talks to this point, would wish to undermine what has been so far achieved and jeopardize the future of the process. As President Carter said a few days ago: let no one be deceived. Those who attempt to obstruct the current effort are opposing the only effort that can bring peace to the Middle East. The effect of their sloganeering and rhetoric is to make them in effect the advocates of the *status quo*, not advocates of change; advocates of war, not advocates of peace; advocates of further suffering, not advocates of achieving the human dignity to which long-suffering people of the region are entitled.

136. The United States remains fully committed to finding a just, lasting and comprehensive peace which must include a resolution of the Palestinian problem. This is the peace to which the Charter binds all of us. We call upon our fellow members to lend their full and unselfish support, singly and in concert, to those now engaged in this crucial search, and to avoid actions which needlessly make this search more arduous and more perilous.

137. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation considers that the discussion which has taken place in the Security Council on the question of the illegal actions by Israel in the occupied Arab territories has been extremely important and very timely. This discussion has shown quite obviously that the policies pursued by Israel and the practices in which it has indulged in exploiting the occupied Arab territories are a blatant violation of international agreements and of numerous United Nations resolutions. Israel's actions are aimed directly at depriving the Arab people of Palestine of its ancestral lands and, consequently, are aimed at precluding the possibility of solving the Palestine problem and, in fact, have led to undermining a comprehensive Middle East settlement.

138. The discussion has revealed the direct link between the annexationist policies of Israel in the occupied Arab territories and the separate agreement drawn up between Egypt and Israel with the assistance of the United States of America. As many speakers have mentioned, the so-called administrative autonomy that is envisaged for the West Bank and Gaza in accordance with this separate deal is simply a formal embodiment of Israel's plan to consolidate its position in the territories it has seized and would be tantamount to depriving the Arab people of Palestine of these legitimate national rights, including their right to self-determination and all other rights, including the possibility of creating their own independent State. The conclusion of a separate peace treaty between Egypt and Israel will thus be an obstacle to the achievement of a comprehensive and just settlement in the interests of all the peoples of the Middle East and to the establishment of a durable peace for all the States of the area.

139. We entirely agree with the opinion expressed here that this treatment is capitulation to Israel, particularly regarding the vital rights of the Arab people of Palestine and the interests of the Arab world as a whole. No attempts to depict what is black as white and to represent this separate

Egypt-Israel deal as a step on the path to a comprehensive settlement can mislead those who genuinely cherish the cause of the Arab peoples and the cause of peace in the Middle East.

140. Such attempts are undertaken, in particular, in a letter of 19 March from the Prime Minister of Egypt to the Secretary-General.<sup>7</sup> It asserts that the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty will lead to the gradual establishment of Palestinian authority on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. However, we could say that that assertion held true for only one day. On 20 March, speaking in the Israeli Parliament, the Prime Minister of Israel categorically refuted that interpretation of the Egyptian-Israeli agreement. On the question of what was to happen to the territories that had been occupied by Israel, the head of the Israeli Government unambiguously stated that Israel would "never return to the pre-1967 boundaries" and that united Jerusalem was the capital of Israel and would be so in perpetuity and would never be divided again. He also said that in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza there would never ever be a Palestinian State. Even more eloquent was the clarification given by the Israeli leader as to exactly what was meant by Palestinian self-rule, or, as he had put it, "autonomy not for the territories but for the inhabitants thereof". If we compare this statement with the actions of Israel in expelling the Arab inhabitants from their age-old homeland, actions that have been so eloquently described to the Council, it becomes completely obvious that the separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty is simply a further step taken by Israel completely to deprive the Arab people of Palestine of the lands which belong to them and to absorb those territories into Israel.

141. There is an urgent need to reject these plans of Israel, which run counter to the vital interests of the Arab peoples and represent a direct threat to international peace and security.

142. The Soviet delegation supported the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of Bangladesh, Zambia, Kuwait and Nigeria since we believe it is along the right lines. However, we believe that in its final form the text is not fully consonant with the demands that such a serious and dangerous situation makes of the Security Council in the situation that has arisen in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. In particular, as we see it, the condemnation of the policies and practices of the Israeli authorities and the way in which they have colonized and acquired the territory should have been much more bold and forthright since this policy and these practices are aimed directly at consolidating Israel's ownership of the occupied territories and is in the final analysis aimed at their annexation. Israel should have been faced with a more decisive demand that it put an end to those practices and abide by the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

143. The Soviet delegation considers that it is time for the Security Council to take a more determined position in connexion with Israel's failure to carry out the resolutions of the Security Council and to consider also the question of applying to Israel those sanctions that are laid down in Chapter VII of the Charter. It is quite obvious that the time

is now ripe to undertake these steps in order to make Israel understand once and for all that the decisions of the United Nations, including the provisions of the resolution that we have just adopted, must be implemented.

144. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, upon whom I now call.

145. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): May I express the most profound gratitude of my Government and people for the deep concern and the moral and humane understanding, not to mention the selfless support, that has been accorded our beleaguered and oppressed people in their darkest hour. A friend in need is a friend indeed.

146. It would be gratuitous on my part to say from my heart "thank you very much" to the Member States that voted affirmatively on the draft resolution presented by Bangladesh and Kuwait and co-sponsored by Nigeria and Zambia. It is, after all, a concrete expression of their abiding faith in decency, in the Charter, in genuine human rights, and in the repudiation of illegality and usurpation.

147. It was more in sadness than in disenchantment that I watched three votes of abstention being cast by Member States whose image of concern for the fate of human individuals, let alone of a whole people of men, women and children, has now been compromised in a context of ambivalence amounting to indifference. There is a limit below which indifference on clear-cut basic human issues that affect the survival of a whole people can degenerate into callous acquiescence. But our people are grateful all the same to know each country's concern for their existence and for the much-vaunted term "human rights".

148. And I ask in all sincerity—explanations and soothing words notwithstanding—what has prompted votes of abstention on a draft resolution which merely reiterates previous resolutions, stating that all Israeli measures are null and void and should be rescinded, and requests the dispatch of a Security Council commission to the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories to examine the situation and the plight of the people on the spot? Members know of the old remark about neutrality: "Neutral on whose side?"

149. A people that has been in captivity for 11 years, a people whose only encounter has been with ruthless military governors and their vile deeds, deserves, I should have thought, that their voice at least be heard so that they may be given a moral uplift by seeing that the world, represented by the Security Council, has not altogether forgotten them or dumped them and left them to the merciless crimes of their oppressors.

150. Speaking before the Knesset on 20 March—the day before yesterday—Begin unravelled, in crystal-clear terms, how Israel views the occupied territories and the Israeli designs for swallowing them up—which is really the subject of our complaint—the swallowing up of the occupied territories. Begin said—and I challenge the representative of Israel to refute him:

First, "Israel will never return to the pre-1967 lines";

<sup>7</sup> A/34/124.

Secondly, replying to the Prime Minister of Egypt as though Mr. Mustafa Khalil were present there, he said: "Mark my words, united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel";

Thirdly, in what Begin termed "Judaea, Samaria and Gaza", "there will never be a Palestinian State". Referring to Palestinian self-rule, Begin said—and I quote verbatim: "We never agreed to autonomy for the territories, but only for the inhabitants." Of course, the inhabitants, over the next 10 years, will all be dead—by attrition or of old age.

151. Even Shimon Peres, the Labour Party opposition leader, who has his own plans for the annexation of large portions of the West Bank—you are all familiar with the Allon Plan—took exception to Begin's autonomy plan as being ridiculous. Peres said:

"Realistically, I cannot see how you can separate self-government from a territory. Can you really distinguish between a man and his house, a farmer and his field? It is impossible!"

152. It is our clear understanding that for the Security Council commission to examine and ascertain the substance of the Jordanian complaint, it should do so on the spot and see for itself the authenticity of our complaint, including interviews with the aggrieved people whose lands and resources have been stolen. Just in case Israel refuses the commission permission to visit Jerusalem and other occupied territories, it is our understanding that the commission will visit Amman, Beirut, Damascus, Cairo, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and whatever other country it chooses at its discretion; it will also interview United States citizens of Palestinian extraction or who hail from those territories, and whose lands have also been confiscated, as I mentioned in one of my earlier statements. Not only will the commission find complete facts, figures and documentation: it will also find available many of the people who have been victims of Israeli despoliation and who will be ready and willing to give incontrovertible evidence on what is taking place in the occupied territories.

153. Looking at the turning point, and watching the fateful historical panorama of unfolding tragedy, more visible than ever before, I do so in a confluence of very deep mixed emotions and reflections. The Palestinian people have made untold sacrifices, generation after generation, to safeguard and preserve their treasured legacy in their ancestral homeland. They have had their ups and downs, facing adversities over thousands of years in a hallowed land too precious and too interwoven into their very fabric to be foresaken. At this time, it looks as though the forces of evil have ganged up on them to secure their banishment. The odds against them are formidable, and the Palestinians may well be destined for further immeasurable suffering, as were their forefathers in the past. It may well be that adversity will have a temporary gain, but our people will never abandon the just struggle which the Charter has sanctified as an imperative act of self-defence, with the assistance of their brethren and all peace-loving peoples all over the world.

154. It could be that their calculations of friend and foe, at various centres in the world, have been faulty and naively

trusting. The area of commonality to which they belong, and which has strategic resources and potentialities that can hardly be overestimated in human and material terms, has not as yet been even partially assembled in the just struggle for their spiritual fountainhead, Jerusalem and the Holy Land, which is deserving of total dedication and concrete, genuine effort at rescue and redemption.

155. But permit me to quote a message from our great prophet Mohammed to his compatriots in the aftermath of overwhelming his adversaries in a military conflict in the Arabian peninsula. He said: "We have just emerged from the small struggle into the real and larger struggle—the struggle of the soul".

156. More than ever before, we are convinced that money, military gadgets and other possessions are barren if unutilized or underutilized. The quicker our nations recover their souls and their mission, the nearer will be the day of salvation. The other tools and techniques will follow by corollary as night follows day.

157. I do not blame those who have brought about our destruction, for they are responding to situations and opportunities as they assess them, in a world whose real criterion is, lamentably, *realpolitik* and not justice. Indeed, we have been striving for the past 11 years to achieve a just, equitable, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East, but to no avail. Weakness and subservience are invariably despised, foremost of all by those who stand to profit most from them.

158. It is our mission in the foreseeable future to recover our souls. And once we do, we can be more than equal to the challenge. In the meantime, it is a waste of effort and energy to apportion blame or praise, because we realize that human nature and frailty cannot be changed overnight, although in certain traumatic situations, such as the one we are facing today, it could very well happen.

159. I need hardly stress Jordan's abiding and profound concern for and commitment to its twin brothers and sisters and kin in the Holy Land. No force on earth can undermine this eternal commitment.

160. What next? The masses of our great area of civilization will be pondering, and very profoundly, what to do next. Here at the United Nations, which is not the preserve of a handful of States, no matter how mighty, we can continue our efforts tenaciously and persistently. It may well be that the time has come for the world community to take a very grave view towards a Member whose behaviour has consistently been defiant and in undisguised violation of everything that the United Nations stands for.

161. As I have so often reiterated, Israel is not above the law—we are all equal before the law—except in its own perverted perception. A recalcitrant and consistently defiant Member must not be given the right to continued membership of a world Organization whose rules of the game are the Charter and not the law of the jungle. South Africa has been taught this lesson.

162. Before I conclude, my conscience compels me to read to the members of the Council from a letter from a young lady Palestinian prisoner sent out from the Ramleh prison—it arrived on my desk just this afternoon—and bearing the heading in Hebrew of the Directorate-General of Prisons. Her name is Mariam Al-Shakhshir. The letter reads:

“I wish to bring the following facts to your attention. We have three fellow female prisoners here who have been sentenced to life imprisonment. They have already spent ten years in prison and are seriously ill. One of them, Aysha Oda, suffers from heart disease, gastric ulcers, pains in the kidneys, headaches, rheumatism and other diseases. The second one, Ayda Saad, suffers from pneumonia and her sputum is mixed with blood. The third is Afifah Bannoura, who suffers from rheumatism which has affected her heart and the small arteries in her legs.

“As the continuation of this situation means death for these three fellow prisoners. I beg you to save them. We are all hopeful that you will take speedy and ample steps in this regard.”<sup>8</sup>

163. I do make an appeal on behalf of those three girls. This is a random example of the so-called “only democracy in the Middle East”, as the media tell us every day. Perhaps the Red Cross or some other humane organization would take action without delay to save three girls from their chronic agony, and there are many others who also are afflicted with chronic diseases but who are yet kept in gaol.

164. In conclusion, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for your patience, which I might have taxed on some occasions, and to express my appreciation of the exemplary manner in which you have conducted and presided over our deliberations.

165. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

166. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The resolution which has just been adopted is the product of many factors—the design of Jordan and its allies to sow obstacles on the only realistic and promising road to peace between Israel and its neighbours; the one-sided and biased positions of certain States, based on deliberately distorted data and on malicious interpretations; and the political interests of certain members of the Council, extraneous to the matter here under consideration.

167. Had the Council been prepared to address itself earnestly to the fundamental causes of the situation in an impartial and balanced manner, as is its duty under the Charter, it would have long ago taken due note of the aims and actions of Arab States during 30 years of the Arab-Israeli conflict and now in particular of the bellicose designs directed against Israel from Baghdad, Damascus and, recently, also from Amman. These designs are translated on the ground into attempts at subversion as well as into acts of terror perpetrated by the so-called PLO and, in the international

arena, into the manipulation of the United Nations. Any step taken by the Council that ignores these fundamental and overriding aspects of the conflict will be used as yet another political weapon, supplementing the other means at the disposal of the anti-peace forces in the Arab world and beyond.

168. In the course of this debate we set out our position fully and provided the Council with all the pertinent details and data. We also refuted one by one the empty charges made against Israel in this debate, all this to no avail.

169. This debate and the resolution just adopted by the Council on the eve of the signing of the Israel-Egyptian peace treaty constitute yet another attempt to disrupt the peace process in the Middle East and to substitute confrontation tactics for a negotiated peace in the region.

170. Israel has had a thoroughly disillusioning experience as the result of tendentious investigation by purportedly fact-finding commissions established by the United Nations. Most of them were constituted with a view to underwriting predetermined and hostile conclusions. This approach has been adopted once again in the present case. Thus, the matters that will supposedly form the subject of investigation are already prejudged and disposed of in the present resolution.

171. We cannot be oblivious to the sobering experience of Israel with regard to various fact-finding commissions of this kind. Having been solemnly assured that such commissions would apply an impartial approach, the Government of Israel facilitated their work in all respects. But when their findings and conclusions were not palatable to our detractors, they crushed those findings by using the steam-roller, sustained by their arithmetic majority. They thus were able to ignore cynically and to reject arbitrarily any finding containing a modicum of objectivity. What is more, they perverted the fact-finding machinery for their own ends.

172. The unbalanced and tendentious manner in which the Council has dealt with the over-all issues of the Arab-Israeli conflict, as confirmed yet again in the present debate and its ensuing resolution as well as the experiences to which I have alluded, inevitably affect Israel's attitude towards this resolution. For all these reasons, Israel rejects this resolution in its entirety and will treat it accordingly.

173. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization in exercise of the right of reply.

174. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I shall quote the sentence we have heard here: “This debate went by unnoticed” [2131st meeting, para. 99]. This is the 8th meeting, and representatives of more than 40 Member States have participated in this debate. Yet clearly, in the opinion of the Zionist racists, these Members simply do not count. Not one of them, with the exception of Israel itself, defended or even attempted to justify the atrocities committed by the illegal forces of occupation. If the representative of the neo-Fascists in Tel Aviv simply ignores those who participated and the opinions they expressed as well as their

<sup>8</sup> Subsequently circulated as document S/13207.

concern, I am not surprised because such is the Fascist mentality—why bother? Who cares?—complete disregard in addition to disrespect and contempt.

175. It is really ironic that someone here calls for “an atmosphere of moral, political and intellectual integrity” so that the Security Council can “regain some of its resonance”. That statement was made while Israeli forces of occupation were murdering in cold blood students peacefully demonstrating against yet another and more flagrant violation of their inalienable rights.

176. I shall not elaborate on the theme of intellectual integrity, for those who gloat and praise the virtues of benign colonialism are not worthy to appear before the Organization, especially when it—and I am referring to the Organization—was established, among other things, to eradicate the painful memories of the Nazi criminals. In the Charter we find that the Organization was established “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small”.

177. Those who receive billions of dollars' worth of arms and war *matériel* should be the last to speak of intellectual integrity and morals. Not only should the perpetrators of crimes be condemned but the accessories who supply them should also be condemned.

178. It is clear that the representative of the racist junta at Tel Aviv is not aware of decisions of the General Assembly affirming that the root cause of the conflict in the Middle East is the question of Palestine, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the continued denial of the national rights, including the right to self-determination and the right to sovereignty and independence in their homeland, Palestine. He tried to impress by saying that the root cause is the Arab refusal to recognize Israel's right to exist. I wonder. I shall quote here from an interview with Nahum Goldmann who narrates:

“I was sitting once with Ben Gurion until three in the morning. It was about 12.30. We were sitting in the kitchen. We had a heart-to-heart talk. He said:

“‘Why should the Arabs make peace with us? Are they crazy? If I were an Arab would I accept Israel? They have stolen our country. What? God promised us? What has that to do with the Arabs? What? Is it their business? Hitler? What is their responsibility? We came and stole their country. Why should they make peace?’”

I am quoting from what Ben Gurion was telling the President of the World Zionist Organization, Nahum Goldmann, and that was in the wee hours of the morning when no one was listening. But when they address the Security Council they brag about peace. I am sure you know who Ben Gurion is. For 50 years he led the Zionist movement and he was the man who made this infamous assertion in the introduction to the Israel Government *Yearbook*. He says that the State of Israel “has been established in only a portion of the land of Israel”. I believe that is a good explanation by Ben Gurion himself of why the Arabs do not

and could not recognize this Israel that had stolen our country.

179. The Council has just adopted a resolution. I am grateful to those who supported the resolution but if I may be permitted to express an opinion on the resolution I would say that this resolution is in no way a consolation to the Palestinian people. It avoided the issue, namely the prolonged illegal occupation and the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. It addressed itself to only one manifestation of neo-colonialism, namely settlements.

180. Concerning benign colonialism, the so-called “paradise” in the occupied territories, I shall refrain from commenting with the hope that the commission the Council has just decided to establish—which I understand now will be refused entry into the occupied territories—will report to the Council in due time after having visited the occupied territories and after having talked to the Palestinians in Jerusalem, in Nablus, in Hebron and in Jericho. I as a Palestinian say that the commission is welcome to come to Jerusalem. Jerusalem is an illegally occupied territory so it is within your powers to see to it that the commission goes into this illegally occupied territory and they are welcome to share the so-called “paradise”. We are certain that the commission will walk the Via Dolorosa, the Way of the Cross, that they will walk it in person with the hope of the redemption of my people. I am sure that God will grant guidance to the members of the commission when they compare notes of their findings in the Garden of Gethsemane because that will be the hour of agony. To share their agony with fellow humans is a Christian virtue and a task.

181. Yes, settlements are just one manifestation of the aims of the Zionist movement and the Council is really empowered by the Charter to deal with the root cause. We have no reason to doubt the effectiveness of the United Nations and the Council, but we are afraid of a tendency that has just appeared to give a so-called chance for a different approach, because such an approach is only a gamble and the chips are not only the almost 4 million Palestinians but also peace and security.

182. There is a process of sedating, let us say of drugging by false hopes, a process erroneously called peace efforts. In actual fact what is happening is that there is a stockpiling of arms and war *matériel* in preparation for a yet more devastating war. The United States is granting billions of dollars' worth of war *matériel*—some say \$5 billion and others say \$19 billion. The amount is irrelevant, but they are supplying those arms and this is no indication of peaceful intentions. Or, are we really approaching a new, infamous Munich, a sell-out, a partial satisfaction of the insatiable greed of the Zionist racists? While some rejoice and talk about negotiations, Begin has made it very clear—and I am afraid I will have to repeat what Begin said:

“Israel will never return to the borders of 1967. Neither will she allow the one and unified Jerusalem to be divided or for a Palestinian State to be established on her borders. The only autonomy that will be established is the autonomy which applies to the residents of those

lands, not the lands themselves. What I am saying does not belong to politics. What I am saying is our very life and existence. No force in the world could make Israel retreat on those issues."

183. Of course, we are told that these outstanding issues will be resolved through negotiations—a new drug called "negotiations". Somebody may really doubt the integrity of what Begin said, but let me read a quotation. On 21 March Agence France Presse carried the following:

"The next stage of the Israeli-Egyptian discussions on peace in the Middle East will be difficult, indicated Wednesday at NATO headquarters in Brussels the Under-Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Warren Christopher. Mr. Christopher thought that the interpretation of the Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, of the proceedings of the Knesset on Tuesday was not in contradiction with the actual text of the Egyptian-Israeli treaty."<sup>9</sup>

184. Well, it really is not in contradiction, because they told us that all these issues—the future of Jerusalem, the future of autonomy, the future of 4 million Palestinians—are, according to them, apparently not important for the peace process. What is important is that all this will somehow be resolved during the negotiations.

185. But we do know what Begin and the Israeli Government mean by "negotiation". We know what Begin meant when he said in a statement in November 1978:

"We left no doubt and we stated that after the five-year transition period, when the question of sovereignty comes up for decision, we shall assert our right to sovereignty over Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. If an agreement is reached against the background of counter-claims,

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

very well. If no agreement is arrived at, the result will be that the autonomy arrangements of Israel's security will continue to remain in force."

186. Again, I repeat that negotiation is just another drug. It does not solve and will not solve the question, because Begin has made it clear. He is not fooling or deceiving anyone. He is just making it very clear that he intends to stay there and keep on negotiating eternally. Well, I do not think that we shall allow him to do that, because we are determined to bring this situation to an end.

187. We have heard here the representative of the United States say that peace must include a resolution of the Palestinian problem. I am very glad that the United States also agrees with us that, without the resolution of the question of Palestine, there will be no peace. Their way of going about it is where we disagree with them, and we reject their method. Apparently, they are oblivious to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly at the last session, which declared that:

"... the validity of agreements purporting to solve the problem of Palestine requires that they be within the framework of the United Nations and its Charter and its resolutions on the basis of the full attainment and exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, and with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization" [resolution 33/28 A].

188. If the United States is not aware of that resolution, I wish to call their attention to it, because that is the road to peace, not bilateral agreements with the drug called "negotiations".

*The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.*