

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

LIBRARY

OCT 2 1980

UN/DA COLLECTION

2204th MEETING: 31 MARCH 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2204)	1
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Ton Duc Thang, President of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights: Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832); Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)	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.

2204th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 31 March 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Donald O. MILLS (Jamaica).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2204)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);

Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

The meeting was called to order at 11.55 a.m.

**Tribute to the memory of Mr. Ton Duc Thang,
President of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam**

1. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the members of the Council that word has been received this morning of the death of the President of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Mr. Ton Duc Thang. On this occasion, I wish to express our profound condolences to the Government and people of Viet Nam on their great loss.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);

Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Jordan and Lebanon in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) and Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 27 March from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that I be allowed to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item 'The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights', in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People."

On previous occasions, the Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council should accede to that request.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kane (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: I have also received a letter dated 28 March, from the Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that I be allowed to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item 'The question of the exercise by

the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights', in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, in my capacity as Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People."

In accordance with past practice in this regard, I propose that the Council should accede to that request.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gauci (Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) took a place at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 27 March from the representative of Tunisia [S/13865] which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

The proposal of the representative of Tunisia is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the Council, that invitation would confer upon the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State under rule 37. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

6. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): As recently as 22 February [2199th meeting], the United States stated in the Council that it had no objection to the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the debate before the Council. At the same time, the United States also stated, as it has consistently stated in the past, that the legal basis for the Council to invite the PLO to participate is rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. We do not believe that such an invitation can properly be formulated in terms that suggest that the Palestine Liberation Organization be given procedural rights that would accrue to a State Member that wished to participate in the work of the Council. For these reasons, the United States will vote against the proposed invitation.

7. The PRESIDENT: If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of Tunisia.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, China, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Philippines, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

8. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 31 March from the representative of Tunisia [S/13867] which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights', in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to accede to that request.

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the letter dated 6 March from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council and circulated in document S/13832 and the letter dated 24 March from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council contained in document S/13855.

10. The members of the Council also have before them document S/13715, which contains the text of a note by the Secretary-General dated 30 December 1979, by which he drew the attention of the Council to General Assembly resolution 34/65 A.

11. The first speaker is the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Falilou Kane. I now call on him.

12. Mr. KANE (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, allow me, as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and also on my own behalf, to address to you our warmest congratulations on your accession to the presidency of this distinguished organ. This is a tribute which has been paid to your country, Jamaica,

which has always evinced deep devotion to our Organization's ideals of peace and justice, as well as to the principles of the non-aligned movement, in which it has won the deepest respect.

13. I am grateful to the members of the Council for having acceded to our request for an urgent meeting, pursuant to my letter which appears in document S/13855. On behalf of the Committee, I should like to thank them very sincerely.

14. Since 1976 the report of the Committee¹ has been before the Council. Its contents and its recommendations were presented to the Council by my predecessor. I shall therefore not repeat what has already been said. However, I should like to recall that all those recommendations are based on previous resolutions of the Council and of the General Assembly. Moreover, the recommendations are based essentially on certain fundamental principles, namely: the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to national sovereignty and to return to its homeland, and the inadmissibility of the annexation of Palestinian territories, which have been occupied by Israel since 1967. Finally, these recommendations make specific proposals, on the basis of these resolutions and basic principles, for ways and means of resolving what is generally termed the Palestinian problem.

15. The members of the Council will undoubtedly recall that in resolution 31/20 the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee. In the same resolution, the General Assembly requested the Security Council to consider the recommendations contained in the Committee's report so that the necessary steps could be taken to implement them. Such steps were to achieve early progress towards a solution of the problem of Palestine and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is pursuant to this mandate of the Assembly, which was renewed in resolutions 32/40 A, 33/28 A and 34/65 A, that the Committee called upon the Council to resume, before 31 March 1980, its consideration of the recommendations of the Assembly on Palestine for the purpose of taking a decision on them.

16. The Council has in fact dealt with this matter on two occasions, but no decision was taken. In October 1977, and in June and August 1979, an important member of the Council requested that a decision be deferred because of the negotiations under way at that time on the Middle East problem. On both those occasions, the Committee, wishing to demonstrate its goodwill and its desire to do everything to promote the restoration of peace in the Middle East, agreed to a suspension of the debate. At the same time, however, it made it abundantly clear that it would not accept a postponement *sine die* by the Council of a discussion of the question of Palestine, and that the time for reflection that had been granted should be used by the members concerned to present positive

proposals to promote recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people.

17. What in fact occurred? Unfortunately, the Committee must note today that its patience and goodwill have not been rewarded. It seems that certain members, which continually request that the Council should defer a decision, are simply trying to delay the taking of a decision as much as possible and thus to prevent the Council from acting—for reasons we find it difficult to discern.

18. The General Assembly has on several occasions in the past deplored the Council's immobility in connection with the important, indeed urgent, problem of Palestine. In its resolution 34/65 A it

"Once again urges the Security Council to consider and take as soon as possible a decision on the recommendations endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolutions 31/20, 32/40 A and 33/28 A and in the present resolution".

In the same resolution the Assembly authorized and requested the Committee

"in the event of the Security Council failing to consider or to take a decision on those recommendations by 31 March 1980, to consider that situation and to make the suggestions it deems appropriate".

19. The General Assembly resolutions, as well as recent developments in the occupied Arab territories, show that it is necessary, urgent and timely for the Council to take a speedy decision on the Assembly's recommendations. Indeed, recently the Israeli Cabinet authorized the establishment of Israeli settlements in the very heart of the Arab town of Al-Khalil, which is situated in the territories illegally occupied by Israel since 1967. That decision, which is part and parcel of a series of similar measures taken by the Israeli authorities, is a further step in Israel's policy of *faits accomplis*—a policy which, as is known, is contrary to the rules of international law and to the resolutions of the United Nations. On 25 February, on the instructions of the Committee, I had an opportunity to speak at some length on this question [2200th meeting].

20. The Members of the Council still have fresh in their memories resolution 465 (1980), which they adopted unanimously on 1 March. The Committee cannot but welcome a unanimous decision by the Council making it clear that all measures taken by Israel to change, *inter alia*, the demographic composition and the status of Arab and Palestinian territories illegally occupied since 1967 have no legal validity. In that resolution, the Security Council called upon Israel to dismantle the existing settlements and in particular to cease on an urgent basis the establishment of new settlements in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. At the same time, the Council strongly deplored the Government of Israel's policy of estab-

lishing settlements and described it as a serious obstruction to the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

21. The patent scorn of the Israeli Government for the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and for world public opinion cannot be more clearly demonstrated than by the provocative decisions to expropriate vast tracts of Arab land around Jerusalem and other cities in order to establish new settlements—only a scant few days after the adoption of resolution 465 (1980).

22. Only a few days ago, Israel, pursuing its policy of defiance of our Organization, decided to open two so-called schools in Al-Khalil. That attempt to establish new settlements in the occupied territories, under the guise of educational institutions, proves—if proof were needed—that the Israeli authorities still have no intention of abandoning their plans to annex the occupied Arab territories and the Holy City of Jerusalem.

23. Such practices and such an attitude should induce the Council to act swiftly and to recognize the right of the Palestinian People to self-determination and its right to establish an independent and sovereign State in Palestine. Indeed, the more time passes, the more opportunities Israel has to present the world with further *faits accomplis* and to make it more difficult to progress towards peace.

24. Quite obviously, the Council's failure to act can only encourage Israel to persist in its delinquency. It is, however, heartening today to note that authoritative voices have been heard quite recently—particularly that of President Giscard d'Estaing during a visit to the Arab peninsula—in favour of the recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, as well as its right to have its legitimate representatives participate in any negotiation to determine its future; and, since then, some European countries have taken that position. That means that today the vast majority of the members of the Council are—to a greater or lesser degree, it must be said—in favour of recognizing the rights claimed by the Palestinian people. That is an important and significant fact which, as time passes, will become more and more crystallized, because injustice cannot go on for ever. We who come from peoples that used to be under the colonial yoke have experienced this ourselves.

25. A certain permanent member, however, is still using the excuse of not wishing to interfere with the negotiations going on outside this body on the problem of the Middle East. That hardly seems to us a convincing argument. Indeed, it is the Committee's opinion that recognition by the Council of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people cannot but be a positive contribution to any discussion aimed at finding a just, lasting and comprehensive solution

to the Middle East problem. Since the problem of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East conflict, it would appear to us to be unrealistic to seek to solve it in a way that ignored the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian peoples, wherever they may be. That is why the Committee believes that there is still time for the Israeli leaders to face the facts by recognizing the national rights of the Palestinian people and entering into talks with its representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

26. Name-calling and mud-slinging are no longer appropriate today. The fact of Palestine is a reality, since it has been recognized by more than 110 States. It is in Israel's own interest to bear that in mind, if it does not wish to find itself in the absurd, indeed ridiculous, situation of someone who seeks to stem the tide with his bare hands.

27. Israel's security depends on the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of its Arab neighbours. What is occurring in Lebanon is precisely an extension of the Palestinian conflict, obviously stirred up by Israel. Genuine peace will be possible only if the rights of all the parties concerned, including the Palestinians, are respected.

28. The Committee has been greatly encouraged in its endeavours by the success which has been won by the Palestinian cause throughout the world since less than a year ago. The countries of the European Economic Community, as far as they are concerned, had already accepted this fact, as members may recall, during the general debate at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. They have just reaffirmed this through their most authoritative spokesmen. During the most recent Summit Conference of the non-aligned countries, which was held in Havana, the cause of the Palestinian people received the firm support of more than 90 countries. Recently, other European countries have declared themselves on the subject of the rights of the Palestinian people. Such developments are striking proof of the broad consensus which is gradually emerging within the international community on the need to take account of the national rights of the Palestinian people in any peace effort in this part of the world.

29. The Committee can only be pleased at this change in the attitude on the part of the European Governments with respect to the Palestine question. We venture to hope that the representatives of those countries, as well as other countries, will henceforth adopt a more positive attitude to the Committee's recommendations and suggestions regarding the ways and means for promoting the return of peace to the Middle East.

30. It has always been the aim of the Committee to take account of all opinions when it formulates its recommendations and suggestions. Its door has always been open to all Member States, including Israel.

Unfortunately, it has been faced with the boycott tactics of Israel and its protectors. Today, however, it is becoming increasingly obvious that it is not because the Committee suffers from a congenital bias that Israel preaches boycott. The truth is quite simply that Israel seeks to prevent the United Nations from shedding light on its annexationist and expansionist policies and its violations of human rights.

31. Is it conceivable at the end of the twentieth century—at a time when there are discussions everywhere of the new international order which should govern relations between States in the spheres of politics, economics, culture and information—that a State, a single State, Israel, continues to hold fast to unrepenting fanaticism and blind absolutism? “This self-assured and dominating people”—that was how General de Gaulle described it in 1967 and he could hardly have been a better prophet. Does that country believe itself to be the only one that is right among all the other countries in the international community, among all the members of the Security Council, in the whole of this Organization? We wonder. Its leaders would do well to think about this situation and also about certain events which it would be useful to recall: the blindness of certain leaders brought the world to the brink of a conflagration when, in Viet Nam, the legitimate aspirations of a people were not respected. At that time, all the cosmetic solutions which were attempted collapsed like a house of cards and Viet Nam freed itself and reunified itself. For several decades, the great country of China, the most populous country in the world, found itself refused admission to the United Nations, again because of the narrow and unrealistic stance of those same leaders.

32. Remember what was said at this table by an eminent representative, no longer one of us, when he left his post. I refer to Mr. Andrew Young. If it is true that good sense is the quality most evenly distributed throughout the world, a lesson should be learned from those two instances and it should be admitted that the Palestinian people should not be treated as a people that has not yet come of age, that exists to be dominated, mistreated and occupied, while in Africa, Latin America, Asia and elsewhere, other peoples have freed themselves from colonization and foreign occupation.

33. During this debate we shall again hear the offensive language of the representative of Israel. We know that, as he did while the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories was under consideration, he will indulge in personal attacks on the representatives of countries who intend to participate in this debate in a manner which he does not like. Apparently, if he has no arguments, he can do nothing but engage in insults. “If you are not right, if you have no arguments, insult your opponent,” as a prominent statesman of the last century said. The lesson has been well learnt. But this will not prevent us, for our part, from sticking to our guns, for we take care to respect

the decency, calm and courtesy which are appropriate in this place because we hold in high esteem the institution which the Security Council represents, just as we have high esteem and respect for the individual countries represented there.

34. The ever-growing consensus on the elements of the solution to the problem of Palestine, as well as on the tension which prevails in the occupied Arab territories, should encourage the Council to give a positive impetus to the process of peace in the Middle East. As everyone knows, a general strike was declared as of yesterday in the occupied Arab territories to observe Earth Day, which has been celebrated for four years, in protest against the seizure of Arab lands by the Israeli authorities. This very serious situation should encourage everyone to reflect and to seek an urgent solution to this problem.

35. The search for a solution can be accomplished initially, as we see it, by the adoption of a resolution which would recognize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, as they have been defined by the General Assembly. In taking such a decision the Council would be helping to remedy one of the most serious and most flagrant injustices of our time. Such a decision would not, as has been misleadingly suggested here, signify the denial of the rights of one of the parties to the Middle East conflict—to wit, the State of Israel. The Committee, in this connection, has always felt that what is essentially at stake in the Middle East is recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Israel not only enjoys its national rights, but, indeed, continually misuses them by illegally occupying Arab territories in violation of every principle of *jus gentium*, of the Charter and of the pertinent resolutions.

36. It is not the existence of Israel that is at present at issue. That country exists, it is seated among us, and no one here wants it to disappear. This is quite clear and I wish to reaffirm it on behalf of the Committee. On the other hand, on the pretext of its desire for absolute security, that country must not apply a policy of totally denying the existence of Arab Palestine and of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Therefore, if we truly desire to solve the overall problem of the Middle East, we must start by recognizing the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, a right that is at the very heart of the Palestinian question.

37. As Chairman of the Committee, this is the positive approach which I have come here to propose. If the Council agrees to this approach, it will make it possible for us to glimpse the beginnings of a solution of this extremely complex issue for which the United Nations bears the indelible marks of original sin. We have every hope that the Council will do this because that is the price of peace in the Middle East and, indeed, in the whole world.

38. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and I now call on him.

39. Mr. GAUCI (Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People): Mr. President, I wish first to compliment you and your country on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March and I wish to associate myself and my delegation with the message of sympathy that you have conveyed to the people of Viet Nam on the irreparable loss that they have suffered.

40. It is in itself sad that we should again be appearing before this body. Our presence here unfortunately only symbolizes a lack of progress on a problem that has been allowed to drag on for over three decades, and we only appear here because our sense of responsibility and the mandate given to us by the General Assembly clearly show that we have no other peaceful course. We advocate an objective and timely appraisal of the present situation.

41. It would be fruitless for me to repeat facts regarding the Palestine question that are known and understood by all of us here. Strange as it may sound and in full recognition of the complexity of the matter, I venture to say that it was easier for the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People unanimously to agree on its recommendations than it is to plan in advance and then to find the most appropriate time and the most productive approach for the pursuit of agreed recommendations.

42. These recommendations, as will be recalled, were the logical outcome of an emerging international consensus on the question of Palestine, considered as the heart of the Middle East conflict. The danger to international peace was not only recognized, but had actually been experienced more than once, particularly when a nuclear alert was ordered, sending shivers of apprehension reverberating throughout the world.

43. Subsequently, the nations in the region officially and publicly declared their yearning for peace—the protagonists, in particular, and other countries involved, in general. The people were suffering and economic progress in the region and throughout the world was retarded as a result of the violence and tension. The peoples in the region resolutely desired to turn away from death and destruction.

44. At the General Assembly, in an historic speech, an olive branch was offered. That branch has been held aloft for a number of years. The question before us, therefore, which is of fundamental importance equally to respect for human rights and to the prospects for economic prosperity and world peace, is the effective response we should give to that gesture. Do we encourage the aching arm to remain aloft, or do we

allow it to fall in tired disappointment and frustration engendered by the intransigence of one nation and the indifference of a few?

45. The General Assembly and the non-aligned movement have already responded positively. The former by a majority that has increased with every passing year and the latter with regular unanimity have endorsed the recommendations of the Committee as a basis for the solution of the Palestine question. I would recall that at the latest session of the General Assembly 117 nations voted in favour.

46. But the Security Council has not yet decided and so far has not pronounced itself either on the Committee's recommendations or, indeed, on any other internationally accepted alternative—for, if one recommended approach is not taken up, a rational alternative must be devised unless we wish to court disaster. The Committee itself has provided several opportunities for constructive additions or amendments to its suggestions, both here and in the General Assembly. None has been suggested even though we have waited patiently for over three years, under constant pressure from the Assembly.

47. While the Security Council stands immobilized, the situation on the spot unfortunately has remained tense and therefore dangerous. Other events on the international horizon, and even the internal politics of influential countries, are distracting attention from what urgently needs to be done in the Middle East. Must we therefore wait for another tragic confrontation before we assume our responsibilities?

48. The provocative actions of the occupying Power in the face of the manifest desire of the international community to devise means of restoring peace to the troubled region are regrettable, illegal and therefore unacceptable. But it is also sad to witness indifference and aloofness, when example and diplomatic activity by influential countries are so obviously desired and necessary.

49. What the Committee is saying, therefore, is that this question deserves priority. It is an international responsibility. It is a question of fundamental human rights. It is and remains potentially a renewed threat to peace. It is a question which has defied solution for far too long and it is one which requires a positive contribution from all quarters. When that is not forthcoming or is being deliberately frustrated, then it should unequivocally be pointed out in an effort to correct, in time, courses of action which might otherwise lead to devastating and unimaginable consequences.

50. The question is at a delicate stage. We in the Committee have been patient and we are ready to be even more patient. But obviously there is a limit to the endurance of the people most directly concerned.

51. Their future is at stake, but they are being deliberately kept out of the process. Their future, against their wishes, is being decided behind their backs. Would any self-respecting country or individual, present or represented in this chamber, accept such a state of affairs? Is it conceivable that, in the year of our Lord 1980, the international community should remain silent while the destiny of a people is being decided arbitrarily under occupation by the threat of imprisonment or exile at best, or at the point of a gun at worst? Is this our common conception of the practical application of the sacred principle of self-determination of peoples?

52. The Committee and other bodies of the United Nations have watched over events in the region over the past decades, always with apprehension and concern, and have come up with recommendations for change. None of those recommendations has been acted upon. But at least the reports provide eloquent evidence of the peremptory and arrogant way in which the Palestinian people in the occupied territories are being treated, and of the way in which creeping colonization is blatantly being practised by Israel. Today's newspapers give further evidence of these retrograde, inflexible intentions.

53. In short, the rights of the Palestinian people, as defined by the international community, are not being implemented. On the contrary, they are being denied, despite the international consensus backing their just cause. This, in simple terms, is what the Committee is protesting against, and once again we stress that the Security Council, in this situation and at this stage, cannot remain aloof, indifferent to the human tragedy in which the major Powers, besides the countries in the region, are by force of present circumstances the *dramatis personae*.

54. The gap between what is necessary and what is not being done has to be filled. This task seems to fall on a minority of countries which so far have remained uncertain and hesitant. Most of the Western European countries fall into this category. Apparently interest has been awakened in European countries, particularly those of the European Economic Community, in assuming a more balanced position on the essential parameters of a comprehensive solution, judging by recent individual initiatives and collective policy statements.

55. On the basis of justice and morality, in defence of fundamental human rights, and even on the more narrow basis of self-interest, it seems to me that the countries of Europe need to assume a much more active role in helping to achieve the climax of an international consensus for a peaceful and comprehensive solution, which the recently signed Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty shows no sign of providing at this stage. Partial peace has already become very expensive. While progress continues to elude us, the prospects of economic chaos and political war loom dangerously nearer every day.

56. It is in the common interest of European and Arab countries in particular that there should be an equitable solution. And there cannot be an equitable solution to the Middle East problem unless, as a fundamental prerequisite, the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people are taken into account, and unless their representatives have a say in the unfolding of their destiny. There should no longer be any doubt that the Palestinians recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization as their political spokesman and leaders. This has been confirmed time and time again both at the United Nations and in the occupied territories. It is certainly not for outsiders to tell the Palestinians who their leaders are.

57. My own country, Malta, has pointed out what needs to be done on numerous occasions in the past. Permit me, in my dual capacity as Rapporteur of the Committee and as representative of Malta, to do so once again, at a critical period, before hostile division becomes an even more pronounced feature of the turbulent Middle East. The time for objective involvement is fast running out.

58. There are now two major plans for the Middle East. One is the partial accord, recently signed, between two of the countries on the spot, with United States backing. This agreement was recently strongly condemned by the non-aligned countries, in so far as it neglected the rights of the Palestinian people. The second plan is that proposed by the United Nations, already endorsed by 117 countries. Despite conflicting interpretations, these two approaches should not be mutually exclusive, and Europe has an important role to play—and a suitable opportunity for it—if the Middle East is to be rescued from the clear danger of more acute confrontation and, instead, drawn towards the potential of a genuinely peaceful solution. The opportunities lie ahead; the spadework has already been done. The question now is at an important cross roads, and the desire within the region itself for positive change and peaceful initiatives is probably at its most acute.

59. It is my firm conviction, as Rapporteur of the Committee, that the United Nations has proposed an objective and comprehensive solution. There is a significance in this advocated solution which is often overlooked in the heat of the debate at the United Nations. I wish to stress this point because it was on this basis that, at the latest session of the General Assembly, I asked for a unanimous vote. I repeat that plea here in the Council today.

60. I believe it is of particular significance that, for the first time, the third world has reconfirmed and given legal endorsement to a decision taken in the past, when the membership of the United Nations was only 50 countries. Now international opinion is much more widely represented and a former decision of far-reaching significance, which was objected to previously, has now been endorsed. In other words, first,

the right of Israel to exist within secure borders has been repeatedly confirmed by the present United Nations membership, and, secondly, indirectly, through their support of the Committee's recommendations, Israel's right to an independent existence has also been accepted by the PLO and its supporters, as a proposition coming from the prevailing international consensus on this issue. What they could not accept in the past as an imposition, they can accept from a more broadly-based international consensus in which their friends are represented. But the present uncertainty about the future of the Palestinian people must be clarified first.

61. Public opinion throughout the world, including Israel itself and the United States, is clamouring for change. But it is eliciting no governmental action, and the United Nations can function only if a truly resolute and unexceptionable international consensus emerges. This is therefore the year when a major step forward is needed. But who will provide the impetus?

62. The role of European countries during this delicate phase therefore assumes critical importance in the shaping of a future course based on justice, designed to produce genuine prospects for an enduring and peaceful solution, a solution so long overdue because of opportunities overlooked in the past. We cannot afford to make the same mistakes. The international community can no longer afford indifference, neither can it condone erroneous policies.

63. Among the European countries, those bordering the Mediterranean have a special responsibility in this regard, for they are the first to suffer as a result of the division in the region, which will prevail until an equitable solution is arrived at. And no solution can be considered democratic and rational if it fails to provide the elements necessary for Palestinian self-determination. This fact has been recognized by Mediterranean countries. Malta, for its part, has consistently encouraged diplomatic dialogue to replace armed conflict and rejectionist attitudes. Despite the small size of our delegation, I assumed the time-consuming task of Rapporteur of the Committee as a genuine contribution towards a peaceful approach. Other European Mediterranean countries are members of the Committee. The other-non-European-Mediterranean countries have consistently followed the Committee's work and have contributed to its deliberations. Israel, unfortunately, has been and remains the only exception, an obstacle to progress.

64. Malta therefore recommends resolute action, both by the Security Council and in an indigenous regional approach which we are pursuing independently, backed by the non-aligned movement. We are now past the time of declarations. What we need is concrete recommendations backed by determination to translate words into deeds. Surely we can all agree that it is high time for the peaceful aspirations of the Palestinian people to be realized. The oppression of

30 years must be alleviated and not be allowed to become more pronounced.

65. The United Nations has provided a comprehensive formula for peace that does not overlook the interests and preoccupations of any country or people in the Middle East. However, it remains to be acted on. The Committee has pointed the way. On this occasion, with a renewed sense of urgency and concern, we again urge the Council to lead us further forward during this important phase in a determined effort to set a peaceful, comprehensive Middle East policy that will finally begin to do justice to the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people.

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

67. Mr. BLUM (Israel): This debate was initiated by the committee known as the Palestine Committee, which, as everyone knows, is a pliant tool in the hands of the terrorist PLO. It will be recalled that that Committee was set up by the General Assembly for the purpose of by-passing Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Nineteen of its 23 members do not have diplomatic relations with Israel, and some of them do not even recognize Israel's right to exist. It is thus not surprising that the Committee's recommendations, which were first set out in 1976, and which ostensibly are the subject of this debate, accord fully with the PLO's aims.

68. There can be no doubt about those vicious aims. Indeed, only on 11 February of this year, Yasser Arafat, in an interview with *El Mundo* in Caracas, declared that:

"Peace for us means the destruction of Israel.

"We are preparing for an all-out war, a war which will last for generations . . . We shall not rest until the day when we return to our home, and until we destroy Israel. The unity of the Arab world will make this possible.

"The destruction of Israel is the goal of our struggle, and the guidelines of that struggle have remained firm since the establishment of Fatah in 1965 . . . We know that the intention of some of the Arab leaders is to solve the conflict by peaceful means. When this occurs, we shall oppose it."
[S/13872 of 2 April 1980.]

Moreover, only last Friday, 28 March, Reuters reported from Beirut that George Habash, one of Arafat's leading henchmen, "would accept an independent State on the West Bank of the River Jordan and the Gaza Strip—provided it served as a base for continued efforts to dismantle Israel". Habash went on to explain that he wanted to make that clear, because "the only way for peace in this part of the

world—the Middle East—is to erase completely the cancerous presence of Zionism”.

69. That is what we are dealing with, no matter how much the issues are fudged or how much certain Governments and quarters may try to portray the PLO and its leaders as moderate and reasonable. The simple and harsh fact is that when the PLO talks about peace it means the elimination of the State of Israel.

70. The issue before us has deliberately been overlaid with layer upon layer of myth and distortion. In the process, the problem of the Palestinian Arabs has been grossly distorted, especially in recent years, when the world's dependence on Arab oil has been manipulated to further the PLO's aims. Indeed, if it were not for the threat of the Arab oil weapon, there is good reason to believe that many States would not have adopted the positions they have declared publicly—particularly of late.

71. Here at the United Nations there is a virtual conspiracy of silence about the link which the Arabs have asserted between their oil and the question of the Palestinian Arabs. Here, in this Organization, a series of myths has been propagated, flying in the face of history and present-day political realities alike. Among those myths are the following: first, the Palestinian Arabs have no State in which they enjoy self-determination today; secondly, only one refugee problem—the Arab refugee problem—was created as a result of Arab aggression in 1948; and, thirdly, there is some mystical connection between the question of the Palestinian Arabs and the energy crisis and the latter will somehow go away if the former is solved at Israel's expense.

72. As always, reality is very different from myth. Stripped of all its artificial encumbrances, the problem facing us today takes on quite a different aspect. The simple and incontrovertible facts are as follows. First, that two States have been established on the territory which was the Palestine Mandate between the two World Wars. One is an Arab State—Jordan—and the other is a Jewish State—Israel. Secondly, the Palestinian Arabs have long ago achieved self-determination in the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan. Thirdly, a Jewish refugee problem, in addition to the Arab refugee problem, was created by Arab aggression in 1948 and, in effect, an exchange of populations has taken place. And, fourthly, the energy crisis is unrelated to the question of the Palestinian Arabs; hence, the solution of one will not resolve the other.

73. Central to any discussion of the issue before us is the basic fact which I have just mentioned—namely, that two States have been established on the territory of the former Palestine Mandate. One is the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan, which achieved national self-determination, independence and sovereignty in 1946. The other is the Palestinian Jewish State of Israel, which became independent in 1948. Hence, there is no

need or justification whatsoever for the establishment of a second Palestinian Arab State in what was formerly the Palestine Mandate. The fact is that the vast majority of Jordanian citizens are Palestinian Arabs; and, similarly, the vast majority of Palestinian Arabs are Jordanian citizens. Palestinian Arabs occupy leading positions in Jordan today too numerous to mention. They constitute Jordan's administrative, intellectual and economic élite and are in fact the backbone and mainstay of the country.

74. The Palestinian Arab State of Jordan is only one of the 21 separate Arab States, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf, which the Arabs have established since the end of the First World War. The combined area of those 21 States is 5.5 million square miles—that is to say, 10.3 per cent of the world's land surface. The Arab States straddle an unbroken land mass greater in size than Europe, the United States or China, and are rich in material resources, not least of them oil, on which much of modern civilization is dependent.

75. On the other hand, the total area of the Palestine Mandate in 1920, on which a Jewish State was to be established was about 45,000 square miles—that is, less than 1 per cent of the enormous territories encompassed by the Arab States today. This, however, is by no means the end of the story. With the establishment of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan on about 80 per cent of the territory of the Palestine Mandate, the Palestinian Jewish State—Israel—was left with less than one fifth of 1 per cent of the total area of the 21 Arab States today. And even this tiny sliver of land for the Jewish people to exercise its right of self-determination in its ancestral patrimony has been begrudged by the Arab world, which is apparently incapable of countenancing a non-Arab and non-Moslem State in the Middle East.

76. Everything that we have experienced in the Arab-Israel conflict since 1948 flows from one fundamental fact: the unwillingness of Arab Governments to accept, and coexist with, a sovereign Jewish State, irrespective of its size and boundaries.

77. This simple fact was recently highlighted once again by Iraq, which on 20 February circulated as an official document of both the General Assembly and the Security Council its “National Charter” as proclaimed by the President of Iraq [S/13816]. In that Charter, it was specifically stated that Israel is “a deformed entity” and “is not considered a State”. The same document goes on to commit Iraq, in no uncertain terms, to all-out warfare against Israel, and enjoins other Arab States to participate actively in that war, employing “all means and techniques”. This undisguised denial by one Member State of the right of another Member State to exist characterizes the position of those Arab States which are relentlessly opposed to making peace with Israel and which in the last few years have come to be known as the “rejec-

tionist States". It goes without saying that their position is in flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and in effect amounts to an outright rejection of the Charter and all it stands for.

78. This adamant refusal on the part of most Arab States to recognize Israel's right to exist has always been and remains the core and cause of the Arab-Israel conflict, and everything else is pretext or subterfuge. This is the reason why the Arab States have launched four major wars against Israel with the express purpose of destroying it. This is the reason why they have developed a ramified series of battle fronts and an array of weapons against Israel. These weapons have involved, for example, an economic boycott against Israel, which has been extended into a secondary boycott on third parties trading with Israel. As is well known, various countries have been blackmailed into joining this campaign against Israel. A propaganda war of major proportions, using the techniques developed by Goebbels and his gang, has been directed for years against Israel. And the United Nations has been seized upon, in all its various organs and agencies as an instrument readily at the disposal of the Arab States in their relentless political warfare against Israel. And this is the reason why they have again come to the Security Council now.

79. Within this context, but with even uglier intent, the Arab States also created the terrorist organization which came to be known as the PLO. This murder organization was founded in 1964—that is to say, three years before the Six-Day War of 1967—at a time when Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District were under Jordanian and Egyptian occupation, respectively. In other words, it is evident that the PLO was created by the Arab States merely as another weapon in their serried arsenal for the destruction of Israel, even before the Six-Day War of 1967.

80. The PLO's so-called Covenant is permeated with the criminal concept of the elimination of the State of Israel. That document was originally adopted in 1964, and subsequently amended in 1968. It has been reaffirmed since, year after year, by all the central institutions of the terrorist PLO, the last time being as recently as August of last year, when its so-called "Central Committee" met in Damascus.

81. The members of the Council will be aware that virtually every article in the PLO's Covenant calls for or implies the dissolution of the State of Israel. Article 19 of the document in question declares that "the establishment of Israel is fundamentally null and void, whatever time has elapsed". Article 20 goes on to assert that "the claim of a historical or spiritual tie between the Jews and Palestine does not tally with historical facts". In other words, with one cavalier stroke of the pen, the PLO seeks to rewrite more than 3,000 years of the history of mankind. Article 15 grotesquely sets out "to purge the Zionist presence from Palestine" is a "national duty".

82. These are not abstract propositions but operational principles. Most specifically, articles 9 and 10 of the Covenant declare that "armed struggle is the only way to liberate Palestine"; and that "fedayeen action", the PLO euphemism for indiscriminate terror, forms "the nucleus of the popular Palestinian war of liberation".

83. The PLO has not hesitated to translate words into deeds. Attempts at the mass murder of innocent men, women and children, in Israel and throughout the world, have characterized the PLO and its activities since its creation in 1964. Indeed, in the course of the 16 years since then, it has attempted thousands of individual acts of terror. Over 1,000 men, women and children—not only Jews but also Arabs and others—have been murdered and more than 5,000 people have been maimed and wounded. The PLO has openly boasted of its responsibility for virtually every one of those outrages.

84. As we all know, the PLO has had no inhibitions about violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of many Member States and has shown little respect for the niceties of law, order and public security in those countries. Because of the active support it receives from certain Arab Governments, the PLO has become the linchpin of the "terrorist international", which is plaguing society throughout the world today. It services and supplies the needs of other terrorist groups in Europe, Latin America, Asia and Africa, all of which, for example, train openly on PLO bases and plan and practise terrorist attacks without let or hindrance.

85. Moreover, in all its criminal activities the PLO is aided, trained and equipped by the Soviet Union. In turn, the Soviet Union uses the PLO in its well-known attempts to destabilize the entire Middle East and sabotage the peace process. Hence it came as no surprise when that Soviet stooge rushed to proclaim its support for the Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, a non-aligned and Moslem State.

86. The grave threat to international peace and security which is created in this way is further exacerbated by the encouragement which the PLO derives from the favourable attitudes here at the United Nations, in violation of the Charter and of the rules of procedure of its various organs.

87. Another aspect of the unremitting acts of Arab aggression against Israel since 1948 has been the creation of two refugee problems of similar dimensions in the Middle East—not just one, as is commonly supposed.

88. By the time Arab aggression against Israel had been successfully thwarted in 1949, some 600,000 Palestinian Arabs had become refugees and found themselves in areas controlled by Arab Governments. Instead of settling and integrating their Palestinian

brethren, who speak the same language, share the same cultural, historical and religious heritage and frequently even have family in the Arab host countries, those countries forced them to remain in camps and exploited them callously as a political weapon against Israel.

89. The thousands of Jews who lived in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District until 1948 could not for long resist the invading Arab armies. Those of them who had survived the invasion and prison camps sought and found refuge in the State of Israel.

90. A much larger problem of Jewish refugees was caused by the Arab hostility towards the ancient Jewish communities in Arab lands. Those Jews, who at the time numbered nearly 1 million and who over the centuries had contributed so much to the advancement of the Arab world, from the cultural, economic and many other points of view, had often been treated as second-class citizens, subject to various forms of discrimination and persecution. Even before the Arab aggression against Israel in 1948 and 1949 had been repelled, they fell victim to violence and further persecution at the hands of Arabs thirsting for revenge. Many of them were murdered. Others were thrown into prison and tortured. Hundreds of thousands were forced to flee, leaving behind considerable property and material assets. Homes and businesses were looted. Bank accounts were frozen. Communal property and priceless cultural assets were expropriated by Arab Governments.

91. From 1948 to the present day, more than 800,000 Jews have been forced to leave Arab countries. About 650,000 of them have come to Israel, in most cases with only the clothes on their backs. Hence, in effect, a *de facto* exchange of populations has taken place between the Arab States and Israel, triggered off by Arab aggression in 1947 and 1948.

92. According to United Nations figures, there have been anything from 60 million to 100 million refugees and displaced persons since the end of the Second World War. Even if one accepts the smaller of these figures, the Arab refugees in 1948 constituted no more than 1 per cent of the total. The vast majority of the other refugee problems in the world, including that of the Jewish refugees, have been solved by the resettlement and integration of those refugees in their new countries or places of residence. To be sure, that has already happened for most Arab refugees and their offspring, the vast majority of whom continue to live in the territory of the former Palestine Mandate and are citizens of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan.

93. Until 1967 Palestinian Arabs constituted an international problem to the extent that some of them were still unsettled refugees. Before 1967 Israel did not control Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District. Yet there was no demand then for the establishment of a "Palestinian State" in those areas. The Arab coun-

tries which now so sanctimoniously preach the necessity for a "Palestinian State" in those areas did nothing at the time. The explanation for this is very simple: the entire world knew that the Kingdom of Jordan is the Palestinian Arab State, just as the State of Israel is the Palestinian Jewish State; the entire world also knew that the vast majority of Palestinian Arabs are Jordanian citizens and that the majority of Jordanian citizens are Palestinian Arabs.

94. However, in an attempt to undermine the peace process called for by the Security Council in its resolution 242 (1967), Arab strategists searched for slogans and terms that would catch on in the general political climate which had developed in the world by that time. They estimated that they stood more to gain by promoting the alleged existence of a second Palestinian Arab people, entitled to a second Palestinian Arab State in the area of the former Palestine Mandate. The advantages of that tactical sleight of hand were obvious. It would enable the Arab States to claim that there was still a Palestinian Arab people deprived of the rights to self-determination and independence, and the implementation of those claims would clearly be at the expense of Israel.

95. Leading spokesmen of the PLO admit that this bogus thesis was invented to work towards the destruction of the State of Israel. For instance, Zuhair Muhsin, the head of the PLO's so-called military department until his death last year, was quoted as follows in the Dutch daily newspaper *Trouw* on 31 March 1977:

"There are no differences between Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese . . . We are one people.

"It is only for political reasons that we carefully stress our Palestinian identity, for it is in the national interest of the Arabs to encourage a separate Palestinian identity to counter Zionism. Yes, the existence of a separate Palestinian identity serves only tactical purposes.

"The founding of a Palestinian State is a new tool in the continuing battle against Israel and for Arab unity.

"Jordan is a State with defined borders. It cannot claim Haifa or Jaffa, whereas I have a right to Haifa, Jaffa, Jerusalem and Beersheba. After we have attained all our rights in the whole of Palestine, we must not postpone, even for one single moment, the reunification of Jordan and Palestine."

96. The meaning could not be clearer. The assertion of a second Palestinian Arab identity is merely one more subterfuge designed to bring about the destruction of the State of Israel—if not in one fell swoop, then in stages.

97. For a number of years now, the PLO has advocated a programme which is sometimes described by PLO spokesmen as a two- or three-stage policy. In essence, it aims in its first stage at the establishment of a second Palestinian Arab State anywhere in the territories administered by Israel since 1967. The second stage of the policy is to use this proposed State as a launching pad for the ultimate overthrow of Israel. This programme was described with complete candour by Farouk Khaddoumi, another of Yasser Arafat's henchmen, in *Newsweek* magazine on 14 March 1977:

"There are two [initial] phases to our return: the first phase to the 1967 lines, and the second to the 1948 lines. The third stage is the democratic State of Palestine. So we are fighting for these three stages."

Asked if the PLO had become more moderate, Khaddoumi replied:

"By moderation we mean we are ready . . . to establish a State on a part of our territory. In the past we said no, on all of it, immediately, a democratic State of Palestine. Now we say no, this can be implemented in three stages. That is moderation."

98. That is the cold truth, notwithstanding the wishful thinking and illusions of certain international figures, in Europe and elsewhere. And yet there are still some who fall into the trap of considering a plan to destroy Israel in stages as "moderation".

99. To implement their sinister designs, the Arab rejectionist States have created an enormous war machine and thus an ominous threat to peace. The rejectionists' strategy has been to create an eastern front combining, in the first instance, the armed forces of Syria to the north of Israel, Jordan and Iraq to the east, and Saudi Arabia to the south. The combined military weight of these countries will be supplemented in times of war with sophisticated weapons available in enormous quantities from the arsenals of other rejectionist States. This colossal array of force is to be mounted against Israel, also through Judaea and Samaria if at all possible.

100. To give some notion of what we are talking about, I am bound to recall what I said on 27 February of this year in the Council [2202nd meeting].

101. The Arab States have today 500,000 more men under arms than has the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and three times the artillery of the combined NATO forces. They also have 3,000 more tanks and several hundred more combat aircraft than NATO. The eastern front alone—that is, Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia—is currently equivalent to NATO in manpower and tanks, and already has twice as much artillery. In terms of air power, the Arab armies will this year equal the combined strength

of the Warsaw Treaty forces. They will be double that of NATO, or three times that of the People's Republic of China. In terms of ground forces, the Arab States have today almost as many tanks as the United States, and more artillery than it has.

102. And against whom, one may well ask, is this colossal array of military power to be used? Perhaps some members of the Council can take these harsh military facts lightly. Israel cannot.

103. The rejectionists regard a PLO State in Judaea and Samaria and the Gaza District as the most important bridgehead through which they might realize their dream of a war of annihilation against Israel. A glance at the map will show why. Before 1967 Israel at its narrowest point was less than nine miles wide—that is, less than the length of Manhattan Island. Half of Israel's population is concentrated in the narrow coastal plain between Netanya and Tel Aviv. Before 1967 all this population was within easy reach of Jordan's long guns.

104. Ever since Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District have been under Israeli control, the Arab rejectionists have tried to reconvert them into forward bases. In this, they have allotted the PLO a special role and set it the task of using the territories as a launching pad for acts of hostility, terror, sabotage and subversion against Israel and its civilian population. As part of their "grand design", the rejectionists would obviously like the territories leading to the outskirts of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and every other town and city in Israel to become a PLO State and be emptied of any Israeli presence that might stand in their way. Israel sees no reason to oblige them.

105. If we put aside the myths, the political sloganeering and the propaganda, the problem facing us can be seen to be of manageable proportions. There is already a Palestinian Arab State called Jordan, populated by the majority of the Palestinian Arabs. It is a State in which the national identity and aspirations of the Palestinian Arabs have already found full expression.

106. To be sure, there are certain special problems which concern Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District, as well as the Palestinian Arabs living there. These problems cannot readily be settled in any final form at this stage. The fact is that, because of the Arab refusal to make peace with Israel, it was not possible for three decades to conduct serious negotiations about the Arab-Israel conflict in all its aspects. The possibility of such negotiations only opened up in 1977, and the elements for a comprehensive solution of the conflict only came together at Camp David in the late summer of 1978. In the course of bringing these elements together, and in the light of the experience gained in negotiating the Israel-Egypt peace treaty, we have all come to recognize how difficult and complex the process is of reconciling and accommodating the

legitimate concerns, including the security interests, of all those involved.

107. Given the long record of Arab hostility to and aggression against Israel, it is inevitable that before the final boundaries are delineated between Israel and Jordan there must be a transitional period, a period which will in itself, in the parlance of the United Nations, constitute a confidence-building measure. That is precisely the concept embodied in the Camp David framework for peace in the Middle East as regards the future of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District and of the Palestinian Arabs residing in those areas.

108. The Camp David framework is squarely based on resolution 242 (1967), which to this day remains the only agreed basis for peace negotiations in the Middle East. Any attempt to tamper with that resolution can only undermine the whole delicate structure on which the peace process is based.

109. The Camp David framework sees the solution of the question of the Palestinian Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District in terms of granting those residents full autonomy for a transitional period of five years before reaching an agreement on the final status of the areas concerned. To that end, it was agreed to negotiate on a principle of self-government—to be exercised through an administrative council—for the Arab inhabitants of the areas in question.

110. The Camp David framework invites the Palestinian Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District to play an active role in shaping their future by calling on them to participate in all aspects of the negotiations. They have been invited to participate not only in current negotiations to set up a self-governing administrative council, but also in the negotiations which will determine the final status of the areas they live in, as well as in the eventual negotiations on a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, in which the delimitation of boundaries between the two countries will be agreed on. This solution offers the Palestinian Arabs concerned greater opportunities than anything they have ever experienced in their history. It offers them the prospect of governing themselves, of prosperity and of peaceful co-existence alongside their neighbours. It offers them a secure future, free from terror.

111. As everyone knows, the autonomy talks have been proceeding for just over nine months. This is a very short period of time in relation to the complexity of the issues involved. The pace of the talks is, as it needs to be, slow and deliberate, but progress is being made and agreement has been reached on a fairly wide range of issues. To advance this process, the President of the United States will be holding talks in Washington next week with President Sadat of Egypt. The week after that, President Carter will also

have talks in Washington with Prime Minister Menachem Begin.

112. Thus, there can be little doubt that this debate, too, was initiated and timed to try to frustrate the ongoing peace process in the Middle East. Indeed, this has been the pattern and the purpose of all the debates held in the Council on the Arab-Israel conflict since the peace negotiations entered their advanced stages, and particularly since the signing of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt almost exactly a year ago.

113. Even without the forthcoming talks in Washington, the object of this debate was clear well in advance. Justification for it has been made by reference to General Assembly resolution 34/65 A, which urged the Council to act on the subject now before it by 31 March 1980. The choice of this date was deliberate, since at the time that the resolution was drafted and adopted, it was known that the talks being held on full autonomy for the Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District would not be concluded before May of this year. Hence, it was decided, with clearly malicious intent, to lay the ground for a Council meeting before the autonomy talks had run their course. That malicious intent was also made clearly evident in, and was reinforced by, resolution 34/65 B, in which the numerical majority always at the disposal of Israel's enemies repudiated the peace process in the Middle East. Let us therefore not delude ourselves about the object of the present exercise.

114. As usually happens on occasions such as this, there will be States, both in the Council and beyond it, which, while recognizing full well the true nature and objectives of the present debate, will none the less find it difficult to resist the temptation of trying to gain some political advantage or to prove their credentials by participating in this debate. Such tactics are no doubt part of the game of politics, but they can scarcely be regarded as helpful or as contributing to the quest for peace, which, as we all know, is being conducted in more serious negotiations elsewhere.

115. The question facing the Council is stark. Will it be supportive of a peace process in the Middle East that has already yielded a major peace treaty between two sovereign States, Members of this Organization, and that is now well on the way to providing the Arab residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district with much more in the way of self-rule than was ever on offer in the two decades from 1948 to 1967 when they were controlled by Jordan and Egypt? Or will the Council jettison its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and join the band waggon of that cacophonous chorus of States and groupings with deeply conflicting interests and nothing in common except a willingness to exploit every opportunity in a deliberate attempt to thwart the peace process in the Middle East?

116. I mentioned earlier the supposed connection between Arab oil and the question before us. With the

world's growing dependence on Arab oil, the Arab petro-hegemonists have asserted this connexion and have blatantly begun to blackmail the world, threatening to strangle its economy if the destructive aims of the PLO are not satisfied. As a result, we have witnessed in recent months a sorry parade of nations, great and small, supplicating the Arab oil gods. These nations seem to think that adopting positions that put Israel's security at risk is paying a cheap price in an attempt to placate the Arab petro-hegemonists.

117. Some 40 years ago a small, democratic and freedom-loving State in the heart of Europe was sacrificed, ostensibly for the sake of "peace with honour". What ensued was neither peace nor honour, and the entire world paid a heavy price for that cynical and short-sighted stance. That dismal lesson has not been lost on Israel, even if others choose to forget it.

118. A year has passed since the Israel-Egypt peace treaty was signed. That momentous occasion was an historic turning point in the relations between our two nations. For over three decades a state of war had existed between us and four bloody wars were fought in that relatively short span of time.

119. To make peace, Israel made many sacrifices and took many risks. Israel has preferred these sacrifices for peace over the sacrifices of war. But the road before us to complete peace with all our Arab neighbours remains long and tortuous. We are at present engaged in negotiating the second phase of the Camp David framework and we are committed to carrying the peace process through to its end.

120. The situation in the Middle East and the international climate in general are far from stable and reassuring. We know that there will be continued attempts to try to exploit that situation and, for that matter, the international community as a whole, to thwart the quest for peace.

121. Israel will not be deflected by the enemies of peace. It is entitled to expect that the Council will refrain from giving them support or encouragement.

122. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and I now call on him.

123. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, when you assumed the presidency on 1 March I am sure you never envisaged that a resolution adopted under your presidency would shock the world because of the after-effects and the response of one particular Member State. But that resolution is still a living resolution that is being dealt with every day by the press, especially in this country. It has been used as another commodity in the bargaining for the position of President of the United States. I am sure, Sir, that on this last day of your presidency something as historic will be accomplished.

124. We should like at the outset to associate ourselves with the message of sympathy and condolences that you, Sir, have expressed to the Vietnamese people and Government.

125. Once again the Council is meeting to consider the heart of the Middle East conflict. On several occasions the Council has met to consider derivatives like Israeli invasions, expansion and occupation. It has also met to consider derivatives of derivatives, such as the renewal of the mandate of United Nations forces along the lines of the occupied territories, the Israeli policy and practice of creeping annexation, violations of the inalienable rights of people, violations of the Charter and United Nations resolutions, violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, violations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949, and a number of other flagrant violations.

126. This meeting of the Council has been convened to consider the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. A request for such consideration was made by the General Assembly at its thirty-first, thirty-second, thirty-third and thirty-fourth sessions. Thus the item is not new.

127. For more than three decades the Council has been considering the derivatives and ramifications, but only in the last few years has it met to consider the heart of the issue. Meetings held and resolutions and decisions adopted during more than three decades have not resolved the problem nor brought the world any closer to peace. It is our firm conviction that only by addressing itself to the heart of the issue can the Council take action conducive to peace.

128. It is relevant to note that the Council is meeting at the beginning of Holy Week, the week of the Passion, a week that the Christian world observes with piety and compassion, a week climaxed by resurrection and redemption after the crucifixion. We are all aware that also during this week members of the Jewish faith will be observing the Feast of the Passover, and I am sure that the Council will take into account the religious rites and observances on such occasions. As of yesterday, Palm Sunday, the Christians of the world, and in particular the Christians of Jerusalem, had their thoughts directed to that week. The City of Jerusalem is this week reliving the glorious entry of the Messiah. To the Christians, every single step and every single stone in Jerusalem is holy and has been so for the last 2,000 years.

129. Christians do remember when the Lord stood on the Mount of Olives and said:

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!"²

"For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side,

"And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another . . .".³

Those are the words of the Master. What the Israelis are doing is destroying and demolishing the houses of the Holy City and building those fortresses around the city, the trenches to which reference has been made. And then the Lord came into the Old City:

"And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves,

"And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves."⁴

130. That is the Jerusalem in which we believe, the Jerusalem which is the house of prayer, the Jerusalem sacred for more than 2,000 years to Christians around the world and for more than 15 centuries to the Moslems around the world. The Jerusalem that we think of is not the Jerusalem that the Zionists think of.

131. The founder of modern Zionism, Theodor Herzl, refers to Jerusalem in the following way, and I quote from his diary for 31 October 1898:

"When I remember thee in days to come, O Jerusalem, it will not be with delight.

"The musty deposits of two thousand years of inhumanity,"—and I take it the 2,000 years refer to the Christian era—"intolerance and foulness lie in your reeking alleys. The one man who has been present here all this while, the lovable dreamer of Nazareth, has done nothing but help increase the hate."

I am sure members know that he is alluding to Jesus of Nazareth. Herzl continues:

"If Jerusalem is ever ours, and if I were still able to do anything about it, I would begin by cleaning it up.

"I would clear out everything that is not sacred, set up workers' houses beyond the city, empty and tear down the filthy rat-holes, burn all the non-sacred ruins, and put the bazaars elsewhere. Then, retaining as much of the old architectural style as possible, I would build an airy, comfortable, properly sewerred, brand new city around the Holy Places."

132. Christianity, which according to Herzl is hatred, could not be considered as sacred. Islam also could

not be considered as sacred. So the aim of the Zionist movement is to destroy the City of Jerusalem but maintain as much of the architectural style as possible. I take it that Herzl is referring to the beautiful architectural style of what the Moslems have erected on the temple area.

133. I am sorry, but during this week the Via Dolorosa means a lot to me. It means a lot to me to walk those 14 Stations of the Cross. What does the Via Dolorosa mean to the Zionists? According to Herzl, the Via Dolorosa is "a route the Jews shun as something maleficent". The Palestinian people has been subjected to different and most barbarous forms of torture. We have been subjected to visitations and to the denial of all our rights, including the right to life itself, but thanks to our perseverance and resolute will to regain our rights and our homes and thanks to the ever-increasing support we receive from the rest of the world, we are certain that the day of our redemption, of our liberation—the day we regain all our inalienable rights—is soon coming.

134. A few points at this juncture call for clarification. We all recall that in August 1979 the Council met to consider the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. That meeting was only one in a series which should have started in May 1979 in response to a request from the General Assembly. But in response to a request by some members, the Council met in June and again in July 1979 when, at the special request of the representative of the United States, the meeting was adjourned until August. We all recall the price the representative of the United States had to pay for securing what his Government wanted him to obtain, namely, a postponement of the debate. We all recall the mood in the Council when a draft resolution [S/13154 of 23 August 1979] affirming that the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights also applied to the Palestinian people was not pressed to the vote. Chairman Yasser Arafat then responded to requests by friends to spare Ambassador Andrew Young the embarrassment of using the veto against the issue of the rights of the Palestinian people and against the Charter. Andrew Young retired with dignity and honour, true to the image of the American founding fathers, because for them moral values, freedom and self-determination were principles worth fighting for—and that is enshrined in the archives and in legends. But poor Andy still had some idealism and romanticism in him. I recall this episode to assert that the time for action, for a decision by the Council on this matter, is long overdue.

135. Specifically, the Council is meeting to decide on the measures endorsed by the General Assembly in resolutions 31/20, 32/40 A, 33/28 A and 34/65 A, which reaffirm

"that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the achievement,

inter alia, of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”.

This was the decision of the international community, adopted by a wide margin of more than 8 to 1.

136. The matter before the Council is defined with precision: while the international community was pursuing a constructive approach to a comprehensive peace, Begin, Carter and Sadat were planting obstacles along that road. While the international community was determined to restore to the Palestinian people its inalienable rights, Begin, Carter and Sadat were determined to nullify those rights. The so-called framework for peace, which is in fact a new military alliance converting Egypt as well into an arsenal of lethal and destructive arms where arms and armaments are stockpiled, the so-called Camp David accords, are conceived in such a way as to ignore, infringe upon, violate and deny the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and to nullify the internationally endorsed approach to peace, as stated earlier.

137. The unholy tripartite alliance negotiating the future of the Palestinian people and territory has as a first step usurped the right of the Palestinian people. The unholy three are determining our future in our absence and against our will and desire. Assuming that the current negotiations bear fruit, that fruit will be of necessity a nullification of all our rights. Should the world stand with arms folded while Begin, Carter and Sadat reach an agreement nullifying our rights? Should the Council stand with arms folded while the conspiracy to eliminate the Palestinians is under way?

138. A thorough and close study of the so-called framework for peace will show that it completely ignores the right of the Palestinians to return. It is clear what the result would be in the event of success in the current negotiations: namely, perpetuation of the state of dispersion of the Palestinians and perpetuation of the Palestinians’ status as stateless, and that would definitely call for perpetuation of frustration, and of necessity that would engender resentment, revolution and violence. It is one’s right to fight back and to fight for the restoration of one’s rights, including by use of arms.

139. On the subject of the right of return, section A, paragraph 3, of the Camp David accord reads as follows:

“During the transitional period, representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the self-governing authority will constitute a continuing committee to decide by agreement on the modalities of admission of persons displaced from the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, together with necessary measures to prevent disruption and disorder.”

Should the current negotiations bear fruit and bring about the positive results they claim, what will the Palestinian get? Most likely he will be given a paper, a form in which it is clearly asked, “Where were you in May 1967?” If he cannot establish his whereabouts, then his application will be automatically disregarded. But suppose he does establish his whereabouts in the West Bank or Gaza: the “continuing committee” will have to agree on his admission—and here you see that the right of return is annulled in the accord; they call it “admission” now.

140. I think it only appropriate for one to recall that the Council adopted its resolution 237 (1967), in which it called upon

“the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities”.

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People recommended that the Council should request immediate implementation of resolution 237 (1967) and that such implementation should not be related to any other condition. I think it is the duty of the Council to see to it that its resolutions are implemented. However, resolution 237 (1967) is completely ignored in the so-called framework for peace. Yet the Palestine Liberation Organization is being approached with a view to giving the current negotiations another chance. Well, as I have already said, even if such negotiations prove successful, what will be in them for the Palestinian people?

141. In effect we are asked not only to abandon our rights but to become a party to an attempt to violate the decisions of the Council, including resolution 452 (1979), in which the Council accepted the recommendations contained in the report of the commission established to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. I quote:

“On the basis of the conclusion reached, the Commission would like, therefore, to recommend that the Security Council, bearing in mind the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland . . .” [S/13450 and Add.1 of 12 July 1979, para. 230].

That is what the Council accepted: the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return. Thus the Council, as well as the General Assembly, has recognized the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return. But the Begin-Carter-Sadat accord ignores that inalienable right.

142. Moreover, in the Camp David accord there is a very clearly marked denial of the Palestinian people as such. Section A, paragraph 1, subparagraph (c)

envisages negotiations to be conducted "among Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the elected representatives of the inhabitants"—and I stress the word "inhabitants"—"of the West Bank and Gaza". Clearly, the high contracting parties who affixed their signatures to the accord are oblivious of the existence of Palestinians outside the West Bank and Gaza. They are totally unaware of the presence of a United Nations agency dealing with Palestinian refugees in territories outside the West Bank and Gaza. They wish to ignore the facts and to close their eyes to the ever present Palestinian people and its internationally recognized representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, which has today been invited to participate in this debate. The Camp David accord is maliciously and criminally designed to make the Palestinian people extinct. Almost 2 million of us have been denied the right to return and by force prevented from exercising our inalienable right to return. Should the current negotiations bear fruit and prove successful, almost 2 million Palestinians will be condemned to perpetual exile. Their fate does not seem to disturb the consciences of Begin, Carter or Sadat. It is the fate and the future of the Palestinian people and territory that constitute the main factor that will decide the future of peace in the Middle East.

143. Not only did the Camp David accord fragment the Palestinian people into inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza and others, but the National Security Adviser to President Carter, a certain Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, in Washington, on 12 March, told the National Press Club:

"There is a question with Gaza, specifically whether it is Palestinian or Arab or what. The issue is being negotiated."

I cannot attribute this to ignorance or lack of elementary education; it is definitely an integral part of the Sadat-Carter-Begin plan to eliminate the Palestinian people and further to trample on its rights. Are we really in need of further additional symptoms to allow us to read the designs of the Begin-Carter-Sadat accord correctly?

144. The Council is also called upon to take a decision on the recommendations regarding the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in Palestine. The report of the Committee includes recommendations endorsed on several occasions by the General Assembly, and by an overwhelming majority of 8 to 1, as was reflected in the voting on resolution 34/65 A.

145. What the unholy tripartite alliance is attempting to do is to nullify the will of the international community. The so-called framework for peace does not in any of its provisions envisage the Palestinian people as being enabled to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination. What the accord envisages is the participation of the representatives of the inhabitants of

the West Bank and Gaza in the determination of their own future through negotiations with Egypt, Israel and Jordan, negotiations to achieve agreement on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza. Perhaps a mathematical clarification could help. Of the almost 4 million Palestinians, only 1.5 million live in the West Bank and Gaza. Thus the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza, including the part of Jerusalem occupied since 1967, will represent something like 37 per cent of the Palestinian Arabs. According to the Camp David agreement, the representatives of the inhabitants will have one part in four in the negotiations. The net result: the Palestinians will have a 9 per cent share in the participation. That is not self-determination; it is permitting others to share and, in this case, giving them a more than 90 per cent advantage. I agree that this is a rather complex and complicated matter, but in effect it means no self-determination.

146. National independence and sovereignty in Palestine is another inalienable right of the Palestinian people. I am sure we all know the destiny of that right. President Carter is constantly assuring White House visitors that "We do not favour an independent Palestinian State; we have constantly opposed this prospect". Begin and the world Zionist movement have a clear stand on the existence and the survival of the Palestinians in Palestine, not to mention their sovereignty and independence. Well, I do not really know what Sadat has in mind, but by deduction he, too, opposes—and very militantly—the prospects of national independence of the Palestinian people and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine.

147. Thus the determination of the unholy tripartite alliance does not in any way discourage us or lead us to despair. Their attempts are doomed, because, on 29 November 1979—the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People—the General Assembly declared in resolution 34/65 B

"that the Camp David accords and other agreements have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967".

That resolution, as we all know, was adopted by more than a two-to-one majority.

148. Only in September 1979, the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries decided "to condemn the Camp David agreements and the treaty between Egypt and Israel". The Summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity had earlier condemned energetically "all the partial agreements and separate treaties which constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the Arab nation and of the Palestinian people". That Conference also reaffirmed that the Zionist occupation and usurpation of Palestine and of the rights of its people were

the core of the Middle East conflict and, consequently, rendered any solution to that conflict impossible without the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights, including the right to return, to attain self-determination and to establish an independent Palestinian State in Palestine.

149. President Fidel Castro, the Chairman of the non-aligned movement, carried this message in his statement in the general debate of the General Assembly. He stated, among other things that:

"The basis for a just peace in the region starts with the total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories and provides for the return to the Palestinian people of all their occupied territories and the restoration of their inalienable national rights, including their right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX)."⁵

150. But it was of the greatest significance that in his statement to the General Assembly on 2 October, His Holiness Pope John Paul II said:

"It is my fervent hope that a solution also to the Middle East crises may draw nearer. While being prepared to recognize the value of any concrete step or attempt made to settle the conflict I want to recall that it would have no value if it did not truly represent the 'first stone' of a general overall peace in the area, a peace that, being necessarily based on equitable recognition of the rights of all, cannot fail to include the consideration and just settlement of the Palestinian question. Connected with this question is that of the tranquility, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon within the formula that has made it an example of peaceful and mutually fruitful coexistence between distinct communities, a formula that I hope will, in the common interest, be maintained, with the adjustments required by the developments of the situation. I also hope for a special statute that, under international guarantees—as my predecessor Paul VI indicated—would respect the particular nature of Jerusalem, a heritage sacred to the veneration of millions of believers of the three great monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam."⁶

151. The free African continent made its position more than clear in the statement of Mr. William Tolbert, the President of Liberia. In his address to the General Assembly on 26 September, he said:

"Regarding the grave danger to international peace and security inherent in the Middle East crisis, Africa reaffirmed in Monrovia its unrelenting support and unswerving commitment to the struggle of the Palestinian people for the full realization and exercise of all of their national rights.

"In pledging its full support and determination to continue to work for a lasting and just peace in the Middle East, Africa, speaking in Monrovia, condemned all partial agreements and treaties which violate the recognized rights of the Palestinian people and contradict the principles of just and comprehensive solutions to the Middle East problem.

"If current peace initiatives in the Middle East are to lead to a comprehensive, just and durable settlement, it would seem imperative, in our view, that the framework of negotiation be expanded to include the Palestinian people, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization. For the Palestinian people alone are entitled to speak for themselves, and their participation is indispensable to the success of any peace initiative in the Middle East."⁷

152. On 25 September the Foreign Minister of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the nine members of the European Community in the General Assembly, said regarding the elements essential to the negotiation of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East that in the establishment of a just and lasting peace:

"... it is essential that there be respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. These include the right to a homeland and the right, through its representatives, to play its full part in the negotiation of a comprehensive settlement."⁸

He reiterated that, in the opinion of the Nine, a comprehensive settlement would meet the legitimate rights and interests of all parties, including the Palestinian people

"who are entitled, within the framework set by a peace settlement, to exercise their right to determine their own future as a people."⁹

He did not hesitate to stress that the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the peace process was essential.

153. The constant and clear position of the socialist countries needs no recalling. The socialist countries in Europe, Asia and elsewhere have extended to our cause and our struggle both moral and concrete support. They know that, in their efforts for peace, peace in Palestine comes first.

154. As for the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the League of Arab States, Sadat's régime has been expelled from these intergovernmental organizations.

155. Only the other day, on the first anniversary of the signing of the Washington pact, the Minister for External Affairs of India told Parliament that his Government had accorded full diplomatic recognition to the PLO representative.

156. And when I stated that we are not in despair and that the just cause of the Palestinian people is getting further support, I had in mind also the visits of Chairman Yasser Arafat to Vienna, Madrid and Lisbon and the reception accorded him at a popular level as well as by governmental authorities.

157. In this context, it is most important to recall that on 3 March, in a joint communiqué of Kuwait and France, President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing expressed his conviction that the question of Palestine is not a refugee problem but that of a people that should be enabled to exercise its right to self-determination, and that peace can be established only after the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories occupied in 1967. On 5 March President Giscard d'Estaing made this even clearer in a joint communiqué during his visit to Qatar, where he said that Israel should withdraw from all the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, and that the Palestinian people, like all other peoples, should have the right to determine its own destiny in its own homeland within the framework of a comprehensive settlement.

158. Mr. Brian Lenihan, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland, came out even more clearly on 10 February in a joint communiqué issued in Bahrain, which reads as follows:

"The two sides stressed that all parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, should play a full role in the negotiations for a comprehensive peace settlement. In this regard, Ireland recognizes the role of the Palestine Liberation Organization in representing the Palestinian people.

"Both parties agreed that an essential aspect of a solution to the Palestinian problem was withdrawal of Israel from all territory occupied since the 1967 conflict, including Jerusalem, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions."

159. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher spelled out the position of the Federal Republic of Germany in a statement made in Cairo in March. The position of the Federal Republic of Germany is based on the idea that the Palestinian people have a right to self-determination and a right to a homeland and that the Palestinian people alone are entitled to decide about their future and who is to represent them.

160. I think that it will be sufficient to recall here that the Foreign Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, Lord Carrington, told the House of Lords on 17 March: "It would be a great mistake to think you can get a settlement without account being taken of the Palestine Liberation Organization". That was said even after Yigal Yadin, the Deputy Premier of Israel, had "warned Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on 12 March that any outside interference in the Arab-Israeli peace process would have 'very crucial effects' ". This quotation is

taken from a report of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency dated 13 March. I think that Her Majesty's Government has had plenty of warnings and threats from the Zionists: Begin, Shamir, and now Yadin.

161. Even the United States has recognized that there would be no comprehensive peace in the Middle East until the Palestinian problem, in all its aspects, is resolved. That was a statement made by my colleague—if he permits me to call him so—the representative of the United States, on 1 March [2203rd meeting].

162. By recalling all these positive and sincere developments, developments and positions which are constructive and will definitely help the peace process, we wish only to register our great appreciation for these moves and endeavours. As a matter of fact, Chairman Yasser Arafat expressed his high esteem for the moves by President Giscard d'Estaing and by Chancellor Kreisky.

163. However, these positive and constructive moves and positions of the international community are obstructed by the Camp David process and, in particular, by the United States as the engineer in planting mines along the road to peace. President Carter is not satisfied with constantly denying its inalienable rights to the Palestinian people; his Administration is financing the execution of its plans against peace. After the vote on 1 March on resolution 465 (1980), when the United States voted together with the rest of the world and in conformity with its declared position that Israeli practices obstruct peace, President Carter immediately tried to disavow the United States position. I honestly wish he had the same courage to apologize to the Iranian people for the complicity of the United States, and in particular of the Central Intelligence Agency, in the crimes committed by the Shah against the Iranian people. He would have spared everybody, especially the hostages, all that anxiety and secured their freedom. What is more, he would have liberated himself from his self-imposed solitary confinement in the Rose Garden and could have taken an active role in his campaign.

164. I seem to have deviated from the subject of the financing of the anti-peace projects. After 1 March, the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the United States rewarded Israel on 25 March for its obstruction of peace. It adopted an amendment to the foreign aid bill by which Israel would receive \$200 million in additional military credits and an increase in its economic grant. That \$200 million was in addition to another \$200 million granted a month earlier, I think at the time of the visit of the War Minister, Weizman. President Carter felt that it was in the interest of his campaign to affirm that Israel had been granted more than \$10 billion during the short period of his tenure of the presidency.

165. On 1 March the Council adopted an historic resolution, resolution 465 (1980), by which it unani-

mously accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979). The Council unanimously accepted the fact that the Israeli policy in the occupied territories, particularly in the West Bank, had largely contributed to a deterioration of the situation and that it was incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area. The Council also unanimously accepted the following conclusion, which is to be found in the Commission's report:

"In complete disregard of United Nations resolutions and Security Council decisions, Israel is still pursuing its systematic and relentless process of colonization of the occupied territories. This is evidenced by the stated policy of constructing additional settlements in the most viable parts of the West Bank and by the expansion of others already in existence, as well as the long-term planning of still more settlements." [S/13679, para. 46].

This Council is now of the opinion

"that the Israeli Government has to bear responsibility for the settlement programme, which is being implemented as an official policy" [*ibid.*, para. 48].

166. After the unanimous adoption of resolution 465 (1980), the immediate reply by Begin and his gang—and I am not referring to the Gang of Five in the United States, but to the criminals in Tel Aviv—was the seizure of 1,100 acres of Arab property in Jerusalem and the authorization to establish a new settlement in Arab Hebron. Whether it is a question of a *yeshiva* or a college or whatever it is called, that move in fact means the transfer of a hundred new Jewish families to residence in the homes of Arab Palestinians, who are Moslems guarding the sanctity of a shrine, the tomb of the Patriarch Abraham. To top it all, another criminal, another Zionist racist criminal, who did not approve of even the Camp David accords because they contained too many concessions—I am referring to Shamir, this notorious leader of the criminal Stern Gang—is now the Foreign Minister of racist Zionist Israel. I am sure that Count Bernadotte is now turning over in his grave. We all know who killed the United Nations Mediator.

167. Yes, while the world is moving in the right direction for the achievement of peace, racist Zionist Israel is nullifying even so-called autonomy—and that is very important. Even this so-called autonomy is being nullified through the practices and policies in the occupied territories. Time will drag on and on

and the world will be drugged by beautiful words of hope, while more and more Israelis and other Jews are transferred to residence in Arab homes and while more and more Palestinians are subjected to persecution and deportation.

168. An official at the White House is reported to have summed up Begin's policy as "throwing carpet tacks on the road". Thus again, while the world is moving in the right direction, Begin is financed by Carter in throwing carpet tacks on the road, with Sadat an encouraging onlooker. The latter is happy with the bilateral treaty, happy to have his flag on the Egyptian Embassy in Israel. But certainly, I do not think he was really happy to see a million Palestinian flags in Cairo the day he received the credentials of Begin's envoy. The Egyptian people were there to tell Sadat, loudly and clearly, "we shall not betray the cause of the Palestinians".

169. The Security Council has a duty, a responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is empowered to redress injustice. It is legally committed to restoring their rights to the Palestinians and has the power to do so. It is in a position to decide on the recommendations of the General Assembly. This is Holy Week and the Council cannot permit itself to sit on the pavement and play the role of Pontius Pilate. It must not. It must act. It is entrusted with the task of sparing humanity the scourge of war, and peace starts in Jerusalem and in Palestine.

170. Before concluding, I wish simply to rebut and to deny what has been attributed to Chairman Arafat as reported in *El Mundo* and read out today by the representative of Tel Aviv.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first to Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 35.*

² Luke 13:34.

³ Luke 19:43,44.

⁴ Matthew 21:12,13.

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, 31st meeting, para. 23.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 17th meeting, para. 24.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 10th meeting, paras. 35 to 37.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 8th meeting, para. 27.

⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 29.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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