

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY



**SECURITY COUNCIL**

**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

**2200<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 25 FEBRUARY 1980

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2200) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
(a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);	
(b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802) .....	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.

## 2200th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 25 February 1980, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Peter FLORIN  
(German Democratic Republic).

*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/2200)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
  - (a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);
  - (b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

- (a) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13801);
- (b) Letter dated 15 February 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13802)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2199th meeting, I invite the representative of Jordan to take a place at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table and I invite the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) took a place at the Council table, Mr. Roa-Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Filali (Morocco), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table and Mr. Kane (Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Pakistan and Viet Nam in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bouzarbia (Algeria), Mr. Naik (Pakistan) and Mrs. Nguyen Ngoc Dung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, permanent observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. MAKSoud: I wish to express to you Mr. President, and to the members of the Council the appreciation of the Arab League for the invitation to address the Council on an issue of profound concern to the Arab nation, to the League and the Arab peoples. I wish to take this opportunity to express to you, Sir, our esteem for your friendly country and people, with whom the Arab people have close relations, and for you personally because of the exemplary manner in which you are fulfilling your responsibilities.

5. The report of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) makes it very clear, and indeed incontestable, that Israel's policy of colonization has largely contributed

“to a deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories and that it is incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area” [S/13679, para. 45].

That is reiterated in one form or another in every paragraph of the report's conclusions, as, for instance, when it states that Israel's settlement policy is

“incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area and that it is bound to lead to a further deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories” [*ibid.*, para. 51].

6. I shall not belabour the evidence that has been submitted to the Commission and to the Council. It is conclusive, irrefutable and complete. If Israel had sought to challenge the evidence submitted to the Commission, it had every opportunity to do so. If it had been able to disprove the evidence or at least some of it, it had every opportunity to do so. If it had any justification for modifying the conclusions, it had at all stages of the Commission's work every opportunity to do so. I refer the Council to paragraphs 15, 19, 23, 38 and 39 of the Commission's report. Instead, Israel refused to collaborate with the Commission, obstructed its tasks and challenged its mandate. It did so because Israel considered that, since it could not answer the mounting criticism, it would wait for the moment when the Council convened to attack the credibility of this body, to heap insults on it—and on the United Nations as an organization—and to pursue diversionary tactics while accusing the Council of using them. Was that clever? Perhaps. Was it dangerous? Of course. Why?

7. What the Council is witnessing is an evolving pattern in the treatment by Israel of the Council's functions and deliberations and, ultimately, of its mandate. Knowing in advance what built-in constraints exist in view of the veto power of the United States, or the threat of its use, Israel hardens its position, considering each remark critical of its behaviour indicative of enmity. Israel is further undertaking to create a situation in which the United States would function in the light of its convenience rather than its convictions. When that is achieved and then communicated, or at least hinted at, the thrust of what ought to be done will be deflected to what can be done. When Israel, in view of the particular role of the United States in this case, finds that the United States has defined the parameters of its flexibility on issues pertaining to the question of Palestine, or any phase of it, then it reverts to its studied contempt of what takes place in the Council.

8. In general, what ought to be done in the light of the evidence becomes a question of how best to accommodate the position of the United States and reconcile it with the collective judgement of the international community. The issue then becomes whether to deplore or to condemn Israel's settlement policy, not whether to condemn Israel and impose sanctions

on it as provided in the Charter, in as much as the colonizing policy of Israel is deemed objectively a serious threat to peace in the region, as is spelled out in paragraph 57 of the Commission's report, which states:

“In view of the magnitude of the problem of settlements and its direct effect on the over-all deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories and, therefore, its implications for peace in the region, as well as for international peace and security, the Security Council should keep the situation under constant review.”

9. Hence, we end up with an annual or a semi-annual exercise in which the Council deals with such a grave threat to peace by merely expressing concern or deploring it, while Israel proceeds, in the mean time, to establish new settlements, to expand existing ones and to introduce new laws permitting settlement not only around the Arab Palestinian towns and cities but within them.

10. There has been a universal awareness of the dangers inherent in Israel's policy of creeping annexation. The vivisection of the Palestinian body politic is pursued so systematically that Israel shows no signs of relenting in or abandoning this expansionist process. Even Israel's use of such terms as “Jews' right to settle” in the “land of Israel” carries ominous signs of the realization of a design of annexation. The term “land of Israel” has no legal or political meaning except in the lexicon of Israel and of the Zionist movement. It includes the territories occupied in the West Bank and Gaza. If—as the Mayor of Al-Khalil (Hebron), Mr. Qawasma, whom the Israeli authorities have prevented from attending the Council's meeting, said—Israel asserts the rights of Jews to settle in Hebron, why not apply the same right to the Palestinians to settle in their homes—homes in the literal meaning of the term: in Jaffa, Lydda, Safad, Acre, Haifa, and so on? The pious protest of Israel that the international community's preventing Jews from settling wherever they want is racist could be a valid protest if it were not for the Israeli record replete with the institutionalized exclusion of Palestinian Arabs from their homes inside usurped Palestine, or what is called Israel. The racist entity not only resorts to double standards, it is blind to any standard of values except its own. Preventing Israelis from settling in Hebron is, according to this lopsided logic, racist; but forcibly preventing Palestinian Arabs from returning to their homes inside Israel is a matter of course.

11. The Security Council and various other United Nations bodies are by now familiar with the semantic acrobacy resorted to by Israel to shield its colonizing pursuits. It would therefore serve no useful purpose to analyse them. For many years it has been possible to discern a measure of permissiveness in dealing with Israel, especially in many Western societies.

What may be termed the guilt complex of many Western States has been manipulated by Israel to insulate it from questions. Sceptical remarks about its aggression, expansionism, colonization and violation of human rights and United Nations resolutions have been treated by Israel as lingering anti-Semitism. To shield its colonizing policy from scrutiny, it has resorted to a form of intellectual terrorism and diplomatic blackmail.

12. In the West generally, and more recently in the United States, public opinion has been silenced. Israeli apologists and Zionists have threatened to mar the reputation of any person who dares shed light on the behaviour pattern or policy of Israel. The United Nations itself has not been spared this conjured wrath. However, as evidence of Israel's aggressiveness, expansionism, racism and colonization has become more clear, visible and unmistakable, Israel has termed every criticism of its behaviour an act of endangering its security. The colonial settlements have thus been explained either as the fulfilment of metaphysical aspirations and theological tenets or as security measures for Israel. Which Israel? Israel never answers because the self-perception of Israel is that it is a State that is still becoming rather than a State that is. Hence, what many tend to treat as the existing State of Israel is, for Israel, the embryo of the State to be.

13. Unless this reality is grasped, Israel's behaviour pattern and its colonizing policies will not be clearly understood or adequately dealt with. The reality is that Israel considers all investigations of its settlement policies, all criticism of its colonizing process, all condemnations of its contempt for the United Nations Charter, resolutions and activities to be mere interruptions of its grand design to annex the occupied territories in their entirety and destroy whatever potential exists for the exercise of Palestinian self-determination. The reality is that Israel's appetite for the territories in Gaza and the West Bank has not been quenched. What Israel wants is for its plans of annexation to go unchallenged and uninterrupted. If that is not possible, then it wants to create new facts, create new colonies, break the framework of the Palestinian entity and emasculate the world body so far as that body's ability and, later on, its will to come to grips with the very essence of Israel's objectives are concerned.

14. Therein lie the dangers inherent in the Camp David agreements. We have witnessed the way in which Israel, in pursuit of its contempt of the authority of the Council and its challenge to the deliberations taking place in the light of the Commission's report, is interjecting the Camp David agreements and the so-called autonomy negotiations as a bar to this body's fulfilling its responsibilities. Maliciously and erroneously, Israel describes the negotiations it is undertaking with Egyptian authorities and the United States as the only "serious" ones. What is taking place here is consequently unworthy of a response.

15. Tomorrow, 26 February, while this body is deliberating on the colonizing policy in the occupied territories and is hearing elaborate evidence on the scope of the threat that this policy constitutes to the peace of the region, an exchange of ambassadors between Israel and Sadat's Government will take place. What a travesty, and how ironic!

16. It has often been said by some of our American friends that the Camp David agreements and the subsequent treaty between Israel and President Sadat will render Israel more amenable to the international standards of behaviour; the so-called peace treaty will constrain Israel to give up the pursuit of its expansionist objectives. "Give it a chance," apologists for the treaty said. But since the treaty was signed on the lawns of the White House, with unprecedented fanfare and false euphoria, Israel—as the Commission's report details and underlines—has established new colonies, pursued more vigorously its annexationist policies and initiated programmes, policies and legislation that would make the so-called autonomy talks a mockery even for those who are engaged in negotiating it.

17. The Camp David agreements and the so-called autonomy negotiations constituted—instead of incentives that would inhibit and restrain Israel's propensity for aggression, expansion and colonization—a licence for Israel to intensify its annexationist policies, as we have witnessed in south Lebanon and in the West Bank and Gaza. What did the other signatories of the Camp David agreements do about these Israeli transgressions that took place after the signing of the agreements, after the signing of the so-called peace treaty? True, they protested and even said that the settlements were illegal. But the process continued uninterrupted. It was and remains a pathetic sight: Israel defiantly implanting new colonies, mutilating the body politic of the areas it occupies and creating the new facts to ensure that at the terminal point of the so-called autonomy negotiations there would not be any viable entity to enjoy even the municipal level of administrative authority these autonomy negotiations envisage.

18. It was pathetic to see our leading Arab State's authorities incapable of using Egypt's great leverage to arrest the settlements policies by merely stating that negotiations would stop if the implantation of settlements did not stop. The diplomatic day-dreaming generated by the Camp David agreements cornered both Egyptian and United States diplomacy and caused its dysfunctioning because of the studied intransigence of a pampered Israel more eager to pursue what it has set out to achieve than to cater to ego trips of its cosignatories.

19. The equation that governs the interrelations of the three parties to the Camp David agreements is not of major concern and relevance to the deliberations of the Council. What is relevant is that Israel and, to a lesser extent, both the other partners seek to render the mechanism of the Camp David agreements an

alternative vehicle to the United Nations. True, this attempt will not succeed because the so-called peace treaty has become a step away from peace instead of the promised step towards peace. Yet what must be pointed out here is that the modalities which the Camp David agreements introduced have been aimed at undermining the credibility, the mandate, the authority and the effectiveness of the United Nations and, most recently, of the Security Council. This is too grave a precedent to be allowed to go unnoticed and undealt with.

20. We are being told that the United States did declare these settlements illegal. The Egyptian declaration considered them to be in violation of the spirit of the Camp David agreements. What was done? The United States did not stop its arms supplies to Israel; it did not freeze the financial assistance programmes, which amount in their aggregate to nearly half a billion dollars for the settlement programme that Israel is carrying out in the occupied territories. Egypt's President could not wait; he did not postpone his decision to send an ambassador; instead, he expedited the exchange and lost the last of his levers—if indeed he had ever intended to use any.

21. What is germane to the issue before this body concerning the Camp David agreements is that the parties involved are eager to convince the world community that they are seriously dealing with the Palestinian question. Unfortunately, there are people in the United States, and to a much lesser extent in certain countries of Western Europe, who believe that this can be so. Israel and President Sadat are, each for their own reasons, hoping that those people will keep this illusion. Israel resorts to insulting the United Nations and the Security Council—as its representative did last Friday when this series of meetings opened.

22. Why has the League of Arab States vigorously opposed the Camp David agreements and, subsequently, the so-called Sadat-Israel peace treaty? The aspects which are most germane to the deliberations here are those related to the so-called "autonomy" talks.

23. Autonomy is, as is well known, an administrative formula and has no legal, constitutional or political meaning or connotation. Autonomy as an objective is therefore pre-emptive of sovereignty. It forecloses the Palestinians' right to an independent State, and, by implication, it denies the Palestinians the right to national self-determination.

24. When the end result of negotiations is stated to be autonomy, even if it is described as full autonomy, then the Camp David agreements constitute a clear negation of the Charter and of all the United Nations resolutions that have spelled out clearly and precisely the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Then all statements to the contrary are designed to

distract us from and to cover up the real plan to deny the Palestinians not only their right to statehood but also their existing status of peoplehood. That is the licence which the Camp David agreements gave Israel to proceed with the colonizing process which the Commission's report rightly concluded constituted a threat to peace in the region. How?

25. By confining the target of negotiations to the objective of autonomy, the parties to the Camp David agreements have acceded to Israel's plan of keeping sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza pending. The deliberate equivocation on this central question at best puts the occupying Power on an equal footing with the Palestinian people in staking a claim to sovereignty over Palestinian territories. Israel's military occupation gave it a logistic, strategic and administrative advantage in making functional its claim to exercise the prerogatives of sovereignty. Israel has confiscated and annexed more than 30 per cent of the West Bank. So, even when the option of autonomy is being dangled, it covers less than 70 per cent of the occupied territories, and in a region criss-crossed with military and paramilitary settlements that renders meaningless whatever may be the outcome of the autonomy talks, making it an insult to international intelligence.

26. Therefore we see how the establishment of new settlements, the control over water resources and the various annexationist measures can go hand in hand with the so-called autonomy negotiations which the United States is sponsoring and which Egypt's rulers eagerly pursue. It is clear, in our view, that what the Council is dealing with today is something more than what the Commission's report concludes and recommends. It has to deal with the Zionist ideology which has made Israel the main cause of instability in the region and the serious threat to peace it constitutes.

27. The Council must ask itself: is it enough to express concern about Israel's obvious violations? Is it enough to deplore? Is it enough to condemn? Should not this body begin to think of imposing the sanctions that will deter Israel from the pursuit of its ignoble expansionist and colonizing objectives? Until when must Israel be treated as an exception to the rules of law, both civil and international? Does not the Council realize that, like all racist entities, Israel considers itself answerable to nobody, while the world must consider itself accountable to it? Is it not time that Israel's occupation of a privileged position be terminated? No privilege is enjoyed except at the expense of denying somebody his rights. For how long can Israel's racist privileges be tolerated when that means denying the Palestinian people their natural and national rights?

28. Those questions can no longer remain unanswered. The challenges they pose can no longer remain pending. The United States, the super-Power that underwrites—at times against its convictions and,

imately, its interests—the policies and objectives of Israel, should no longer provide the ultimate protective cover for an Israel playing havoc with the chances for a genuine, just and comprehensive peace in the region. We say that because many member States of the Arab League have close and friendly relations with the United States, but are alarmed at the level of liberate inconsistency between utterance and performance when it comes to United States policies concerning Israel's obvious violations. By diluting the resolutions that articulate the real consensus of its body, the United States serves notice on Israel that it can pursue its objectives without fearing the sanctions necessary to make it comply with the minimum standards of international behaviour.

9. We in the Arab League are conscious of the discrepancy that exists between the political convenience of the United States—especially during election years—and the diplomatic convictions which do not differ substantially from the conclusions of the report. That is why the Arab Summit Conference, which met in November in Tunis, coupled with its severe censure of United States policies in the Middle East took a decision to intensify the Arab campaign of information and awareness among Americans on the real issues involved in the Middle East conflict—the assumption being that, although greatly disappointed with United States policies on those issues, we have not reached either disillusionment or a state of rupture in our communications.

10. We are stating this because we know that the principal cause of Israel's capacity to defy the international consensus has been the United States' reluctance to draw the logical conclusions from its own assessment and evaluation of the Israeli violations and colonizing policies. In addition to finding itself boxed in by the mechanism of the Camp David agreements, the United States has given a dispensation to Israel to project every minute and minor compliance with the dictates of the international will as a major concession or "sacrifice". That is how the partial withdrawal from Sinai is being projected, and thus Israel is able not only to buy time but also to concentrate on intensifying its colonizing policies in the West Bank and Gaza, as the Commission's report confirms.

11. The cycle that allows Israel to get away with its violations and contempt of the international consensus cannot remain unchecked. The clear-cut nature of the Commission's report, its conclusions and its recommendations render imperative the need to impose on Israel the necessary sanctions to make it desist from the pursuit of policies that threaten the peace and stability of a very vital region.

12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is Mr. Falilou Kane, Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

33. Mr. KANE (Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council for allowing me to speak in this debate in my capacity as Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

34. May I also most warmly congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this important organ of the United Nations. I am sure that your experience and talents as a seasoned diplomat will be of the greatest use to us in this debate. We are fortunate indeed that this debate is being held under your presidency, because the German Democratic Republic, your country, has always supported the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People in its efforts to promote a just solution of the question of Palestine.

35. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Jacques Leprette, for the admirable way in which he conducted the Council's business during the month of January, a particularly difficult period.

36. Once again the Council must deal with Israel's serious violations of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the threats that those violations constitute to international peace and security. The Government of that country has just authorized Israeli citizens to settle in the very heart of the Arab city of Al-Khalil, which is in the Arab territories illegally occupied since 1967. This new violation of international law by Israel is further proof of that country's determination to defy our organization by continuing its settlement policy in the illegally occupied Arab territories. That policy is meeting with almost unanimous condemnation within the international community. Even the countries regarded as staunch friends of Israel have declared that such a policy is in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949<sup>1</sup> and a serious obstacle to peace.

37. It is because the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People considers that Israel's affronts to the Organization cannot continue without gravely endangering international peace and security that it believes the latest events in Al-Khalil call for careful consideration by the Council and the subsequent adoption of effective measures. In this respect Israel's refusal to authorize the mayor of Al-Khalil to respond to the Council's invitation is deplorable. In the Committee's opinion, that act is an implicit admission of guilt, for why else should Israel so fear the testimony of the Mayor of Al-Khalil?

38. On 22 March 1979 the Council, following repeated infringements of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian

people by Israel, decided to establish a commission of inquiry "to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem" [resolution 446 (1979)]. In spite of the innumerable obstacles which Israel sought to place in its way, that Commission was able to discharge its mandate and in July 1979 to submit a first objective and precise report to the Council [S/13450 and Add.1].

39. The Committee, which Israel has boycotted as it did the Commission, must once again condemn the lack of co-operation on the part of the Israeli authorities with the members of the Commission. By that attempted boycott Israel seeks to discredit the results of the Commission's work. However, no one is deceived by this sleight of hand. If the Israeli leaders are really sincere when they state that the settlements do not constitute an obstacle to peace, what have they to fear from a commission of inquiry? One must admit that, if they had nothing to hide, if they did not openly violate human rights in the occupied territories, they would have no difficulty in receiving the Commission.

40. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to the representatives of Portugal, Bolivia and Zambia for the quality and the thoroughness of their two reports. Their concern to seek the truth impartially was borne out by the endeavours they made to obtain the points of view of all the parties concerned, including Israel. It is not their fault if Israel has chosen to boycott all the efforts of various bodies of the United Nations to shed light on the treatment of the populations of the occupied Arab territories.

41. Israel has on various pretexts boycotted the work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979). Therefore, it has become clear that it is not those United Nations bodies that are partial but Israel, which fears the truth may come to light.

42. The consideration in July 1979 of the first report of the Commission gave the members of the Council the opportunity to realize that Israel was undeniably violating the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people by implementing what the report described as a wilful, systematic and large-scale process of establishing settlements in the occupied territories. That report showed clearly that the policy followed by Israel in the occupied Arab territories was aimed at effecting radical and irreversible demographic, cultural, social and religious changes.

43. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which had constantly been providing proof that Israel's policy in the occupied Arab territories was designed to deny the

Palestinian people its right to self-determination and sovereignty, could not but express its approval of the conclusions in the Commission's report.

44. The Committee had also noted with satisfaction that the Council had, in its resolution 452 (1979), almost unanimously endorsed the recommendations of the Commission and called upon the Government and the people of Israel, on an urgent basis, to cease the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. Unfortunately, we are bound to observe that Israel took no notice of that resolution. On the contrary, it has stepped up its violations of the national rights of the Palestinian people by authorizing the establishment of new settlements, by arresting eminent Palestinians, including the Mayor of Nablus, who were "guilty" of expressing the feelings of their people, and, finally, by exercising harsh repression with the aim of dissuading the Palestinian people in the occupied territories from exercising the right freely to express its opinion, which is conferred upon it by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

45. The conclusions contained in the Commission's second report are quite edifying in this respect. Since the adoption of resolution 452 (1979), the Commission has noted that the Israeli authorities have confiscated 40,000 dunums of privately owned lands in order to allow for the expansion of settlements in the West Bank. Those authorities have extended and strengthened existing Israeli settlements. They have lifted all legal restrictions on a massive transfer of the Israeli population in the occupied territories by authorizing Israeli citizens to acquire land in those territories. Thus, at this time, the Government of Israel has, using many different pretexts and specious arguments, confiscated 31.4 per cent of all land in the West Bank.

46. It is daily becoming clearer that Israel's policy in the occupied Arab territories is one of gradual annexation through the continued Judaization of the demographic, economic, cultural and religious character of those territories. Thus, the Holy City of Jerusalem has now been surrounded by Jewish districts with the clear objective of separating it from the rest of the West Bank and accentuating its Jewish character. However, because Jerusalem is the meeting ground for the three great monotheistic religions, it should be able to preserve its unique historical and religious character. At the last meeting of the Council, the representative of Morocco, speaking on behalf of the Islamic Group, said how ardently the Moselm world aspired to seeing the city of Jerusalem returned to Arab sovereignty.

47. Another aspect of the Israeli policy of settlement in the occupied Arab territories is the implementation of all kinds of economic, legislative or financial measures aimed at inducing the Arab inhabitants to abandon their traditional occupations and leave their



homeland. That applies to the Israeli Government's measures aimed at reducing the water resources of the Palestinian population. Such measures can obviously have only disastrous effects on the agricultural activities of that population. If the Council does not act swiftly and firmly, the Arab inhabitants are threatened with progressive ruin and are in danger of being forced to abandon their land to the Israeli settlers.

48. The violations by Israel of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national sovereignty are nothing new, but they are a constant source of concern to the international community and they raise serious doubts among the friends of Israel about that State's desire for peace. Indeed, recent events in Al-Khalil have shocked international public opinion. By deciding to promote settlement in that holy city despite the protests of the Arab population, Israel is in danger of exacerbating tension in the area and causing bloody confrontations.

49. What is happening today in Al-Khalil is not, in the Committee's view, an isolated event. In fact, it is one of a series of systematic violations of the Charter and of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949<sup>1</sup>. It is a deliberate decision to destroy the identity of the Palestinian people and to deprive it of its most fundamental human rights. Above all, the intention is to transform the West Bank into a bantustan, making the Palestinians strangers in their own land, and covertly to annex Arab lands.

50. Israel, in this field, is following in the footsteps of South Africa, whose infamous policy of bantustanization is designed to strip the indigenous populations of their most sacred rights. Just as it has rejected the policy of bantustanization, the international community will oppose any application of a similar policy in Palestine.

51. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has given me a mandate to express its deep concern to the Council. Indeed, it is the duty of the Security Council, as the main organ for the maintenance of international peace and security, to take the required decisions, in accordance with its powers under the Charter, in order to put an end to the Israeli policy of covert annexation of Arab territories. In this respect, the Committee feels that the Council must resolutely condemn the latest measures taken by Israel in Al-Khalil and reaffirm that the Israeli policy of establishing settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967 is illegal and is an obstacle to the attainment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

52. The Committee also feels that the mandate of the Commission must be extended so that it may keep the Council informed of developments in this field.

53. The members of the Council, who have often expressed their concern about the violations of human rights in Africa, in Latin America and in other parts of the world, should understand that the question of Palestine is of the same nature, that the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people cannot be continually violated, while the Council is reduced to impotence, and that international peace and security cannot be perpetually threatened by the actions of a Member State of the United Nations, a Member which, furthermore, was entirely the creation of the Organization.

54. The non-aligned countries, at their last summit conference in Havana, had occasion to consider the question of the blocking of the Council where the recovery by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights was concerned. Those countries intend to bring the matter to the General Assembly in special session if the Council continues to be reduced to impotence. As the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Mathias of Portugal, stated last Friday:

"We wish to continue to believe that it is possible for reason and common sense to prevail. That, in the ultimate analysis, is the message which we bring to the Council." [2199th meeting, para. 29.]

55. If Israel has lost its reason and flung aside all restraint, the Council, which is the body responsible for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world, must fully assume its responsibilities under the relevant provisions of the Charter. It is to be hoped, however, that wisdom will prevail and that, in the face of the persistent and flagrant defiance of this body by Israel, the Council will finally be able to take specific and effective measures to find a way out of this situation, which seriously harms the prestige of the Organization.

56. Mr. ESSAAFI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The situation in the occupied Arab territories was already considered by the Council in March and July of last year, in the light of the incontrovertible facts of which it was informed, particularly those contained in the first report of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979). Nevertheless, the situation has deteriorated considerably and has taken on alarming proportions which justify these meetings of the Council and necessitate immediate and effective action, on its part.

57. My delegation is aghast and filled with indignation at the intolerable actions of the Israeli Government and by the heavy exactions it makes daily from Palestinians. Such facts have been duly reported by the representative of Jordan and the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who have proved, with facts and figures as corroboration, the seriousness and the extent of the repressive policy of the occupying Power. Their statements, which have been reliably documented, have given us a complete picture

of the present situation, a gloomy picture, which illustrates the expansionist policy of Israel and reveals its designs, which are dangerous for the region both in the long term and in the short term.

58. A number of these designs were unmasked in the Commission's second report, which the Chairman of the Commission, Ambassador Mathias of Portugal presented in such a clear and eloquent fashion at the Council's last meeting. The part of the report describing the way in which the situation has developed since the adoption of resolution 452 (1979) provides us with new facts, all equally serious, that cannot but once again arouse the anxiety and indignation of the international community.

59. First, the Israeli occupation authorities have proceeded to confiscate further private Arab land amounting to several thousand hectares to permit the expansion of the settlements already in existence.

60. Secondly, the decision taken by the Israeli Government in September last authorizes Israeli citizens to acquire land in occupied areas belonging to Palestinians, who, in the grip of terror, have no choice but to submit and comply.

61. Thirdly, the intensive exploitation of water resources by the occupying authorities and their diversion of other traditional water resources in the occupied territories exclusively to serve Jewish settlers have brought the Arab inhabitants and land-owners to the brink of ruin and destitution, since they are deprived of the means of irrigating their farms and their plantations and are thus forced either to leave or to suffer the humiliation and degradation of working as hired hands on their own land.

62. Fourthly, the planning, construction and establishment of fresh settlements of the kind contained in the master plan established by the World Zionist Organization [*see S/13582 of 22 October 1979*—a plan whose existence has been corroborated by various sources—is now being carried out by the Israeli Government.

63. Furthermore, the Israeli authorities do not shrink from deviating from their own laws and infringing on the legality of the institutions of their own country, as has been shown by the case of the colony of Qaddum, which the High Court of Justice of Israel declared illegal. Despite the verdict of the High Court, the Israeli authorities decided to shift the settlement a little, though their action remained illegal.

64. Those facts, which are listed in the Commission's report are in themselves extremely enlightening as to the purposes, whether covert or overt, of the resolutely expansionist policy pursued by the Government of Israel, a policy that both scorns and spurns international conventions. Furthermore, the Commission's conclusions and recommendations leave no doubt as

to the obstinate determination of the occupying Power to continue its repressive policy, despite its having been condemned by the international community and despite the resolutions of the United Nations.

65. Israel has deliberately chosen to be ostracized by the international community. The number of countries that condemn it, that have rejected it or broken off diplomatic relations with it, is very eloquent in this respect. In this, only South Africa can be compared with Israel.

66. I should like to pay a tribute to the members of the Commission for their skill and objectivity and the remarkable work they have carried out in order to serve truth and justice, despite Israel's complete refusal to co-operate with them and despite its deliberately negative attitude, which should be resolutely condemned. To justify that attitude, an attitude which is hardly surprising to us, Israel bases its argument on its non-recognition of resolution 446 (1979). Thus, it accepts or rejects resolutions according to whether or not they suit it, and tramples underfoot Article 25 of the Charter. That is further proof of the total contempt in which Israel holds the Organization and of the need for the Council to ponder the inevitable conclusions that arise therefrom.

67. Since the Commission's second report was placed before the Council further serious events have occurred in the occupied Arab territories. As an example, let me mention only what happened recently in the Arab city of Al-Khalil. In addition to the decision of the Israeli Government to authorize Israelis to settle in the very heart of that Arab city, for days its population has been subjected to a particularly stringent curfew. Collective sanctions have been imposed on it because of the murder of an Israeli soldier. Thus it has been subjected to extreme brutality and most inhuman treatment by the occupying military authorities.

68. Who can forbear thinking of similar treatment meted out by the Nazis to Jews during the Second World War? The similarity is striking. It is repugnant and sad. To the credit of the Jews, there are, fortunately, here and there, and in Israel also, some who have branded the Israeli Government with infamy for its policy of settlement in occupied Arab territories and its behaviour towards the Palestinians. The Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, Emmanuel Jakobovitz, echoing others equally anxious about the future of Israel, such as Nahum Goldmann, has urged the Government of Israel to give up its expansionist policy and recognize a free and independent Palestinian State as its neighbour. A few days ago, in London, he stated:

"The key to peace in the Near East cannot be found in Sinai but rather in the relations between Israel and the Palestinians. It is precisely there that we are going to win or lose, because it is there that the fate of Israel will be decided."

Should we regard that declaration as a diversionary tactic to distract international attention from other events, such as we were accused of by the representative of Israel on Friday last? Of course, Israel will never think that the time is ripe to consider the situation prevailing in the occupied Arab territories, because its conscience is not easy. Far from it.

69. The policy of the Israeli Government is a colonialist policy in its most reprehensible form, because it is not aimed only at enslaving a people and exploiting it but also at expelling it from its country and taking its place. This policy is designed to turn that people into a stateless group of refugees doomed to eternal exile, for ever cut off from its roots and its homeland. Even worse, the Palestinians who live in the occupied territories are subject to daily harassment and extortion, which affects their national character and is harmful to their religion and its Holy Places, the purpose being to destroy their identity and to cast them into the melting-pot of ubiquitous Judaism. Those who refuse to bow are expelled, and the rest are enslaved.

70. Furthermore, humiliation is visited on the Palestinian not only as a person but also as a believer because he is the impotent witness of the desecration of the Holy Place, the great Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi Mosque. That is in addition to the damage done by the Israelis to the Holy Places of Jerusalem in order to serve an unbridled Judaization and it affects what is most profound and most sacred not only to the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories but also to the hundreds of millions of Moslems throughout the world. It affects both their faith and their spiritual heritage.

71. Is this a policy of peace? Israel is doing everything it can to prevent the coming of peace. A just and equitable peace that takes account of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence in a free and sovereign State has been deliberately thwarted by the Israeli Government. The only choice open to the Palestinian people is that of struggling by every means in its power to recover its sovereignty and its dignity.

72. The situation is extremely alarming. As has been frequently demonstrated an official policy of colonization has been unremittingly pursued by Israel since 1967. Israel is implacable in the way it constantly pursues the modification of the legal status, the geographical nature and the demographic composition of the occupied territories. New colonies have been set up. More lands, including the most fertile areas, have been illegally expropriated. Water resources have been diverted in order to quell a population that is doomed to despair, Palestinians who are daily expelled from their homeland or arbitrarily detained. All this is done in contempt of the numerous resolutions of the United Nations and of international law, in particular of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, to which the State of Israel is a party.

73. This is, indeed, a weighty charge-sheet of actions that are contrary to the provisions of the Charter, the most fundamental principles of international law and the most elementary standards of international morality. Consequently, it is necessary, indeed urgent, that the Council put an end to those actions. It is high time for it to take specific and effective steps aimed at putting an end to that policy of *faits accomplis* and to those actions that threaten international peace and security.

74. The representative of Israel has claimed that the present debate is designed to impede the peace efforts. We are all aware that nothing could impede the achievement of peace more than the continued policy of his Government and its repressive practices within the occupied Arab territories. We cannot over-stress the reason that has led to such a situation, namely, that the Palestinians, relegated as they have been to the status of refugees for decades now, have had their most fundamental and legitimate rights denied them.

75. Since the necessary reparation of this flagrant injustice is at the heart of any solution to the problems in that area, it is clear that half-measures are not enough to ensure respect for the aspirations of the Palestinian people. That people, which has long suffered from oppression and injustice, aspires only to peace, genuine peace, a peace based on justice and dignity, a peace that will restore to it its national rights and enable it to live as a free and sovereign people among all the other peoples in that area.

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

77. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): I should like to thank the Council for having offered me this opportunity to set forth the views of my Government concerning the negative consequences of the measures and actions taken by the Israeli Government against the populations of the occupied Arab territories.

78. It gives me great pleasure to greet you, Mr. President, as the representative of the German Democratic Republic, with which my country has been developing friendly relations and all-round co-operation, and to wish you every success in discharging the responsible function of President of the Council for the month of February.

79. The consideration of this problem by the Council confirms the fact that the crisis in the Middle East is continuing with relentless intensity and that new foci of crisis are constantly emerging in the area, thus increasing the possibility of a wider conflict. This confirms the fact that peace and stability in this region can be achieved only through a comprehensive settlement of all aspects of the crisis in the Middle

East, and especially the solution of the Palestinian question, on the basis of the creation of a national State of the Palestinian people. Any other approach not only does not solve but exacerbates the crisis in its entirety and postpones its solution.

80. The problem under consideration in the Council has assumed added significance in the present complex relations characterized by general and disquieting international tension. The ever more frequent cases of military intervention and interference in internal affairs, of various forms of attack on the freedom and independence of sovereign States, in particular of the non-aligned countries, and the unabated arms race and the intensification of great-Power and bloc rivalries threaten the very foundations of the system of international relations based on the principles of the Charter and constantly instigate various forms of usurpation of the rights of sovereign countries and peoples. All the greater, therefore, is the responsibility of the Council, and of us all, for creating conditions that would put the Middle East problem on a track leading to a genuine comprehensive settlement.

81. The world Organization and its organs, the Security Council in particular, have been compelled for a number of years to deal with problems resulting from the internationally prohibited actions and acts by the Israeli authorities against the populations of the occupied Arab territories. As has been many times established, the policy and practice of Israel, in addition to its permanent aggression against sovereign Arab States, a policy and practice of establishing illegal settlements in the occupied territories, of perpetrating acts of denationalization, of exploiting natural resources and of destroying historical and cultural wealth, amount actually to a systematic and persistent attempt at altering the geographical, ethnographic, economic, religious, cultural and historical characteristics of the occupied territories and their inhabitants. That practice has been known from the time of colonization. However, it is also known that that policy has been defeated in the past and that therefore all protagonists of such a policy should take this fact into account.

82. The actions of the Israeli occupation authorities cannot be characterized otherwise than as a flagrant violation of the rules of international law—of rules, principles and norms that Israel committed itself to observe by its signing or accepting them. By its membership in the United Nations, Israel has assumed the obligation to respect the Charter and the decisions of the world Organization; it has also signed the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. In spite of this, we are witnesses to constant violations and total disregard of the principles and provisions of those documents. The actions of Israel are contrary to the provisions of The Hague Convention of 1907,<sup>2</sup> which laid down the legal foundations of international law for the peaceful settlement of disputes. It has never been possible to ensure the application of the rules of law by

violating them, nor can they be derived from something contrary to them. There is, consequently, no need to emphasize in particular that such acts perpetrated by an occupier or committed during occupation are null and void.

83. The documents of the United Nations are replete with data illustrating the negative policy and practices of Israel in the occupied territories. This is also proved by the most recent findings contained in the report of 4 December of the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) and by the data embodied in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories<sup>3</sup> which was adopted at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

84. It is also proved beyond any doubt by the most recent example of Al-Khalil (Hebron), the case of the Mayor of Nablus and others. All this shows that Israel continues to pursue its policy of occupation and annexation as well as the systematic expulsion of a whole people from its homeland. All this is aimed at consolidating its occupation in the Middle East and legalizing a policy of *faits accomplis* in order to prevent the Palestinian people from realizing its legitimate and inalienable rights. The settlement of the Middle East crisis as a whole is thereby indirectly impeded.

85. The position of Yugoslavia concerning the Middle East crisis is well known. It is founded on three basic principles, which have also been approved by the international community: first, the total withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in the 1967 war; secondly, the realization of the inalienable national right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to return and to establish its own State, with the Palestine Liberation Organization as its sole legitimate and internationally recognized representative; and thirdly, the right of all the countries and peoples of the region to a secure and independent development. This is, in our view, the only realistic and internationally acceptable platform for achieving a just and lasting peace in the region, and any delay in actions and measures for its realization could have serious consequences for international peace and security.

86. In this sense, we are all responsible for what emanates from the unsolved Middle East crisis. Any further delay in solving this question is tantamount to complicity in depriving of its rights a people which, by the high level of its national consciousness and its constructive contributions, has become an equal member of the international community. The denial of the national right of the Palestinian people to its homeland is contrary not only to the norms of international law, but also to the principles on which are based the whole international community and peace and security in the world. The international community must put a stop to such recidivist actions by Israel, as they constitute the naked use of force and

undermine the very foundations of international relations. That Israeli policy has been condemned repeatedly within the United Nations and by the decisions of numerous international gatherings, especially those of the non-aligned countries, which have given the broadest support to the Arab peoples and countries in their struggle for the realization of their legitimate rights and have become their allies.

87. Any further continuation of its policy of violence provides one more proof of Israel's lack of readiness to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations on a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of the crisis in the Middle East. It should also open the eyes of those on whom Israel relies in its intransigence and defiance of the international community. Hence, the need for all members of the Council to take immediately the necessary measures for checking such a policy. It is necessary to prevent the continuation of all activities designed to deprive the occupied territories of their national identity, having in mind, in the first place, Jerusalem, with its cultural and religious pluralism.

88. We therefore fully agree with the report of the Commission that the Council should take effective measures to prevail on Israel to cease the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories and to eliminate the consequences of such measures and actions, considering them null and void. We also agree with the need to examine within the United Nations all the possibilities for taking effective measures to prevent Israel from exploiting the natural, geographical, cultural and other resources that it has usurped as a result of its occupation. All these actions should be placed within the framework of general efforts to achieve a peaceful, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, to realize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and to eliminate all the consequences of occupation and aggression.

89. Yugoslavia has been in solidarity with the victims of aggression from the very outset—with all the Arab countries and peoples, particularly the Palestinian people—proceeding from the assumption that lack of freedom in any part of the world threatens freedom everywhere. Together with the other non-aligned countries, we have consistently advocated a peaceful, comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis on the aforementioned internationally accepted bases. We shall support every action of the Council towards that end.

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

91. Mr. MANSOURI (Syrian Arab Republic): I thank you very much, Mr. President, for having given me the opportunity to speak in the Council.

92. First of all, I should like to express my congratulations to you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month. The long-standing friendly relations between our countries, as well as your deep experience and high qualifications, assure us that you will conduct the work of this Council in a very efficient manner.

93. Allow me at the same time to pay due respect to your predecessor, the representative of France, Mr. Leprette, for the efficient manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

94. This is not the first time that the Council has been seized of the question relating to the Israeli Zionist policy of settlement in the occupied Arab territories, and it will certainly not be the last. Indeed the Council considered the subject in the past and adopted resolution 446 (1979), in which it established a three-member Commission to examine the situation relating to the settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. The Council met in July last year, considered the first report of that Commission and consequently adopted its resolution 452 (1979). In that resolution the Council, which reflects international opinion, called upon "the Government and people of Israel to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem" and requested the Commission to continue its work.

95. What we are now facing is a situation in which the Israeli authorities are in total defiance of this resolution and other previous ones. The occupying authorities do not hide their policy of continuing their planning for more expansion and more settlements in the occupied areas. I need no more evidence than the conclusion reached by the Commission, as stated in paragraph 45 of its second report, that

"... the Commission has detected no evidence of any basic positive change in Israel's policy with regard to the construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories under occupation, particularly in the West Bank of Jordan. On the contrary, the Commission is of the view that that policy has largely contributed to a deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories and that it is incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area."

96. My colleagues from Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization have given the Council the details [2199th meeting] about the recent events in Al-Khalil, and I need not repeat what they have said. What I want to state, and indeed to emphasize, is that the actions taken by the occupying authority are contrary to, and in violation of, all international laws and standards of conduct. They are also against basic human rights. Nobody in the world except the Zionist authorities applies collective punishment, against the whole population of a town, for an un-

specified murder committed by someone unknown. That in itself is a violation of all international laws and treaties. It is a flagrant violation of the duties of the occupying authorities, as defined by the Geneva Conventions. Furthermore, one wonders about the Israeli authorities' claim to recognize the "historical" rights of a few Jewish families to return to Al-Khalil, under the pretext that they lived there 50 years ago, when, at the same time, those authorities shamelessly deny the same right of millions of Palestinians to return to their homeland, where they lived for centuries. Could that be called justice and equal treatment for equal human beings? Or is it something else? I leave it to everyone's logic and conscience to judge.

97. We share the view expressed by the Commission in its second report that the Israeli Government has to bear responsibility for the settlement programme, which is in fact in the process of implementation and was prepared as a plan by the World Zionist Organization—a plan to build 46 new settlements in the years 1979 to 1983. There is no doubt that what is going on in Al-Khalil and other areas in the West Bank is nothing more than the implementation of that plan.

98. We urge this body to consider carefully the recommendations of the Commission and to adopt effective measures to prevail on Israel to cease the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories and to dismantle the existing settlements accordingly. Unless Israel is forced to comply with the Council's resolutions and unless it gives up the policy of occupation and expansion and the Zionist plan for supremacy in the Middle East, security and peace in that area, and in the world, will face a grave threat.

99. I should like to draw the Council's attention to the following points. First, the Israeli media have reported time and again that General Sharon, Minister of Agriculture, has submitted to the Israeli Cabinet a plan involving the establishment of four new settlements in the occupied Golan Heights. Secondly, according to the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* of 29 July 1979, the Israeli Minister of Education and Culture assured the "Council for the Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Golan Heights" that his Government considers the Golan Heights to be an indivisible part of Israel. Thirdly, it is clear that Israel persists in its attempts to change the demographic composition of the Golan Heights, in contravention of United Nations resolutions and the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, as well as of other relevant conventions and regulations. In our view, this persistence confirms the systematic expansionist nature of a premeditated and organized policy by Israel.

100. We feel that the Council should keep the matter under constant consideration and that it should take the necessary measures to keep the investigations going as a matter of importance—and especially the investigation of the problem of the water resources, which

the Commission has dealt with briefly in paragraphs 42 to 44, inclusive, of its report. We think that the Council should extend the mandate of the Commission and ask it to submit a new report on developments—regardless of the fact that such a report will certainly not solve the problems of the Middle East. We all know that peace and stability in the Middle East cannot be achieved if the essential requirements for such peace and stability are not fulfilled; and those requirements are: first, that there must be a total Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, and, secondly, that the Palestinian people should be able to exercise their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and to a sovereign, independent State in their homeland.

101. We consider that all that is happening in the Middle East is outside the framework of the United Nations and, consequently, that it will not lead to any peaceful settlement in that area. We consider the Camp David agreements and the so-called peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, and any other agreements that may emerge out of them, to be null and void. Furthermore, we regard the denial of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights an insult not only to that people but to the Arab nation and to the United Nations itself as well.

102. We call upon those who are impeding the fulfilment of this aim to seize the opportunity and come to recognize the reality of the existence of the Palestinian people and its right to self-determination.

103. Finally, in paragraph 54 of its report the Commission recommends that the Council

"adopt effective measures to prevail on Israel to cease the establishment of settlements in occupied territories and to dismantle the existing settlements accordingly."

We feel that no measures could be effective in this situation except the application of Chapter VII of the Charter—and indeed it is high time to apply that Chapter.

104. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

105. Mr. ROA-KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Comrade President, I should like first of all to thank you and, through you, the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to take part in the Council's deliberations in my capacity as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group in the United Nations. I should like also to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are certain that your well-known diplomatic qualities of prudence and wisdom will make it possible for the Council to carry through to

a successful conclusion its consideration of the matter now before it—the claim for the exercise by the heroic Palestinian people of its inalienable rights.

106. In its resolution 452 (1979), the Council calls upon the Government and people of Israel to

“cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.”

Today we are meeting once again because the Zionist authorities of Israel not only ignored that resolution at the time but also continue to violate the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in all the occupied territories and, most recently, in Al-Khalil. The fact that they have changed the Arab name to “Hebron” clearly shows the colonialist aims of Mr. Begin’s henchmen.

107. On the other hand, it is worth remembering that that haughty attitude on the part of a State which claims membership in the United Nations and which owes its very existence to General Assembly resolution 181 (II) still persists in the main because the Council has been prevented from adopting the measures provided for in the Charter and has taken no action on Assembly resolutions 31/20, 32/40 and 33/28 concerning the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

108. The international community must not forget that peace in the Middle East can be attained only through a comprehensive agreement, including, among other things, the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from the Arab and Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since the act of aggression of 1967, recognition of the inalienable right of that people to national sovereignty and independence, and the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and their right to enjoy their properties, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

109. In looking at the situation in Al-Khalil we must stress that we are not dealing with an isolated or fortuitous incident. It is not by chance that the rights of the Arab and Palestinian people in that plot of land are being flouted and trampled under the heel of the conqueror; rather it is the result of premeditated and far-reaching actions that have been repeatedly condemned by the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Non-Aligned Movement and the international community.

110. Less than a year ago, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People alerted world public opinion and the United Nations to the existence of a “master plan” for the development of settlements in the occupied territories of Gaza and the West Bank of the Jordan, drawn up by Matityahu Drobles of the World Zionist Organization [see S/13582 of 22 October 1979]. That

monstrosity, whose sole aim is to impose the Zionist State’s domination on the territories it has illegally occupied since 1967, gives every detail, coldly calculated to the last Israeli pound, of how the foreign land is to be usurped and “de-Arabized” inch by inch. As we fathom the motives and thoughts of those calculating land-grabbers, we cannot but identify them with the sinister desire for *Lebensraum*.

111. The facts speak for themselves. Since 1967 the Israeli occupation authorities have implemented a policy of depriving the Arab and Palestinian inhabitants of Gaza and the West Bank of their land through the compulsory purchase of land and the multiplication of Israeli settlements. The Government of Israel has provided many material incentives for settlers, including water, electricity, telephone service, building materials and equipment, and means of transport. Despite the shamefaced denials of the Tel Aviv Government, people are well aware of the close co-operation between the military occupation forces and the ultranationalist settlement group Gush Emunim, and others of that ilk.

112. During the last 13 years a classic pattern of colonial domination and exploitation has been established. That policy, should it persist in the future, will reduce the territories’ economy to almost complete dependence on the occupying Power, even after the occupation ends. Add to that the constant interference in—indeed, suppression of—the so-called self-government of those territories, the policy of systematic repression applied against the Arab population—curfew, torture, demolition of buildings, arrests, expulsions—and one will have an accurate picture of Israel’s objective: the integration *manu militari* of the occupied territories of Gaza and the West Bank of the Jordan.

113. The fact that all that is taking place in explicit violation of the fourth Geneva Convention and of the relevant United Nations resolutions does not seem to upset the digestion of some members of the Council who are determined to run counter to the tide of history.

114. The Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana in 1979, reaffirmed that no just solution to the problem of the Middle East could be found or peace restored to the region until a number of basic principles were simultaneously applied in their entirety. Among them were the following:

“All measures taken by Israel in the Palestinian and Arab territories since their occupation, including all arrangements, constructions, modifications and alterations designed to transform the political, cultural, religious, physical, geographic and demographic features, are illegal and null and void; and

“The establishment of colonies (settlements) in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied

by Israel constitutes an illegal act which is null and void and is an obstacle to peace. For this reason, such colonies must be dismantled immediately and no new ones allowed to be established.”<sup>4</sup>

Further,

“The Conference vigorously denounced Israel’s exploitation of the natural resources of Palestine and the occupied Arab territories and its violation of the Hague and Geneva Conventions, and called upon all States to take the necessary measures to prevent any co-operation with Israel which might enable it to continue its illegal exploitation of those resources or obtain illicit profits from such exploitation.

“The Conference condemned Israel’s persistent violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the inhabitants of the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. It likewise condemned Israel’s persistent policy of colonization and expulsion of the indigenous Arab population; its alteration of the physical, cultural, religious and demographic features of the occupied territories; the destruction of Arab homes; and the confiscation of Arab property in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention . . .

“ . . .

“The Conference affirmed that the restoration of Jerusalem to Arab sovereignty is an indispensable condition for a durable peace . . .

“The Conference denounced the Zionist and racist policy pursued by Israel, which is stubbornly continuing to ignore the decisions of the international community and maintaining its military occupation, engaging in terror and brutal oppression against the Palestinian people . . .

“ . . .

“The Conference invited the Security Council to meet its responsibilities by imposing on Israel the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter . . .

“The Conference expressed its regret that the Security Council has not yet taken any decision concerning the General Assembly recommendations . . .

“The Conference condemned the threat by the United States to use the veto in the Security Council against any resolution concerning the implementation of the Palestinian people’s inalienable national rights.”<sup>5</sup>

115. As Chairman of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the United Nations, I appeal to the mem-

bers of the Council not to continue disregarding the just claims of the Palestine Arab people oppressed by Israeli occupation. The vindication of its inalienable right to sovereignty, freedom and independence is in their hands. The non-aligned countries and the overwhelming majority of the Member States hope that the Council will take the measures provided for in the Charter and without delay and in all justice carry out its fundamental responsibility to the community of nations.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

117. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Reference has been made this afternoon by various speakers to the Council’s invitation to the Mayor of Hebron, Mr. Fahd Qawasma, to participate in this debate.

118. The members of the Council will wish to know that Mr. Qawasma requested last week that he be permitted to travel to Amman and then to proceed from there to New York. On the morning of Friday, 22 February, Mr. Qawasma was informed that on this occasion his request could not be granted.

119. That took place many hours before the Tunisian representative made his request to the Council concerning Mr. Qawasma. Accordingly, on Friday afternoon here in New York, many hours after Mr. Qawasma had been notified that his application had been declined, it must have been clear to the representative of Tunisia and all those behind him that they were purposely engaged in a transparent exercise of duplicity in the knowledge that Mr. Qawasma would be unable to come to New York.

120. As I indicated in a letter to the Secretary-General this morning, although Israel is under no obligation whatsoever to permit the residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District to travel abroad, its liberal policy in administering these territories has also found expression in consistently facilitating free movement of the local residents abroad, including movement and travel to Arab countries which regard themselves as being in a state of war with Israel. Mr. Qawasma himself has been the beneficiary of this liberal approach on numerous occasions and has been permitted to travel extensively to various Arab countries, as well as to Europe and the United States. However, the purpose of his intended trip on this occasion would have been to lend support to Israel’s avowed enemies in their ongoing and concerted campaign of incitement and vilification and in this way to aid and abet them in their unrelenting political warfare against my country [*S/13824, para. 4*].

121. I should like to make one or two further observations.



122. As is well known, our enemies regard Judaea and Samaria as territories "occupied" by Israel, as the representative of Tunisia, for instance, stated here again this afternoon. According to their argument, since Israel is an "occupying Power", it is bound by the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

123. The least one can expect is that those espousing such views should make an effort at consistency. If indeed Israel's conduct in Judaea and Samaria is subject to the fourth Geneva Convention, as is asserted by them, I would invite our adversaries to indicate under which provision of that Convention they claim the existence of a duty for Israel to permit travel abroad for the residents of Judaea and Samaria. In fact, they know full well that there is no provision in the Geneva Convention requiring that the movement of the local population outside the territories be permitted. As I have already mentioned before, Israel as a rule facilitates such movement in both directions, including movement to Arab countries that regard themselves as being in a state of war with Israel. In particular, Israel facilitates pilgrimages to Mecca and family visits in both directions. However, this liberal policy of Israel's cannot serve as justification for demands to be made on Israel in excess of the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

124. The only logical construction that can be placed on the request by Tunisia that the Council invite the Mayor of Hebron is, therefore, that the representative of Tunisia, as the representative of the Arab States on the Council, no longer regards Judaea and Samaria as territories "occupied" by Israel. It is somewhat bizarre though that such a significant shift in Arab foreign policy should have been announced in such a round-about way. I therefore invite the representative of Tunisia to state plainly and clearly that his country, and the other countries he represents here, no longer regard Israel as an "occupying Power" in Judaea and Samaria, and I assure him that the implications of such a statement will be given earnest consideration by my Government.

125. The question of the invitation of the Mayor of Hebron again highlights the duplicity and hypocrisy of the Arab States, characteristics of their approach towards Israel ever since our accession to statehood in 1948. In the last 32 years, Arab Governments have violated every conceivable universal treaty, convention, Charter principle and requirement in relation to Israel. The explanation offered by them has been that they regard themselves as being in a state of war with Israel. This, incidentally, has not prevented them from systematically violating even the laws of war in respect of Israel. But while they piously claim for themselves the privileges of the international law of war, they seek to impose on Israel the duties that go even beyond those of the international law of peace. They should, of course, remember that no State can invoke in its favour benefits deriving from certain provisions of

international law without at the same time being prepared to abide by the duties flowing from international law. Reciprocity is, as we all know, a cardinal principle and cornerstone of international law. Regrettably, lack of reciprocity, and duplicity, are the guiding principles of Israel's enemies in their attitude towards my country.

126. In their statements and letters to the Council, Arab representatives and their supporters have made a concerted effort to distort and misrepresent the questions concerning Hebron.

127. Hebron has always been a central link in the unswerving attachment of the Jewish people to its homeland. The Hebrew Patriarchs were buried almost 4,000 years ago in the Cave of Machpela in Hebron, and ever since that time their burial ground has been hallowed and venerated by the Jewish people. Apart from two short periods following expulsions by the Romans and the Crusaders, Jews lived continuously in the city for almost three millennia. In recent centuries, it was a community consisting largely of pious scholars and students. This peaceful and defenceless Jewish community was massacred by an Arab mob in 1929, when the forerunners of the present PLO terrorists turned their fanatical hatred against it. The attackers did not spare women, children, or the elderly. They destroyed Jewish houses, razed synagogues and burned sacred Torah scrolls. In 1948, with the invasion and illegal occupation of Judaea and Samaria by Jordan, the entire region became *Judenrein*, and any Jewish presence was prohibited.

128. On 5 June 1967, King Hussein spurned an official message from Israel delivered through the United Nations intermediary in which he was invited to stay out of the six-day war which began that day. Instead, the Jordanian occupiers of Judaea and Samaria opened fire all along the armistice lines with Israel and, as a result of their renewed aggression, lost control of Judaea and Samaria. Since 1967, experience has shown that Jews and Arabs can live together peacefully in Hebron and elsewhere with a modicum of mutual accommodation and without encroaching on each other's rights.

129. The enemies of peace and reconciliation, whose aim is to torpedo any peaceful Arab-Israel coexistence, have deliberately created incidents in Hebron and elsewhere in order to further their belligerent designs.

130. What happened in Hebron on 30 January is a prime example of their despicable *modus operandi*. On that day, Yehoshua Sloma, a young theological student in neighbouring Kiryat Arba, was fatally wounded while shopping in a market at the centre of Hebron. As a result, a curfew was imposed by the authorities on the immediate area of the crime. The purpose of the curfew was to facilitate the search for those responsible for the murder. Contrary to allegations made here, the curfew was not imposed on

the population as a form of collective punishment, and the greater part of the city as well as the bulk of its population were not affected. The curfew was lifted every day in order to allow residents in the curfew area to shop for food. In the city as a whole, except for the limited curfew area, life went on as usual. It is complete nonsense to suggest that food did not reach the city and its residents. Incidentally, the assertion made by the representative of Tunisia to the effect that the curfew is still in force is absolutely untrue. It was lifted more than two weeks ago. Apparently news of this kind does not reach the representative of Tunisia with the same rapidity as that relating to Mr. Qawasma's travel plans.

131. I should add that during the curfew Moslem religious observances were carried on as usual in all parts of the city, except in the mosque erected over the Cave of Machpela, known as the Mosque of Abraham, on the edge of the curfew area.

132. It has been falsely reported to the Council that hundreds of residents were detained by the authorities. To be sure, some suspects were detained for investigation, but their number was limited. Most of them were released immediately, and all were released as soon as their investigation was completed. Reports that Arab residents were driven from their homes attest only to the unbridled fantasy of their authors.

133. Another recent incident in Hebron has been distorted and twisted in a way typical of the mendacious propaganda techniques of the Arab rejectionists. Arab youths started hurling rocks at Jewish worshippers who had prayed at the Cave of Machpela. One of the rocks hit an elderly Arab man in the eye and blinded him. As often occurs in rejectionist propaganda, this innocent victim of Arab religious intolerance was touted as an example of so-called Israeli brutality.

134. It has also been falsely alleged that the rights of Moslems to worship at the Mosque of Abraham have been revoked. The arrangements to facilitate worship by Moslems and Jews remain unchanged. These arrangements were brought to the knowledge of the Council by my predecessor in his letter dated 1 November 1976 [S/12223]. Under these arrangements, Moslems are able to pray in their area 24 hours a day, every day of the week. Jews are able to pray in their areas on weekdays and on the Jewish Sabbath as well as on Jewish holidays, in accordance with accepted hours of prayer. It should be noted that on Fridays—the Islamic special day of prayer—Moslems are able to pray throughout the whole day. Jews, on the other hand, are limited to evening prayers to greet the coming Jewish Sabbath. These arrangements were established with the greatest consideration for Moslem religious sentiments and without affecting or infringing on Moslem rights. That these arrangements have been working to the satisfaction of all sides in itself refutes the burden of the charges in the "information" supplied by the Islamic Conference.

135. Those are the facts. But how many States in this Organization care about the facts?

136. In the light of all the above I repeat that this debate and the elements being injected into it are nothing but an attempt by the enemies of peace to frustrate the peace process and to divert attention from the real threats to international peace and security. The whole exercise is transparent, and the racism being displayed with regard to Hebron is monstrous.

137. The members of the Council surely cannot let this pass without reneging on the primary responsibility entrusted to them for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. This debate flies in the face of the Council's mandate and all that the Charter stands for.

138. We reserve our right to speak again to address ourselves to other aspects raised in the course of this debate.

139. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, upon whom I now call.

140. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I shall not be drawn into engaging in calculated tactics of diversionary calumnies, extraneous, peripheral and diabolical irrelevancies, particularly when they are directed against me, as happened last Friday. For that is precisely what the Israeli representative would want me to do.

141. Last year, Mr. Blum awarded me what he called a very low credibility rating. I am glad I was not running for any office. Besides, he did not attribute that rating to any of those credible specialized agencies in the business such as the Gallup Poll, the Harris Poll, the CBS-New York Times random polls or any other polls. I am not aware that the United Nations has a set-up for such an evaluation. But I do know that the Security Council, which does not engage in popularity polls but in the serious and judicious assessment of situations affecting peace, security and the survival of nations, endorsed all the facts and figures which we presented in March 1979 on the magnitude of the Israeli despoliation of the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, not only after examining all the documentation presented to it but also after dispatching a Council Commission that examined the situation in the area.

142. The Commission's findings, endorsed unanimously by the Council in resolution 452 (1979), were practically identical with the facts and figures that we had presented—namely, an Israeli colonization of the occupied territories, up to a year ago, in the magnitude of more than 27 per cent of the total area. If ratings of credibility are to be set by independent and objective

inquiry, then the rating of my Government, on whose behalf I spoke, was an unmitigated 100 per cent. And that applies equally to my colleagues who presented their facts and figures in the complaint.

143. If I were in the representative of Israel's place, my only recourse would have been to withdraw from the credibility race, for he must have found himself in a terribly untenable and discredited situation, and that is hardly edifying to any self-respecting individual.

144. To my astonishment—or was it astonishment?—the Israeli representative attempted last Friday to cast aspersions on our updating of the already established facts and figures. The 27.1 per cent Israeli colonization had jumped to 31.4 per cent. In a six-month period, April to October, land confiscations were the equivalent of 15 per cent extra, not to mention the substantial increases between October and today.

145. The position of the Israeli representative is, to say the least, truly pathetic as he is assigned the task of reconciling the irreconcilable, of refuting in this lofty hall what his superiors not only concede but publicly profess to be their official policy—namely, colonization of the whole of Jerusalem and the rest of the occupied lands. Should he not ask his Government to instruct him as to how he and his Government should confront this fundamental dichotomy before the Council and stop engaging in sophistry and perjury?

146. The facts of the case are as simple as they are awesome. Subsequently to resolutions 446 (1979) and 452 (1979), which had forcefully warned Israel of the disastrous consequences of its colonization policy, the occupation authorities went full speed ahead in confiscating additional lands and water, thereby augmenting their seizures to a stunning 1.7 million dunums in Jerusalem and the West Bank alone out of a total area of 5.5 million dunums. That makes an Israeli confiscation of almost one third of the tiny remnants of the Palestinian homeland. And where did we get our figures? From official and unofficial Israeli sources, from the very people whose lands, property and water have been foreclosed and from the landscape of the Holy Land itself, which is the victim of ruthless emasculation, despoliation and plunder.

147. What we are talking about here is the very survival of the Palestinian people in their ancestral homeland. We are not engaged in any exercise of self-flagellation or scourging.

148. In the past, the Palestinian people found themselves in dizzying whirlpools and twisters; they were subjected to calculated and prearranged acts of aggression—including, incidentally, what happened in 1967—designed to bring about their uprooting and eventual perdition; and they were faced with deception, concealment and the widespread application of organized violence before and after the emergence of the racist Israeli entity. These were the tools and

techniques applied by a ruthless and heedless aggressor while the world watched with incredulity, ambivalence and murky vision.

149. Today the international community has no excuse for either ambivalence or masterly inaction. Will the world watch with indifference the systematic cannibalization of the Palestinian homeland and people while the evidence of it is massive, incontrovertible and officially conceded as such by the Israeli hierarchy responsible for that act of national genocide perpetrated against the Palestinian people? The question is: to be or not to be, and any other language would be evading or sugar-coating the basic issue of Palestinian survival.

150. A few days ago His Majesty King Hussein paid an official visit to Romania, after which a joint communiqué was issued that dealt with various aspects of the current international situation. President Nicolae Ceaușescu and King Hussein, in their deliberations on the Middle East, reaffirmed the fact that the serious situation prevailing in that area stemmed from the continuance of Israeli occupation of the Arab territories since 1967 and Israel's refusal to abide by United Nations resolutions. The communiqué likewise asserted that the Palestinian question was at the core of the conflict in the Middle East. The two leaders were in agreement that a solution must be achieved by immediate and total Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people and their right to self-determination and to decide their own future, including the creation, within the framework of Security Council and General Assembly decisions, of an independent State.

151. The communiqué expressed the profound concern of the two leaders resulting from the illegal practices that Israel was perpetrating in the occupied Arab territories and, in particular, the policy of colonization and the violation of the historical and cultural legacy, as well as the racist Israeli practices against the Arab civilians and their expulsion from their lands, with a view to altering the demographic composition of the occupied lands.

152. The communiqué called for the intensification of the efforts to bring about a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, within the framework of the United Nations and on the basis of its resolutions.

153. Regarding the international arena, the two leaders stressed the necessity of respecting the sovereignty and national independence of all States and refraining from interfering in the internal affairs of States, directly or indirectly. The two leaders also expressed their concern over the division of the world into "spheres of influence"—a division that does not

serve the common interests of the States of the world, and I mean all the States of the world.

154. The Romanian-Jordanian communiqué emphasized the imperative of strengthening international solidarity and détente and of striving towards the limitation of armaments. It also stressed the importance of strengthening unity of action among the non-aligned States and the States of the developing world. And last but not least, the communiqué stressed the necessity of supporting the United Nations as the most efficacious framework for finding solutions to international disputes.

155. This is the official position of Jordan on the Middle East situation, the crux of which is the restoration of Palestinian national rights. One cannot very well uproot the majority of the 4 million Palestinians, strangle the remnants in what is left of their homeland and continue relentlessly to do more of the same and then expect the vast masses of our turbulent region to forget the burning centrality of their concerns and concentrate instead on the geo-political or geo-strategic dimensions in the grandiose designs of the game of nations. Perhaps Israel regards itself as a super-Power and could devote a good deal of its attention to this problem. This is the legitimate concern of the super-Powers, and all that the smaller nations can do is to be consistent in their assessment of the situation, declare what they think is right or wrong, depending on the situation, and give whatever considered opinion they believe would be conducive to concord, world peace, justice and harmony.

156. No nation, including the super-Powers, has a penchant for world destruction, and it is our duty as non-aligned nations, wherever and whenever we can, to urge all sides to put out the fires that will inevitably engulf us all. We have no presumptions or claims other than to ensure the very survival of the Palestinian people.

157. If there has been a diminution of the effectiveness of the United Nations, believe me, it is the result of the consistent and persistent audacious Israeli defiance of United Nations injunctions, the Charter and the rule of law. Such an attitude can only be contagious, particularly if the United Nations fails to do anything about it. The Israeli aggressors must be made fully aware that they cannot with impunity destroy the very fabric and foundations upon which the United Nations has been built. Indeed, such defiance exemplified by a deliberate, calculated and self-confessed crime, should disqualify Israel from membership of an esteemed world body for which it has nothing but disdain.

158. We have to face the fact that the Palestinian and Arab peoples of the occupied territories represent the most elemental imperatives of survival. Shall we watch them go down the drain? If we do, then we would merely be postponing the inevitable: the horrors

of an unspeakable explosion in the years or decades to come.

159. Now, even though I had promised myself not to become involved in a discussion on distortions and irrelevancies, I feel that I must make a few remarks in answer to what the representative of Israel has told the Council today.

160. The representative of Israel has shed crocodile tears over the sad riots that engulfed the whole of Palestine, including Hebron, in 1929. The old generation knows what was behind that, but we should ask this: Who ignited that conflagration, the first of its kind to happen after centuries of coexistence between the Jewish and Palestinian inhabitants in peace and tranquillity? The rioting was ignited by provocative and aggressive armed attacks carried out by fanatic Zionist gangs against Al-Buraq Al-Sharif, the western wall of the Al-Haram Al-Sharif area.

161. An international committee of the League of Nations was set up at the request of the British Government to investigate the situation. It was presided over by a former Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs and it concluded categorically that it was the Zionists who had started the attack and tried to violate the accepted status and proprietary rights of the area. I might remind members of the Council that, on the basis of documentation, that committee came to the conclusion that the entire area, the pavements and the properties, belonged to the Palestinians rather than to the Israelis, even though it conceded to the Israelis the right to worship at the Wailing Wall.

162. With regard to the Holy Places, I am sure that representatives will find in the records of the United Nations that the Arab States then directly concerned gave a solemn pledge to permit unlimited access to all the Holy Places, even during the armistice agreement and before the achievement of peace. It was the Israelis—as the records, which I am willing to produce, demonstrate—it was the Israeli representatives who refused and requested that the question be deferred.

163. Why did the Israelis request that the question be deferred? Because they did not wish to repatriate the refugees to their homes in West Jerusalem and they did not wish to restore electricity to what remained of our part of Jerusalem. They refused to restore the water supply and the people of Jerusalem spent six months almost without water except for that stored in wells. They preferred all that cruelty to performing their religious worship. If they had attached any importance to questions of religion, they would certainly have made things work. We were more than willing to do so, and we so declared openly, as the records of the United Nations will show.

164. The representative of Israel has made a mistake regarding the holiest Islamic shrine, namely the Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi Mosque, which was built more

than 1,000 years ago—possibly 1,300 years ago. The Israeli representative must be made to understand that Abraham, through his son Ishmael, is the forefather of all the Arabs. Moreover, Abraham is venerated by all Moslems as the father of all prophets. It is an integral part of our religion. The point that I made last Friday was that not since the Middle Ages had the adherents of one religion converted the Holy Place of the adherents of another religion into something other than what it was, as the Israelis have done on a sizeable and substantial scale in the Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi Mosque. They have literally transformed it into a synagogue.

165. The representative of Israel has again talked about the illegal Israeli occupation of what he illegally called Judaea and Samaria. Of course we have all become accustomed to wily Israeli distortions concerning Jordan. Even though it is repetitious on my part to reply, I feel in duty bound to do so at this moment.

166. As is well known, the Jordanian army was stationed in the whole of Palestine—and I repeat, in the whole of Palestine, including Haifa, Tel Aviv and the heart of Jerusalem—throughout the Second World War as part of the allied effort and forces. It could have remained there. It was in charge of the Alamein camp, one of the most strategic posts in Jerusalem. It was in charge of Katamon and it was in charge of all the strategic spots, both in Jerusalem and in the rest of Palestine. It could have remained there. But out of deference to the United Nations resolution on the creation of a Palestinian Arab State alongside a Jewish State, with a *corpus separatum* for Jerusalem [resolution 181 (II)], it withdrew promptly and to the last soldier on 14 May 1948, upon the termination of the British Mandate. Contingents of Jordanian troops—and believe it or not, there were no more than 600 riflemen—heeded the urgent pleadings of the 80,000 or so crowded and beleaguered people of Jerusalem, of West Jerusalem as well as the Old City because the uprooted inhabitants of West Jerusalem had taken refuge in the Old City. Those people had been subjected for three days and nights on end to incessant attack and bombardment in the Old City, in which the Israelis used tanks, rockets and every weapon that they had in their possession. One will find this in the memoirs of all the older generation of Israeli leaders.

167. When Mr. Ben Gurion was trying to defend himself concerning what he did in the case of Jerusalem, he said that they had sent their best forces, namely the Palmach, to try to wrest in from the Palestinian Arabs, but they could not. But the population ran out of ammunition on 18 May. They did not have a single bullet. We used to pay a shilling in those days for a bullet. And the last attack by the Israeli aggressors, even though this was recognized as a part of the Palestinian Arab State, was turned back by whatever dynamite the Palestinians still had in their

hands. It was then that the Jordanian army entered, in the dawn of 18 May. They entered the city because they wanted to stave off the genocide and uprooting which had befallen their Palestinian brethren elsewhere. Was that occupation—or was it an imperative and humane act of salvation? Would anybody in the world have been happy if 80,000 helpless civilians with no armed force whatsoever, except the few rifles and bullets that they had bought on the black market at extremely high prices which would have ruined even the richest country in the world, had run out of ammunition? What else could the people of Jerusalem have done but send a delegation of their national committee to ask for assistance from the Jordanian army?

168. Of course, the representative of Israel has always alleged that Jewish religious sites were deliberately destroyed in the Jewish quarter. Incidentally, 60 per cent of the Jewish quarter in the Old City of Jerusalem is owned by Palestinian Arabs. A month or two before the end of the Mandate, the Israeli forces planted 1,000 of Israel's troops in the Jewish quarter, against the specific pleas—I repeat: against the specific pleas—of the Jewish inhabitants of that quarter. They did not want that quarter to be the scene of fighting. But the fighting which Israel started resulted in the unfortunate destruction not only of Jewish sites but, equally of Islamic and Christian sites. One of them—the Al-Haram Al-Sharif area—took years to repair.

169. I think that I taxed the Council's patience sufficiently with my long statement on Friday. I would not wish to repeat what I said then; I wish to make only one or two comments in conclusion.

170. With regard to the Mayor of Hebron, Mr. Qawasma, in a sense I feel relieved—and I really mean this—that the Israeli authorities have denied him permission to come to New York and testify before the Council. We know that if he had come here, he would not have been allowed to return to his homeland. We would much rather have him there as the Mayor of Hebron than have him come here and find himself in the position of a refugee—another refugee, to be added to the 2 million that the Israelis have uprooted from their homes.

171. The rejection of a Council request is of course much more an affront to the Council, the highest executive organ of the United Nations, than an affront to the Arab States which the representative of Israel calls the rejectionists and the haters of peace. What peace? The Israelis have already devoured 31 per cent of the land. If this question is again brought before the Council two years from now, the figure may well have increased to 50 per cent.

172. So let the aggressor explain to the Council what his Government's plans are for the future of the Palestinians. What are its calculations? Into what sea does it want to throw the Palestinians?

173. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I now call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

174. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Listening to twisted logic—especially when it is used by racists—is sometimes an interesting exercise. Over the weekend I watched a seven-hour film on something called “Our Hitler”. In that film, the spirit of Hitler apparently says, “If it were not for Hitler, there would not have been a State of Israel”, or “Greater Israel”, or something like that. That is the twisted logic of the racists and fascists. I say “twisted” because we have just heard the representative of the Zionist racists state that the enemies of Israel refer to the West Bank and Gaza as “occupied territories”. But I think that the entire international community has repeatedly asserted that those territories that have been occupied since 1967 are illegally occupied. Are we to understand from the statement of the representative of the Zionist racists that the world is the enemy of Israel? Or is he confirming the fact that Zionism is the enemy of the world and that the Zionists are the enemies of the world? That is the kind of twisted mentality which the Zionist racists have.

175. The representative of the Zionist racists stated also that Israel was under no obligation to permit the free travel of the Mayor of Hebron. On 10 December 1948 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted. Article 13, paragraph (2), of that Declaration reads as follows: “Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country”. Does that not apply to Israel? Does that not apply to the forces of occupation? Does that not apply to a Palestinian who is living under foreign occupation and domination? Mayor Qawasma wanted to leave his country, his town, to come here and respond to an invitation from the Council, and then, of course, to return to his country. Yet we are told that the forces of occupation are under no obligation to permit him to travel. Naturally—for in the territories under occupation, 2 million Palestinians have been taken hostage. The world talks about 5 hostages or 50 hostages. But there are 2 million Palestinians who have been living as hostages for years. The Security Council and the rest of the international community have not raised the same hue and cry about them; they have not expressed their determination to put an end to that situation. Yet, 2 million Palestinians are held hostage by the Zionist movement and its supporters—particularly the United States—in order to achieve their aim. And that aim can be achieved in only one way: through genocide, the physical elimination of the Palestinians.

176. We have been told that the Jews have an unswerving attachment to the Holy Land, be it Hebron or Jerusalem. No one denies that. The Holy Land is venerated not only by Jews, but also by Christians and Moslems. I do not claim that I can give lessons in history, but I would say this: after the Moslem conquest of Jerusalem in the seventh century, it was the

Moslem Caliph who looked for that Rock of Moriah on which Abraham almost offered up his son as a sacrifice. On that rock—which was at that time a real garbage dump—the Caliph ordered the erection of one of the most beautiful mosques, a mosque which still stands today, a mosque that the Zionists are trying, with their excavations, to demolish. Again, it was the Moslem rulers who ordered the building, in Hebron on the Macphela Cave, of the large Al-Ibrahimi Mosque. That was done out of veneration, not out of contempt. So if anyone has been keen on venerating the Patriarchs, starting with Abraham, it has been the Moslems—beginning with those who came to Jerusalem and to Hebron in the seventh century.

177. We have been told that a theological student was assassinated in Hebron. Perhaps he was a theological student—but he was in Hebron, on a spot that had been arbitrarily confiscated from its own people. There is every indication that he was one of the soldiers of occupation. As I said in my statement on Friday, the soldiers of occupation are legitimate targets for the legitimate resistance of the people under occupation.

178. My colleague from Jordan has already explained what happened in 1929. I would only repeat what I said the other day. Why did all this happen in 1929, after centuries during which Arabs and Jews, and Christians, Moslems and Jews, had not only coexisted but lived together? I come from Jerusalem and at my age I have had personal experience of living together with my Jewish and Moslem friends. We all went to school together. We had our youth group. What brought us to this situation of hostility? It was the Zionist plan to uproot us and evict us from our homes that made enemies of us.

179. And, now, why prevent Qawasma from coming here? All he would have done here in the Council would have been to testify about what exactly happened in Hebron, why it happened and maybe to express the aspirations of his own people. But then the Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) was not permitted to investigate the situation there nor was the elected Mayor permitted to come here. And we are told that we are enemies of Israel. Again, I repeat: it is Zionist Israel which is the enemy of the world, of peace and of religion.

180. Mr. ESSAAFI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to go back to some remarks that the representative of Israel attributed to me and speak of two points that he presented differently from the way in which I presented them.

181. First of all, the invitation to the Mayor of Al-Khalil was extended by the Council. Confusion is deliberately being sown by the representative of Israel when he refers to the Geneva Convention which we cited in our statement in speaking about Israeli Government repression of the Arab population in the

occupied territories. The invitation sent to Mayor Qawasma is quite a different matter. The Mayor has been prevented from coming here to participate in a discussion that concerns precisely the situation prevailing in the occupied Arab territories. Elsewhere we spoke of how the Geneva Convention had been violated by the Israeli authorities and described at length the behaviour of those authorities towards the Arab population. When he speaks of duplicity, I think that all of us here are aware of the announcement of the Reuters despatch made by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who reported that the Mayor was being prevented from joining us here in New York. The duplicity is not on our side; it is on the other.

182. Statements about the curfew were also attributed to me. The representative of Israel claims that I said that the curfew was still in force. I shall read out the paragraph as I said it to the Council, and the record is there to prove who is telling the truth and who is distorting it. I said:

“... for days the population [of this town] has been subjected”—I repeat “has been subjected”—to a particularly stringent curfew. Collective sanctions have been imposed on them because of the murder of an Israeli soldier.” [See para. 67 above.]

I said “*a été soumise*” in good French and everyone understands that that does not mean the curfew is necessarily still in force, as the representative of Israel has claimed. I should like to leave it to members to draw the appropriate conclusion; and the text is available to them.

183. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

184. Mr. BLUM (Israel): We have been maintaining all along that the debate staged here, like those staged last March and July, has as its primary purpose the obstruction of the peace process in the Middle East. If there was any need for evidence to substantiate this fact, it was amply provided today in the statement of the observer of the new League of Arab States, who openly lamented the conclusion of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel and the various steps taken to normalize the relations between the two countries. We should all be grateful to Mr. Maksoud for having so unambiguously clarified the anti-peace objectives of the sponsors of this debate.

185. As I stated earlier this afternoon, I shall ask to be allowed to speak again. I shall then take the opportunity to expose again the lack of credibility of the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan.

186. Let me address myself tonight only to one or two points raised in what he erroneously termed a statement. He asked—rhetorically, I presume—who started the pogroms of 1929. The answer is simple: they were started by the same people who started the riots of 1920 and the riots of 1936. More specifically, all those riots and acts of violence were started by the notorious Haj Amin Al-Husseini, the so-called Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who, during the Second World War, having first participated in the abortive pro-Nazi *coup d'état* of Rashid Ali Al-Khailani in Iraq, then escaped to Nazi Germany, where he actively participated in the extermination of Jews. He was wanted as a war criminal in Nuremberg after the war. So that man and his supporters instigated the riots and the pogroms of 1929. To the present day he remains the mentor of the terrorist organization known as the PLO.

187. The representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan tried again to explain away the illegality of the Jordanian aggression of 1948. We have been through this before, but I have no choice but to set the record straight again.

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

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

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

“ . . .

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

“ . . .

“Therefore, here we have the highest type of evidence of the international violation of the law: the admission by those who are committing this violation.” [302nd meeting, pp. 41-43.]

The representative of the United States also stated on that occasion that the communications sent to the Council by Transjordan and by the other Arab countries whose armies had invaded Palestine

“are the best evidence we have of the international character of this aggression”. [*Ibid.*, p. 41.]

190. The representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic told the Council on the same occasion that the purpose of the armed intervention in the internal affairs of Palestine was [“to destroy the State of Israel by force of arms and to bombard the peaceful cities of Israel under the pretext of restoring order” [307th meeting, p. 13].

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

“The USSR delegation cannot but express surprise at the position adopted by the Arab States in the Palestine question, and particularly at the fact that those States—or some of them, at least—have resorted to such action as sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine.” [299th meeting, p. 7.]

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

192. The violation of the international boundaries of Palestine by the Arab armies having constituted an act of armed aggression, the consequent illegal occupation by them of any territory previously forming part of the Mandated Territory of Palestine could not give rise to any legitimate claim of sovereignty—*ius ex injuria non oritur*. Thus the purported “annexation” of Judaea and Samaria by Jordan in 1950 was in violation both of general international law and of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement of 1949<sup>6</sup>. It is not without interest to note in this connection that even the Arab League in 1950 threatened Jordan with expulsion from its ranks because of that purported “annexation”.

193. The representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan also referred to the wanton destruction by the Transjordan Arab Legion of the Jewish Quarter in the Walled City of Jerusalem. Jordan stands condemned as the first country in modern history to bombard the Holy City. It will be recalled that it was Jordan which, intent on destroying the new-born State of Israel and on unlawfully grabbing territory for itself, attacked Jerusalem in 1948, in clear defiance of the principles of the Charter. It placed Jerusalem under siege and opened fire on its inhabitants and on its historic and religious sites. Jordanian forces attacked and destroyed the densely populated Jewish

Quarter of the Old City with mortar shells and seized the eastern part of the city, including the historic walled section which contains religious shrines holy to Jews, Christians and Moslems.

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

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

196. We have on previous occasions had opportunities to expose the machinations of the so-called Palestine Committee, whose total partiality is now notorious. For years now it has been disseminating, as a pliant tool of the terrorist PLO, the latter’s lies and fabrications. Since its former Chairman has departed from the scene, its Acting Chairman has been carrying the torch of mendacity or, I should perhaps say, the torch of acting mendacity. Since he is a newcomer to his noble post, let me reveal to him that the mere rehearsal of falsehoods does not turn them into truths. We have duly noted his singular contribution to world culture in his attempt to erase the name of the city of Hebron, by which it has been known for the past 3,000 years. His Cuban colleague managed to outdo him by suggesting that Israel is trying to change the name of the city. Perhaps he could tell us what the name of the city is in Spanish. Is it possible that his purpose here today has been to position himself so as to improve his chances of being elected the next Chairman of the Palestine Committee?

197. With the participation of Yugoslavia and Cuba in this debate, we have been witnesses once again to



a remarkable spectacle. That spectacle has repeated itself on numerous occasions in the past and has reduced debates such as this to a Punch-and-Judy show. The nature of the relations between these two countries at present is common knowledge and requires no elaboration. Indeed, they continue to jockey for position and vie for leadership of different segments within the non-aligned group. The competition between them is totally unconnected with the subject of the present debate. But if one of them chooses to leap into this debate, the other automatically feels obliged to follow suit.

198. With regard to Cuba, it is an affront that that country should have the gall to venture any opinion in public about "occupied territories", for here we have a country which has been ever ready over the last two decades to put itself militarily and politically at the disposal of one particular super-Power. It has been ever ready to do that super-Power's dirty work and assist on its behalf in the occupation of countries in various continents. Indeed, so long as it has Soviet troops on its shores, it might itself be regarded as an occupied country. Furthermore, as a country which was so aptly described in *Le Monde* of Paris on 16 February 1979 as a "tropical gulag", Cuba is scarcely qualified as an arbiter on anything which touches on fundamental human rights and the dignity of man. Cuba would thus be better advised to set its own house in order than to preach to others.

199. It is extraordinary that Syria should have the temerity to participate in this debate while it continues to occupy a very large part of Lebanon. The motives behind the recent Syrian moves in Lebanon were, at the beginning, a little obscure. They have, however, become abundantly clear in the last few days. The remarkable announcement that Syria might withdraw its troops from Lebanon was nothing but a trick designed to guarantee its permanent occupation of that country. There already have been numerous reports in the media, corroborated by information from intelligence sources, indicating that such Syrian troop movements as have taken place were nothing but the regroupment by Syria of its forces with the aim, *inter alia*, of better deploying them for a strike against Israel. Moreover, in recent days it has emerged that the object of the proposed defence agreement with Lebanon is to turn the latter into a Syrian protectorate. In the short term, the proposed agreement will allow Syria almost complete freedom of movement throughout Lebanon. It will also free Syria from its dependence on a mandate from other Arab countries to maintain its occupation forces in Lebanon. Thus, in the long term, it will enable Syria to realise its long-standing dream of incorporating Lebanon into a Greater Syria.

200. In conclusion, I should like to recall some of the words recently used by a prominent Arab diplomat to describe the internal situation in Syria. He said:

"Under nine years of Assad's rule, the Syrian people have experienced increased hardships and the continuous deterioration in their living conditions.

"In the absence of genuine democratic processes, rampant practices of corruption, extortion and bribery have remained unchecked.

"Many patriotic Syrians, civilians and military alike, who have criticized these policies or opposed the practices of the Assad régime have been silenced by arrest and incarceration. Amnesty International has documented the many violations of the human rights of political detainees in Syria, including the use of torture and the denial of the prisoners' right to a fair trial and open hearing.

"It is the combination of these heightened tensions, increasing frustrations and the intensified discontent which ignited the recent wave of terrorist actions in Syria. While regrettable in their futility and directionless impact, these acts must however be understood as mere reactions to the systematic violence which the Assad régime daily inflicts on the Syrian people.

"While he held meetings to purportedly 'listen to the people', Assad at the same time ordered a military crackdown on dissenters. Public executions have served to create a climate of fear in order to discourage other types of dissent against the régime.

"The undemocratic and bankrupt character of the Syrian régime is clear."

The man who spoke these words is none other than the former Syrian Ambassador to the United Nations. He said them in the course of the press conference which he held in this very building on 27 December 1979, when he announced his resignation out of disgust with the régime which he was required to represent.

201. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Jordan has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

202. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I should like to make a few remarks in passing, reserving my right to make a more detailed refutation of the Israeli flagrant distortions which we have just heard.

203. The professor of law who today engaged in the defence of lawlessness has once again indulged in the usual distortions and misrepresentations with which the Zionist movement has, since its inception, tried to brainwash and mislead the world.

204. He started his statement by asking a very legitimate question. He said: "Why is it that we have brought the question of colonization once more before the Security Council?" Our answer is very simple

indeed. Not only was the debate called at our request and behest, it was mandated by the Council itself when it established the Commission of inquiry and decided in one of the provisions of its resolution to keep the situation under constant review. I need hardly repeat that, since the Commission was established, the rate of colonization has reached epidemic levels. It is indeed a cannibalization of the Palestinian people, and the Israelis are in a hurry to do it as quickly as they possibly can. Therefore, the least that the Council should do is to see whether its resolution has been observed, or defied according to Israel's custom. The updating of information on events and the confiscation of land clearly show the terrifying acceleration of Israeli colonization.

205. In passing, I would again repeat that the riots of 1929 were ignited by Zionist hooligans. I remember that very, very well. They attacked the Al-Buraq area, the western wall of the Al-Haram Al-Sharif area, to us the holiest place in Jerusalem. That led to widespread rioting throughout the length and breadth of Palestine. It was then that the Palestinian Arabs realized, after the normal and cordial relationship that they and the Jews had had, that the Jews there were out to uproot us. And that was the cause of the rioting, as was proved by the international committee to which the League of Nations assigned the task of investigating the rioting.

206. We are accustomed to the Israeli representative referring to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as the Palestinian State of Jordan. Now, he must be made to understand that Jordan is Jordan, and Palestine is Palestine. Jordan is an independent sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations. The Palestinian Arab State has not been created because the Israelis aborted its creation by their notorious Delep plan in 1947 and 1948, though pretending to pay lip-service to and acquiescing in General Assembly resolution 181 (II). I distinctly remember that two or three days after the declaration of the Partition Plan my own quarter in Jerusalem was subjected to a massive organized military attack, which included artillery and the destruction of dozens of houses over the heads of their inhabitants. In those early days we did not have even a revolver with which to defend ourselves, let alone a rifle. We could not have started fighting the Partition Plan even if we had wanted to, because we did not have the means to do so. We simply said that we would not welcome the dismemberment of our own country. That is a legitimate position that every country in the world that faces dismemberment normally takes.

207. As I have said, Jordan is Jordan, and Palestine is Palestine, and the creation of the Palestinian Arab State is clearly delineated in the maps attached to resolution 181 (II), which the Israeli Foreign Minister, in order to deceive and to obtain Israel's admission to the United Nations, himself pledged to abide by and respect. And what of the repatriation of the Palestinian

refugees under General Assembly resolution 194 (III)? As we all know, not a single refugee was enabled to return to his home. In the meantime, what the Israelis did was to destroy hundreds and hundreds of not only Palestinian Arab villages and towns but also hundreds of holy sites throughout the length and breadth of Palestine.

208. As for the Act of Unity which we had between the East Bank and the West Bank in 1950, it specifically provided that that unity should in no way prejudice the ultimate solution of the Palestine problem and that the inhabitants of both banks of the River Jordan would work together in concert for the restoration of full Arab rights by all legal and legitimate means and in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

209. Again, the representative of Israel spoke about the aggression of the Arab armies. Let me remind him, and let him deny it if he can, that even before the end of the British Mandate, before the British army had withdrawn from Palestine, Israel had pre-empted the solution in accordance with United Nations decisions by occupying almost four fifths of Palestine. The entry of the Arab armies, or small contingents of Arab armies, was designed to rescue the remnants of the civilian population who had survived massacres such as the Deir Yassin massacre, in which 250 men, women and children were butchered and thrown into wells. The perpetrator of that heinous crime, the leader, was none other than Menachem Begin, with his Irgun. The Arab Legion did not enter Palestine for any purpose other than to stave off further genocide of the Palestinian people, at the request and pleading of the beleaguered Palestinians. They did not set one foot on the territories that were earmarked for the Jewish State. It was the other way around. It was the Israelis who, even after the end of the Mandate, continued their aggression and their massive attacks against the Arab quarters and against the Arab towns and villages, as I stated earlier.

210. The representative of Israel spoke about holy sites. Let me remind him—and the records are here at the United Nations and in books—that hundreds of Christian and Islamic sites were destroyed by the Israelis during the period 1947 to 1967, and more were destroyed thereafter. As for the Jewish cemetery to which he referred as dating back hundreds of years, it is common knowledge that that cemetery, on Mount Scopus, was leased to the Jews, whom we regarded as co-religionists, a mere 100 years ago by the Islamic Foundation. And the period of the lease was 100 years, which expired 10 years ago. And what did we do then? We kept the cemetery as it was, except that an outside company built an hotel and it was essential that a little road be built to make it accessible to the people. I would not like to mention the name of the company, but it was its suggestion.

211. Now, what did the Israelis do? The representative of Israel is probably not aware that they had

desecrated a more than 1,000-year-old Arab Islamic cemetery, the Mamillah cemetery, which is one of the most cherished Islamic sites in the whole of Jerusalem. I think that anybody who has served in the American Consulate in Jerusalem could testify that that cemetery, in which are buried some of the greatest men, thinkers, writers, theologians, scholastics, warriors and heroes, has been turned into a park on which dogs trample every day. I think that persons in the American Consulate can see that with their own eyes every day. This is where we see cemeteries that have been desecrated: not a 100-year-old cemetery that was leased from the Moslem Foundation, but that Mamillah cemetery which goes back more than 1,000 years.

212. In conclusion, I turn to the claim of the Israeli representative that the representative of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has changed the name of Hebron into something else. It so happens that Al-Khalil is the Arabic name for the city of Hebron and means "The Beloved of the Compassionate", namely, "The Beloved of God". It is a term of veneration, and has been known for almost 1,400 years as Al-Khalil, in the same way as Jerusalem is known as Al-Quds, "The Holy". If it is known in English as Jerusalem and Al-Khalil is known in English as Hebron, it does not mean that the names have been arbitrarily changed. It is a term of veneration.

213. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

214. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I only wish to make a few comments. There will still be enough time for replies later.

215. The logic of the representative of Israel is not only strange, it is insulting. It is insulting to the Security Council and to everybody here who is trying to make a contribution to the matter under discussion and to discuss the matter correctly.

216. At the last meeting, the representative of Israel called the Council a Council that is blinkered and does not want to see the truth. It is really difficult after that to have a conversation with him.

217. Today he has made his colleagues work better, I think, than last time. They have chosen quotations for him, excerpts, notes and other printed matter. He is trying to divert our attention from the matter under discussion, to the past, forgetting that we are not talking now about the 1920s or 1940s, but about the situation that now prevails in the territory occupied by Israel. He should not try to get away with that if he wants to help the Council to find a correct solution. He knows that he is acting like a soldier who is

out of step and who blames the whole platoon, saying that he is marching correctly and that the others are out of step. Does he think anybody can believe him? No one believes him.

218. He made outrageous accusations against a whole number of countries to which I will not refer because they can answer for themselves. Today, he even read out a long quotation from a statement by a man who betrayed his country and his Government. I despise traitors, and I despise the methods whereby people read out quotations from statements by traitors. Any revolution sifts out people who cannot stand the strain, and he has taken advantage of that. It is shameful, simply shameful. He found it appropriate to take a quotation from a statement made by a traitor and to insult the Head of State of the Syrian Arab Republic. I did not expect him to go so far.

219. He is being criticized here not because Israel has formed itself into a State. The United Nations created that State. That is not what Israel is being criticized for. That is not the question. The question under discussion is the situation in the territories occupied by Israel, and that is the question that he is not answering but it is the one that he should answer. He is doing wrong by compelling the Council to take up secondary matters. If he really thought he was in the right he would have allowed the Council Commission to visit his country to see what the situation was and to speak about it. What is he so afraid of? Something must be wrong, something that he does not like. He must be afraid of something. How can we believe after that that he is in the right? Are we to believe him and not the Commission that submitted the report? The Commission consisted of highly respected representatives from Portugal, Zambia and Bolivia. We have no reason not to believe the Commission. On the contrary, none of the members of the Commission is partial in respect of Israel or of any other side. Why did Israel not grant them access? There must be something wrong. Let him answer that question. Why did Israel not allow the Mayor to come here at the request of the Council? The answer he gave does not satisfy anybody. What sort of an answer is it? No answer at all. If the Mayor had come here and spoken, then the representative of Israel could have said that he told lies about such and such, that the true situation is such and such, and the Council would have understood where the truth lay.

220. The representative of Israel mentioned other issues too; in particular, he insulted Cuba and Yugoslavia. They can answer for themselves. I shall not refer to that. I just wanted to say one thing: if Israel had had the same relations with its neighbours and with other countries as the Soviet Union has, let us say, with Cuba, then Israel's policy would never be the subject of discussion here in the Council.

221. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to be

allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him to resume his place at the Council table and to make his statement.

222. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As regards the Tunisian representative's statement about the curfew, we have checked the verbatim record in English and it says: "For days its population has been subjected to a particularly stringent curfew". [*Para. 67 above.*] In English, at least, this implies that he thinks the curfew is still going on.

223. It is indeed ironic that the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan should challenge the fact that his country is the independent Palestinian Arab State established on 80 per cent of the area of the former Palestine Mandate. Mr. Nuseibeh himself is the quintessence of this thesis. He embodies it in his very person, for here we have the son of a well-known Jerusalem family serving as the Ambassador of Jordan to the United Nations. Is he going to tell us that he is not a Palestinian Arab? By challenging my thesis, does he mean to imply that his loyalties to Jordan are questionable? Or is he some form of diplomatic mercenary, a Palestinian Arab merely in the employ of the Jordanian Government? I challenge Mr. Nuseibeh to tell the Council how many other Palestinian Arabs, like him born in the area of Mandated Palestine west of the Jordan River, are Jordanian Ambassadors throughout the world today, such as Abdullah Salah in Washington, Tahir Al-Masri in Paris and Nabih Al-Nimr in Bonn? Is he going to tell us that none of them is a Palestinian Arab, that they have gone through some extraordinary metamorphosis—or are they all, like Ambassador Nuseibeh, diplomats of convenience?

224. Let me remind the Jordanian representative of the record. Between 1922 and 1946 Transjordan was an integral part of the Palestine Mandate. In 1946 it became the independent Palestinian Arab State in that area. When King Abdullah came to the Jericho Conference in December 1948, attended by Palestinian Arabs west of the Jordan River, he was crowned "King of Palestine". Abdullah in fact wanted to rename his country the "Kingdom of Palestine". King Hussein in his memoirs indicates clearly that Transjordan was arbitrarily siphoned off from the rest of Mandated Palestine. Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan stated unambiguously in the Jordanian National Assembly on 2 February 1970: "Palestine is Jordan and Jordan is Palestine. The nation is one and the land is one."

225. In the period of the Jordanian occupation of Judaea and Samaria, that is, from 1948 to 1967, 400,000 Palestinian Arabs from those areas moved to the area east of the River Jordan, which they regarded, as a matter of course, as the Palestinian Arab State on the territory of the former Palestine Mandate. As is also well known, the Arab residents of Judaea and Samaria are citizens of Jordan. The Palestinian

Arabs from these areas who occupy leading positions in Jordan today are too numerous to mention. They constitute Jordan's economic, administrative and intellectual élite.

226. It is an irrefutable fact that Jordan is the Palestinian Arab State on the territory of the former Palestine Mandate, just as Israel is the Palestinian Jewish State in the same area. Those who would challenge this fact have an obvious political axe to grind or, as they would prefer, to wield.

227. I will not compete with Mr. Kharlamov either in logic or in standards of courtesy. Mr. Kharlamov was rude enough last Friday to burst into my remarks and accuse me of uttering what he so felicitously termed "idiocies". He was unable to control himself just at the moment when I suggested that there was a distinct convergence of interests between the initiators of the present debate and those who would try to divert attention from Afghanistan.

228. At the time I was speaking I, for one, was still unaware of the fact that his country was intensifying its use of heavy armour and aircraft against the civilian population of Kabul and other cities in occupied Afghanistan and that that may have been the immediate cause of the Soviet representative's inability to "keep his cool". Incidentally, was it not revealing that Mr. Kharlamov was also exercising his right of reply on behalf of Syria?

229. While I was not familiar with the developments in Kabul last Friday, I was familiar with the description of Mr. Kharlamov's Foreign Minister's visit to Damascus given by the head of the terrorist PLO to the Kuwaiti newspaper *Al-Hadaf* on 14 February. He said explicitly that Mr. Gromyko had visited Damascus last month in order to co-ordinate a confrontation against a "definite" Israeli attack on Syria.

230. Even though it comes from the mouth of a seasoned liar, we can regard Arafat's account as accurate, given his familiarity with Soviet leaders. Moreover, Arafat's account this time has a distinct ring of truth about it. Council members will recall that in 1967 the Soviet Union helped to precipitate the Six-Day War by making precisely the same empty allegations against Israel. When the then Prime Minister of Israel invited the Soviet Ambassador to visit the north of the country and see for himself the hollowness of the charge, the latter refused, in conformity with the Soviet doctrine that if the facts do not conform to the charge, so much the worse for the facts.

231. Mr. Kharlamov also suggested that if my country had with the Soviet Union the kind of relationship which Cuba enjoys with it, we should not have to come before the Council. I quite agree with him. If we became a satellite of the Soviet Union, the Soviet veto would be made available to us. That is what he evidently meant.

232. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I now call on the representative of Jordan, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

233. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I realise that we have detained the Council until a somewhat late hour and I shall therefore make a very few, brief remarks.

234. If the alien Mr. Blum is castigating me for being a Jerusalemite, I should like to tell him that my family has been there for 1,400 years of uninterrupted habitation. It is an honour which he cannot claim. The fact that I am an ambassador of Jordan—and I could have been an ambassador of Syria, of Algeria or of Tunisia—is because I am a fervent believer in Arab unity.

235. Our unity was disrupted by a secret agreement, the Sykes-Picot agreement, which was made behind our backs and which vivisected the territorial integrity of the overall Arab homeland. Indeed, I have written a book on Arab nationalism which shows and proves what is natural, namely, that Arab unity is our ultimate aim. I think that our vivisection is the reason that a person like Mr. Blum can make all his distortions and tell his lies.

236. Is it any surprise that not only I but many others are ambassadors of Jordan? It simply proves that when we made an act of unity it was not a Jordanian occupation of Palestinian territory—it was unity in full equality and full sharing and participation. Indeed, I would add that half the Jordanian Cabinet consisted of Palestinians.

237. As I said earlier, the Act of Unity stipulated specifically that that unity, in which all citizens would live in dignity and equality, was contingent upon and without prejudice to the fulfilment of all the Palestinian Arab rights, including, of course, the creation of the Palestinian Arab State.

238. If I serve any country, it is my duty and it is my honour because the whole area is my homeland. It has been so for most of the 1,400 years of our history. And we shall make sure that it is restored to its unity.

239. The Israeli representative talked about the British Mandate. Let me remind him that, illegitimate as the Declaration was—emanating as it did from a single person, Balfour—it was the British Government itself which in 1923 requested the League of Nations to exclude the area to the east of the River Jordan from the aggressive and inimical application of the Balfour Declaration. It is the result of that aggressive and inimical application—the uprooting of the Palestinian people—that we are discussing here today.

240. As I said earlier, Palestine is Palestine and Jordan is Jordan. If one wants to see the Palestinian Arab State, one need only look in the records of the United Nations: it is delineated in the maps attached to the relevant resolution.

241. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I very much regret that I must again take up the time of members of the Council.

242. First, I should like briefly to refer to the interpretation of what I said in my previous statement. I do not take back a single word of what I said. But my neighbour to the right, in his statement a few moments ago, made my words even stronger than they were. If he wants them to sound that way, then we will let it stand.

243. Secondly, in my previous statement I said something like this: If Israel had relations like those we have with Cuba, then we would not need to be discussing this matter here. And I would add something to that: if Israel had relations with the Palestinians, if it were to allow the Palestinians to have their own national State, if it were to establish friendly relations with them, the Council would not be meeting now and wasting so much time in discussing this question.

244. With regard to the word “satellite” which my neighbour to the right used, I find it very difficult to sort out his country’s relations with its sponsors. I do not know who is the satellite and who is the master among those who give billions of dollars of armaments to his country. He is obviously in a much better position to judge that than I am.

245. I come now to my last point. We know better than he does what our State should do. We know when to send our Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, to another, friendly State. It is not up to Israel to decide, or to make an evaluation of the visit of our Foreign Minister to Syria.

*The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.*

#### NOTES

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

<sup>2</sup> Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

<sup>3</sup> A/34/631.

<sup>4</sup> A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 102f and g.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 110, 111, 126, 128, 130, 132 and 133.

<sup>6</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

---

### 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 diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---