



CONTENTS

Agenda item 31:

The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General 1315

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 31

The situation in the Middle East: report of
the Secretary-General

1. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Thirty years have elapsed since the eruption of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Yet the fundamental facts and factors of the dispute are still the targets of a premeditated plot of falsification and distortion hatched on a scale unprecedented in history.

2. After three decades of tragedy, murder, displacement and dispersal; after four destructive wars that ravaged the area and almost drove the entire world to the brink of nuclear war, a premeditated Byzantine polemic continues to revolve around self-evident points and subjects that no one would have imagined could be the subject of give-and-take and bargaining throughout these long years, taking the place of a discussion of the facts and the reasons behind the conflict.

3. Therefore, we are still confronted with the Middle East question today; we continue to exert unrelenting efforts; we continue to hold negotiations and consultations; we mobilize diplomacy—sometimes secret, sometimes open—and occasionally shuttle diplomacy. All these efforts have been exerted in order to find an answer to such naive and elementary questions as the following. What are the reasons for the Middle East conflict? Who are the parties to the conflict? Who is the true representative of this party or the other? Shall we apply the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of the territory of others by force to all the occupied territories or only to part of the occupied territories? Shall we settle the conflict as a whole? Or will it suffice to have a solution of only an aspect of the problem?

4. The reply to so ridiculous a series of questions requires no more than a simple glance at the realities of the conflict and a brief recapitulation of the history of the conflict, including the hundreds of resolutions so explicit in this regard that have been issued over the past three decades.

5. We can understand how this party or that might resort to such casuistic manoeuvres so as to conceal the facts or to

gain time. But it is inadmissible that the United Nations, an Organization which participated in creating the problem and which has lived with it since its inception up to this day, should allow itself to play the role of the manoeuvrer and should disregard its own resolutions on the question, should indeed swallow up its own resolutions and recommendations on this issue. This is something we cannot expect or accept, nor, for that matter, is it something that the international Organization itself should accept.

6. Let us discuss, for example, the question, Shall we allow the establishment of an independent Palestinian State on the West Bank and in Gaza?

7. The mere posing of such a question on the part of some members of the international community constitutes a violation of the resolutions of the Organization and demonstrates a disregard for the United Nations. The United Nations decided 30 years ago to set up an independent Palestinian State, not only on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, but in an area of Palestinian land which is twice as large as the area of those two regions. Moreover, the Members of the United Nations that today flout legality by posing this question are the very same ones that exerted pressure and resorted to all forms of promises and enticements to force the United Nations, on 29 November 1947, to adopt resolution 181 (II), which called for the partition of Palestine into two States: an Arab State and a Jewish State. What has happened since, that this new question should arise today regarding the right to set up an Arab Palestinian State? Has the United Nations rescinded the partition resolution it adopted in 1947, or does the right of people to their land become invalid as a result of that land's falling victim to annexation and occupation?

8. Let us take the other strange question which, despite its ridiculousness, continues successfully to be used by some States as a means of obstructing the Peace Conference on the Middle East and the realization of a peaceful settlement of the issue: Who represents the Palestinians?

9. This question was put and continues to be put to just about anyone—to those who have some relationship with the question and to those who do not, with the exception of the only party that is directly concerned, that is, the Palestinians themselves. How can any State decide who must represent the other party? If it should be up to us to dictate to the Palestinian people who are to be their representatives, why do we not take a short-cut and impose a destiny on that people as long as we are imposing the choice of their representatives?

10. Those who raise such a question also commit a flagrant violation not only of the principle of the sovereignty of peoples and their right to self-determination but

also of the resolutions and practices of the United Nations in this respect. The General Assembly decided this issue at its twenty-ninth session when in its resolution 3210 (XXIX) it recognized the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and granted that organization the status of observer, on the basis of that recognition, in the United Nations and agreed to its participation in all the Organization's activities and deliberations. The Security Council reaffirmed such recognition regarding the representation by the PLO of the Palestinian people ever since its decision of 4 December 1975,¹ by which it decided to discuss the Middle East question, including the Palestinian cause, with the participation of the PLO. Ever since, the Security Council has continued to allow the participation of that organization in all its meetings and debates concerning the questions of Palestine and the Middle East.

11. We are not now going into detail about the glaring contradictions in this issue. For example, we do not ask how it is possible that an infamous terrorist such as Menachem Begin is not ashamed to claim that he refuses to sit with the representative of the PLO—an organization that is recognized by the whole world as having but one aim, that of liberating its land and defending the right of its people to self-determination—on the grounds that the members of that organization are “terrorists”. We are not at present discussing how Israel has passed from the character of David to that of Goliath, from being a so-called victim of repression to becoming the perpetrator of the most ferocious, barbaric and racist practices of torture, oppression and repression; how it was transformed from an “entity” that appealed for recognition and the right to existence into a usurping settler régime that threatens the existence of others and refuses to recognize their right to live. The overriding need now is to direct the attention of the international community, especially that of the great Powers, which claim to be defending international peace and security and proclaim their heroism in defending and championing human rights, to the facts of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which have become clear after 30 years of the Middle East tragedy. It is ironic that those very States should blind themselves to the basic facts of this problem and continue delaying tactics and procedural and peripheral measures which allow the occupiers to gain time and to consolidate their aggression and settler colonialism.

12. The facts and realities have filled hundreds of thousands of pages and have been the subject of millions of words in statements; hundreds of books have been written on them; thousands of reports have been issued with regard to them; and the United Nations itself has adopted hundreds of resolutions, since its very inception. Therefore, repetition is out of place. We need not go back in detail to the history of the Palestinian tragedy and the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict that brought about that tragedy. But, in the face of this flagrant disregard of the realities of the question, its root-causes and current dimensions, it is essential to remind those who created this issue and continue to give their unconditional support to this aggression, of the following facts.

13. First, Israel is today established on a land that was populated only 30 years ago by a peaceful and innocent people called the Palestinians, two thirds of whom were Moslem and Christian Arabs and only one third was oriental and western Jews, in spite of the hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants who came in, legally or illegally, before that date.

14. Secondly, the United Nations had partitioned Palestine, without the agreement of the sweeping Arab majority, when it adopted the well-known General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 dividing Palestine into two States—a Jewish State representing 56 per cent of the land of Palestine and an Arab State comprising approximately 43 per cent of that land.

15. Thirdly, Israel had established its “Jewish State” by a series of attacks, terrorist actions and massacres, and among its most infamous heroes we find the present Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, on a land whose territory comprises over three fourths of the total area of Palestine, in the two years 1948 and 1949.

16. Fourthly, Israel has persisted in its policy of expansionism, dispersal and Judaization until it completed its seizure of the whole land of Palestine as well as substantial portions of Syrian and Egyptian territories through an aggressive and treacherous war waged against the Arabs on 5 June 1967.

17. Finally, all these Palestinian, Syrian and Egyptian territories have continued to suffer under the yoke of Israeli occupation for 10 years in spite of dozens of resolutions that were adopted by the Organization's General Assembly and Security Council condemning the Israeli occupation and ordering Israel's withdrawal.

18. If we recall all these historical facts, facts that can be denied by no one, and if we remember how the map of “Israel” evolved from 56 per cent of the area of Palestine in 1947 to 76 per cent in 1949 and to a further great increase in 1967 over the original size of Palestine, we ask those who have been raising hell on earth for decades regarding the rights of 3 million Israelis to existence and to secure borders why their conscience is not troubled about the cause of 3 million Palestinians and their right to existence, to secure borders, to their usurped land and to the “State” that was aborted before it could be born. Why do not their hearts go out to that oppressed people, half of whom live in tents and exile and the other half under the yoke of occupation and repression, who are aliens in their own land and oppressed in their own homes—and this without even mentioning the hundreds of thousands of their brother Arabs who were displaced as a result of the occupation of their land in Sinai and in Golan. Does not an Arab possess a right to existence, a right to live free and safe from aggression, subjugation and occupation?

19. The Zionists have been keen since the start to distort the true cause of the conflict in the Middle East; they alleged that the dispute was one between the neighbouring Arab States and Israel and that it was caused by the Arabs' refusal to recognize Israel's right to existence.

20. The argument that the conflict in the Middle East is one between the Arab States and Israel is true. Yet that

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1975*, p. 7.

constitutes only part of the truth, since it ignores the larger and more important part. Why did this conflict erupt between the neighbouring Arab States and Israel?

21. Some may think that the reason for the war that rages now between Syria, Jordan and Egypt on the one hand, and Israel on the other, is the occupation by Israel of Golan, Sinai, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in 1967. But a state of war had prevailed between those Arab States and Israel for a period of 20 years before that date, ever since 1948, before the Zionist occupation of one inch of Syrian or Egyptian territory. Why? Because "Israel" was implanted in the heart of Palestine, the Arab homeland, in the land of a people called the Palestinian people, a people whose fathers and forefathers had lived in that very land for millenia. That land was broken up, partitioned in two sectors, in spite of the will of the overwhelming majority, over two thirds of the population, and without asking the opinion or consent of the majority of the original inhabitants.

22. This tragedy was inflicted by the United Nations upon the Palestinian people less than three years after the signing of the United Nations Charter which reaffirms:

"... faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and the worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small..."²

—that very Charter which reaffirms in its Article 1, as one of the goals of the United Nations, the development of "friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples..."²

23. The Palestinian tragedy, which is unprecedented in history, is the very core of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its direct cause. Where is this Palestinian people today? Half of the Palestinian people, as I said, live in tents, half live under the yoke of occupation. But, in spite of this, they are ignored by everyone. Everyone meets, plots, negotiates, travels, surrenders. They go and they come and they decide. All these moves are made at the expense of that people, in its absence and without a flutter of conscience regarding their usurped rights and their despoiled heritage.

24. All of a sudden the problem of the Middle East and the cause of the Palestinian people in the last few days has been transformed from a "tragedy" to a mixture of "diversionary tragedy" or a "tragi-comedy".

25. The region has become a "theatre of the absurd". And man no longer knows whether to weep or to laugh, to feel scorn or pity, indignation or remorse.

26. The question has become confused and therefore it is difficult to distinguish between allies and opponents, between enemy and friend, between murderer and victim.

27. People all over the world rub their eyes in disbelief. They listen in amazement. Are we truly awake or are we dreaming? Is this one of a series of science-fiction illusions or are we still living on earth?

28. But what took place, regrettably, was not a dream nor a flight of the imagination. Here is the President of the largest Arab State confronting Israel, in flesh and blood, undertaking a ceremonial official visit, a guest who is welcomed in the usurped land, who bows to the banner that still flutters in the air as a symbol of repression and occupation from the Golan to the Canal, from Jordan to Gaza. He stands with all awe and respect to hear the anthem "Hatikvah", to whose tune the Zionist soldiers invaded every inch of the usurped Arab land and to whose tune hundreds of thousands of Arab martyrs fell as they fought to silence it and banish its echo from their skies.

29. That is the leader of Arab Egypt who warmly shakes the hand of those individuals, a long line made up of terrorist war criminals and Zionist butchers who have assassinated an entire Arab people, who have usurped an entire Arab homeland and who throughout 40 to 50 years have perpetrated against the Arab people crimes and atrocities of a magnitude that is both indescribable and revolting.

30. Could this hero of the revolution of 23 July 1952, the successor of Gamal Abdel Nasser, be the same man who shook the hand of the terrorist Menachem Begin, who shook the hand of the war criminal Moshe Dayan, who planted a kiss on the cheek of the racist Golda Meir? What has happened? Has Menachem Begin sought absolution, has he repented for all the massacres perpetrated by him and his colleagues—for example, the massacre at Deir Yasin, where 200 men, women and children were butchered? Has he repented for having called the occupied lands "liberated lands"? Does Moshe Dayan regret the crimes he committed in three wars of aggression—in 1948, 1956 and 1967? Has he gone back on his statement to this Assembly only a few weeks ago [*27th meeting*], when he rejected what he called the "redivision" of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? Has Golda Meir now accepted the fact of the "existence" of the Palestinians? Is the establishment of an independent Palestinian State on the West Bank and in Gaza no longer to be regarded as "a dagger in Israel's back"?

31. Why did the President of Arab Egypt make an official visit to the occupied land, a pompous ceremonial visit greeted by a 21-gun salute, a red carpet and waving flags? Has Israel withdrawn, without our knowledge, from one inch of the occupied territories? Has one single Palestinian returned to his homeland from exile? Has Israel suddenly announced that it welcomes the convening of the Geneva Conference without any conditions or obstacles, or that it no longer refuses to speak and negotiate with the lawful representatives of the Palestinian people? Has Israel stopped sowing dissension among Arabs? Has it stopped liquidating Arabs, one after the other? Has it stopped insisting on partial negotiations and separate peace agreements with each of the Arab States?

32. No, not one of those things has happened. Israel is still Israel. The Zionist occupation is firmly implanted on every inch of the lands usurped. Israeli settlements continue to mushroom with frenzied speed in the occupied Arab territories. Israeli prisons are still full of Arab prisoners, of Arab militants who are fighting against occupation and aggression. The leaders of Israel continue to state that the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are "liberated Israeli

² Quoted in English by the speaker.

territories". They continue to refuse to recognize the rights of the Palestinian people or to accept the establishment of a Palestinian State on two small parcels of land in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, when their immense, expansionist "State" has already absorbed over 80 per cent of the land of Palestine. Israel continues to wage aggression on the Palestinian people and on the neighbouring Arab States. It continues to build up arsenals of weapons, rockets, aircraft and tanks. It continues to threaten that it will use atomic bombs and nuclear weapons against the Arab people if they do not agree to kneel down and surrender.

33. It is a tragedy that the Egyptian President's startling visit to the enemy in the occupied land took place at the very time when the Islamic and Arab world had begun its celebration of the most important of its religious holidays, the feast of Bairam. It is a tragedy that this visit took place at a time when the blood of hundreds of women, children and elderly persons—victims of the barbaric Israeli raids a few days ago on Lebanese villages and Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon—had not yet dried.

34. It was painful to see this Arab President being greeted and received in the heart of the city of Jerusalem and delivering his speech in the Israeli Knesset, which was erected as an aggression on the Holy City; for this implies—at least on the part of this Egyptian President—*de facto* recognition and implicit legitimization of the Israeli acquisition of the city of Jerusalem and its definite annexation to the Zionist entity as its capital.

35. It is indeed a tragedy that the visiting Arab statesman was greeted in Palestine by the Zionist alien invaders, whereas only a few hundred metres away there were hostile demonstrations by sons of his own Arab nation, the owners of the usurped lands, who suffer the deep wounds of oppression and occupation.

36. The official visit of the Arab President to the leaders and representatives of the Zionist racist régime was a tragedy for every free Arab, from the Atlantic to the Gulf. But the humiliation is even deeper because this visit took place in the holy city of Jerusalem, the city holy to the three monotheistic religions, the city wrested from the bosom of Moslems and Christians to become the capital of the racists and the Zionists. This is a humiliation deeply felt by every Christian and Moslem throughout the world. Amidst the shame and dishonour we can only put this indignant and resonant question, Why? Why has this Egyptian President suddenly stabbed in the back the great Arab people of Egypt, their pride and their honour? Why has the "hero of the crossing", one of the creators of the "October miracle", sunk so low before the enemy, whose soldiers continue to trample on and desecrate the pure Arab land? Why does the Egyptian President isolate so tragically the armed Arab struggle against racism, settler colonialism and occupation from the struggle of the fraternal African, Asian and Latin American peoples, thereby giving the Arab struggle such a humiliating and defeatist character?

37. Can anyone imagine that General de Gaulle, in his search for peace, would travel to meet the leaders of the racist Nazi régime in Berlin while their aggressive forces continued to occupy French land?

38. Can anyone today imagine that any of the Presidents of the African confrontation States would visit the leaders of the racist régimes in Salisbury and Pretoria to beg for peace?

39. The Arab people have repeatedly reaffirmed and proved beyond doubt that they desire peace. But that proud Arab people can distinguish between peace and surrender.

40. The wound inflicted by the first stab dealt by this Arab President to the Arab Powers confronting Israeli aggression when he signed the second Sinai disengagement agreement in September 1975³ had not yet healed. That agreement froze the situation in the Sinai confrontation; it allowed the Zionist enemy to take refuge behind the screen of American warning stations and international emergency forces and provided a contractual commitment barring recourse to force to solve the conflict, while the Arab territories of Sinai, the Golan, the West Bank, Jerusalem and Gaza remained under Israeli occupation.

41. The confidential protocols and various secret annexes to the second Sinai disengagement agreement allowed the Zionist entity to blackmail the United States of America and the American taxpayer to the tune of billions of dollars in the way of grants, loans and military assistance—aircraft, rockets and electronic devices—on a regular annual basis, to such an extent that the American taxpayer now pays \$600 annually for each man, woman and child in the Israeli population. All that in return for Israel's withdrawal from a mere few kilometres in the Sinai desert which it had occupied by aggression and force.

42. The astonishing American undertaking, which contravenes sovereignty, was given by the Zionist, Mr. Henry Kissinger, then United States Secretary of State, to Israel in one of the secret protocols appended to the second Sinai agreement. It has allowed Israel to obstruct the convening of the Geneva Conference ever since the signing of that agreement. In that protocol relating to the Geneva Conference Mr. Kissinger pledged to Israel non-recognition of the PLO and refusal to negotiate with that organization, except with Israel's permission. He also pledged the co-ordination of United States policy with Israel, in connexion with the Conference, to the exclusion of all the other parties, and gave in to Israel's insistence on negotiating with the Arabs on a bilateral basis within the framework of the Conference—an arrangement that contradicts the idea and the set-up of the multilateral Geneva Conference.

43. The Egyptian President made that unilateral agreement with Israel two years ago, and it was a blow to the interests of his comrades in the confrontation, the Syrians and the Palestinians, since he thereby bowed blindly to his friend "dear Henry". Henry has unmasked his true face since leaving office and revealed himself as a firmly rooted Zionist who publicly urges Israel not to withdraw from the occupied territories, not to deal with the PLO and not to accept the establishment of a Palestinian State in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

³ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975, document S/11818/Add.1, annex.

44. The new blow dealt by President El-Sadat to the Arab nation extends the understanding of the Sinai agreement; yet it is a more bitter blow to the heart and humiliates Arab honour. It is the fatal first official departure from unified struggle against the Israeli enemy, the first gratuitous capitulation before Zionist racist force that continues to grip the body of the Arab nation.

45. The visit to the Zionist leaders has inflicted and will continue to inflict the following serious damage on the Arab cause of destiny.

46. First of all it split Arab ranks, it weakened the forces of confrontation and it squandered the blood shed for the last 40 years by thousands of Arab martyrs, who sacrificed their lives for Arab lands in a confrontation with the invading settler Zionists.

47. Secondly, it saved Israel from its isolation, allowed it to improve its deteriorating image and imparted an appearance of confidence and credibility to its extremist Zionist leaders without any sign of change, moderation or compromise on the part of the Zionist régime.

48. Thirdly, it imparted a kind of legitimacy and recognition to the Zionist entity, not only in Israel but also in the other occupied Arab territories usurped since 1967 without Israel's undertaking any recognition of the Palestinian people, its representatives or national rights, and without its expressing its intention to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories.

49. Fourthly, it granted a kind of *de facto* recognition to Israel's seizure of Jerusalem and the transformation of that city into the capital of the Zionist régime, in spite of the unanimous international objection to such usurpation.

50. Fifthly, the surrender before Israel's insistence on imposing direct negotiations on the Arabs on an unequal basis under the weight of occupation and the burden of military force led to weakening the role of the United Nations, of the Geneva Conference and even of the two super-Powers which, in spite of certain drawbacks and partiality, continue to constitute a factor for the control and moderation of Israel's extremism and intransigent expansionist policy.

51. Sixthly, it facilitated Zionist plots and manoeuvres which aim at replacing the comprehensive settlement by unilateral agreements and partial settlements in such a way as to allow Israel gradually to return to the step-by-step policy so as to gain time and consecrate the *status quo* which constitutes a grave menace to international peace.

52. Seventhly and finally—and this is the most important and dangerous—it aborted and weakened any means of pressure on Israel by granting what that country called for in the way of recognition, exchange, acceptance and normal relations beforehand, without Israel's fulfilling on its part any of the basic prerequisites that are necessary if we wish to envisage the establishment of such normal relations—foremost among which are withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and the full recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people.

53. Those serious repercussions are the least that will be provoked by the visit of the Egyptian President, a visit unprecedented in the history of the struggling peoples who are fighting for their freedom and for the liberation of their land, to release it from the grip of the racist enemy which practises settler colonialism and racial and religious discrimination as a basis of its official and public policy.

54. The most important aspect is that this visit began without any justification and terminated without any result, except that it has stabbed in the heart the struggle of the Arab people against Zionist aggression.

55. It began under the slogan of a journey for peace, yet it did not rise above the low level of surrender, because Israel, whose existence is based on force and aggression, does not desire peace. Compromise and acquiescence only serve to increase its resolve for aggression and injustice.

56. What the Egyptian President undertook cannot be considered as concerning only him or only fraternal Egypt since it directly affects the Palestinian cause and the crux of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

57. The statement of the Syrian Arab Republic which was issued following the declaration of the Egyptian President's desire to visit Israel said that: "No Arab leader is entitled to take such a step, a step which would affect the existence of the Arab nation, its future and its honour."

58. That statement was published after the visit of the Egyptian President to Damascus, a visit during which President Hafez Al-Assad, the Syrian President, exerted every possible effort to convince the President of the fraternal Arab State of Egypt to abandon his dangerous initiative. Yet the Egyptian President continued, regrettably, to insist on his visit.

59. The statement issued on behalf of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Progressive National Front and the two regional and national leaderships of the Arab Ba'ath Socialist Party expressed the pain felt by the Arab people and their grief at this surrender on the part of a leader of an Arab State to the Zionist entity. The statement reads:

"During the Syrian attempt to change the Egyptian President's mind and the efforts deployed in this respect to make clear to him the dangers inherent in such a visit and the enormous negative effects that it could have on the Arab cause and destiny, Syria reaffirmed that this visit harms our national struggle and belittles the great sacrifice accepted by our Arab people during the long struggle against Zionist occupation of the Arab land. Syria reaffirmed to President El-Sadat during protracted discussions that took place during his visit to Damascus the importance of maintaining the unity of the Arab cause and the inadmissibility of dividing that cause, the danger of a rift in the alliance of Syria and Egypt, an alliance which was always the strategic objective of both fraternal Arab States and of the entire Arab nation. Syrian-Egyptian agreement was always a guarantee of the realization of the aspirations of the Arab masses. Syria has explained to the Egyptian President the dangers inherent in his visit to Israel for the Palestinian cause, the essence of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the negative

results of this visit on Egypt itself, its reputation, its role and its Arab and international status, and the impact it will have on the balance of power in the Arab struggle against the Zionist enemy.”

The statement goes on to say that:

“The decision of the Egyptian President and his insistence on visiting Israel constitutes a painful blow dealt to the Arab nation, a departure from its will, a shattering of its cohesion, and at the same time a grave insult to Arab Egypt and its martyrs who have given their lives in the long battle against the Zionist entity and its expansionist racist policy.

“Syria, which was grieved by President El-Sadat’s decision, believes that the visit to Israel will bring to the Zionist entity gains and benefits that it has been unable to reap during the 30 years that have elapsed in spite of all the aggressive wars against the Arabs. The Arab nation perceives the struggle against the Zionist entity in Palestine as a national liberation struggle against the Zionist presence in Palestine. The Arab nations will never forgive any Arab leader for any step he may take which would legitimize the occupation and perpetuate aggression.

“The Syrian Arab Republic believes that no one in the Arab nation has a right, regardless of his status, to take any decision regarding national causes of destiny in such a way as negatively to affect the cause at large and to grant the enemy the gains that he has dreamed of. Syria believes that no Arab ruler is entitled to take such a step that affects the very existence of the Arab nation, its honour and its future.”

The statement went on to say:

“Syria has exerted many efforts and demonstrated great flexibility in reaffirming its eagerness to strengthen Egypt and its national role. Syria believes that the Egyptian decision cannot negate the national role of Egypt or prevent the Egyptian people from discharging their national responsibilities, because the will of the people is stronger in any confrontation and is always stronger than that of any ruler or statesman.”

60. In spite of the danger and in spite of its negative impact on the Palestinian cause and the Middle East, this visit did not lead, as was to be expected, to any change in the Israeli position. Even the myth of the “psychological barrier” which was used as a justification for this visit was merely an Israeli manoeuvre to deceive world public opinion and to conceal the refusal of the Zionist régime to make progress towards a just and lasting peace in the area on the pretext that Israel fears for its security and fears what it calls the persistence of the Arabs in wanting to destroy it.

61. Israel, which boasts—when it so pleases and when the subject has no bearing on the legendary question of security and borders—that it is able to annihilate the combined Syrian, Egyptian, Jordanian, Iraqi, Lebanese and Saudi forces in a few days, this Israel in fact constitutes a danger to international peace because history shows no precedent

for a small State whose population does not exceed 3 million being able to arm itself with such a tremendous quantity of heavy sophisticated and advanced weapons.

62. The expert Anthony Cordesman, in an article which appeared in the *Armed Forces Journal* last October and which raised the issue of the magnitude of Israeli armaments and provoked a wave of indignation and threats from American Zionist organizations, said:

“The United States may no longer be supplying an Israel whose military strength would lead to Israeli willingness to compromise for peace. It may now find itself aiding an Israel which may use its military strength to take permanent control of former Arab territory in direct opposition to U.S. policy, and be locked into an indefinite cold war with the Arabs.”⁴

63. The writer continues:

“The former Director of the CIA has indicated that Israel now has at least a dozen nuclear weapons. There is growing Congressional discussion of the possibility that these weapons were built using missile material stolen by Israel from the United States.”⁵

64. Reporting a radio interview with Moshe Dayan in March on the Jerusalem radio he quotes Mr. Dayan as saying:

“ ‘Just imagine that Israel has a third of the tanks that the United States has, three times as many as France and three times what England has. We have more planes than Italy, or Germany, or France, and a little less than England. How can a country of 3 million people run in this race against the Arabs, who have . . . unlimited political resources for procurement, and huge quantities of manpower? . . . What I am saying is that along with this race we have to develop an option for ourselves, that is, an ability to produce nuclear weapons.’ ”⁶

That is the Israel which is psychologically unstable and which harbours fears concerning its existence and the setting up of a small Palestinian State next to it.

65. The Arabs are the ones who need to break down the barrier of psychological fear of Israel because it is the Arabs who have been the target of Israeli blows and expansion.

66. The situation which now exists in the Middle East is one of continuous aggression and violation of human rights and of the humiliation of peoples. To allow the continuation of such a situation would constitute an insult to the international community and a shameful blot on the record of those great Powers which boast their “defence” of human rights and their “support” for the liberation of peoples and for their right to self-determination, everywhere, except in the Middle East.

67. The plight of the Palestinian people and their dispersal has continued for 30 years. That people has constituted

⁴ See Anthony H. Cordesman, “How Much Is Too Much?”, *Armed Forces Journal International*, October 1977, p. 32.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁶ *Ibid.*

since 1948 the largest group of refugees to suffer in misery under the yoke of occupation and foreign rule. The extent and magnitude of that plight reached such a point that the United Nations was led, at the start, to establish UNRWA, a large agency dedicated to assisting with this problem alone, whereas a much smaller agency, that of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, is concerned with the problems of all the other refugees in the world. In spite of that, the conscience of mankind remains insensitive to the suffering of the Palestinians and no meaningful action is undertaken to end their dispersal and to achieve their repatriation.

68. On the other hand, the occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, Sinai and Golan has continued for more than 10 years. Nevertheless, United Nations resolutions are totally disregarded, while those countries which claim to be democracies and to champion the rights, freedom, security and independence of peoples merely look on.

69. The actions of those States which are silent with respect to that occupation and which offer support to the Zionist entity through military, economic and political assistance constitute collaboration with aggression and a factor in its perpetuation.

70. The time has come for the United Nations to put an end to the situation of stagnation and obstruction which is knowingly created by Israel in order to perpetuate its aggression and occupation and to prevent the Palestinian people from exercising their national and human rights, which have been denied them for so long.

71. The road to peace has become clear and is well known to all. The existence of any people or any State cannot be at the expense of other peoples or other States. The security of a State cannot be based on regional or geographical expansionism. If 3 million Israelis, who have invaded Palestine throughout the years and who have come from abroad, can have the right to self-determination, the 3 million Arab Palestinians, who were expelled from Palestine or who have been subjected to alien rule, also have the same right to self-determination.

72. If the Israelis have the right to set up their State on the larger part of the land that was usurped in Palestine, the Arab Palestinians have the right to set up their State at least on the remaining, smaller portion of the usurped land of Palestine.

73. The United Nations reaffirmed, in its Definition of Aggression contained in resolution 3314 (XXIX), that military occupation, however temporary it may be, is an act of continuous aggression. In the light of this how can the Zionist occupation of the Arab territories continue for more than 10 years?

74. The termination of that aggressive occupation is the first condition necessary for a just and lasting peace in the region. Therefore, Israel must withdraw from all the Arab territories which it has occupied since 1967.

75. The second fundamental condition for establishing a just peace is to allow the Arab people of Palestine to exercise their inalienable national rights, to set up an

independent State on their land, and to enjoy the right to self-determination just as any other people enjoys that right.

76. The fulfilment of those two basic conditions will inevitably lead the region towards peace. The situation of enmity and war arose only as a result of the violation of the rights of the Palestinians and the occupation of Arab lands by force and aggression. When the Israeli occupation is ended and the rights of the Palestinian people are restored to them, the effects of the aggression faced by the Arab peoples and the Arab lands in the region will come to an end, and there will be no reason for continued tension and war in the region.

77. The Arab peoples and the Arab States have expressed by every possible means their sincere desire for a just and lasting peace. They continue today to reaffirm their support for the right of all States in the Middle East to live in peace without any conditions, apart from termination of the vestiges of an aggression that has confronted the Arab peoples for many years, and their acceptance of any international guarantees that are equitable and compatible with sovereignty in this respect.

78. It is incumbent upon the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, to undertake urgent measures which will lead to the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It is the duty of the Co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East to work in close co-operation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations to ensure that the Conference is convened without delay in order to achieve a comprehensive settlement within the framework of the United Nations which will deal with all the factors in the Arab-Israeli conflict, with the participation of all the parties to the dispute and in particular the Palestinian people, represented on an equal footing by the PLO, which has been accepted by the Palestinian people as its representative and recognized by the United Nations with a majority of over 100 of its Member States.

79. Such a comprehensive settlement must be based on the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to the question of Palestine and the Middle East. It must focus, in particular, on respect for two principles: the inadmissibility of the acquisition by force of the land of others and the right of all peoples without exception to self-determination, independence and sovereignty.

80. I avail myself of this opportunity to commend the efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and his unceasing and active initiatives designed to give impetus to the march towards peace and the removal of all artificial barriers and impediments in the way of such advance. I hope that he will continue to exert his valuable efforts in this respect in the light of the resolutions that have been adopted and will be adopted.

81. It is from the rostrum of the United Nations, and not from any place in the world which is marked by occupation or aggression, that we launch the appeal for a durable peace

based on honour, justice and equality. We make this challenge in the hearing of the aggressive opponent after having explained our acceptance of all the prerequisites for a just and equitable peace and for guarantees of that peace. We challenge the Israeli aggressors to give evidence of their desire for peace. We ask them to make clear at this international rostrum their readiness to withdraw from all the Arab territories which have been occupied by force and aggression since June 1967, and to recognize the national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return to their homeland and to set up their independent State on their own land.

82. If Israel truly desires peace, the road is very easy and its landmarks are very clear. But if it wishes to impose surrender then let it realize full well that the Arab people, in spite of setbacks and deviations, refuse to capitulate and will never falter or hesitate in defending their land, their honour and their dignity until every inch of occupied Arab territory is liberated and every Palestinian exercises his right to freedom, sovereignty and self-determination in his independent State on the soil of his homeland.

83. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): There is an item on our agenda this year entitled "The situation in the Middle East". Since my country is part of the Middle East I thought it only proper to make a modest contribution to the debate. I therefore looked up my files to ascertain what should be said on this annual occasion and to my relief I found that what I had said last year⁷ would be quite appropriate to read out for the record at this session. But I decided not to do that, constrained by three considerations: first, that I have a compulsive aversion to making a statement twice, even though the subject is one and the same; secondly, that, thanks to Mr. Begin and his spokesmen, strange, novel concepts and interpretations have been publicly proclaimed and practised which make a fresh statement a little more rewarding and less tedious; thirdly, that the Middle East at this moment is delicately and precariously poised at a cross-roads of a sort, for good or ill, and since all questions pertaining to the Middle East, unlike other areas of the world, are invariably shrouded in Byzantine obscurantism, for reasons which are inexplicable to me, I thought it would be a disservice to pass on my own deep confusion to this Assembly.

84. Let me explain first that the term "Middle East", in the geographic sense, is a misnomer. Earlier it was known as the Near East, which covered a wider area than the term Middle East. But for perfectly understandable administrative and logistical convenience the renowned British General Wavell changed the name in the Second World War, and it has stuck ever since. Besides that, the question of the Near East, because of its Balkanization, turbulence and strife, triggered the First World War and therefore carried unsavory and bitter memories. In the circumstances, the change of name was a healthy one.

85. But has the Middle East fared any better under its new name? Unfortunately not, for it inherited the germs which had caused the Near East to be given the notorious title "the sick man of Europe".

86. The Middle East is at present the sick man of the world. Under its infected epidermis a motley assortment of problems is lumped together, and language is used to conceal aims, which makes it easier to indulge in some of the most perfidious deeds, intrigues, duplicity, and what have you. This is the price that Balkanization and fragmentation unfailingly exact from those who relish them. They speak with multiple voices, they pursue different avenues and they are prompted by different motivations, in some instances selfless and in others downright selfish; as with quicksand, it is not unusual to find the ground shifting beneath your feet and you have to be a real expert to avoid falling into the many traps which are either built in or placed in the path on which you tread.

87. The Middle East requires a new spirit of cleansing, resurgence and commitment if it is to cease being the burden on the world that it is. And unity is a pivotal element in such resurgence.

88. What I have just said sounds like Byzantine obscurantism, and to some it may sound facetious. None the less, it is the only honest description of the situation in the Middle East, and of the forces—external and internal—which are deciding the fate and shaping the destiny of that region. There always is a sacrificial victim in the deadly game of nations—and the Middle East is no exception.

89. How then should I describe the situation in the Middle East? For the tourists, I strongly urge that heavy clothing should be packed in suitcases, because winter is rapidly approaching and it is quite chilly there. For statesmen and diplomats my advice is to wait and see the unfolding of events. In the meantime, and because diplomats are a highly vigilant and intelligent community, the best course of action is to ponder and ponder deeply the components of decision-making in international affairs, with particular concentration on the element of power, as it relates to international issues.

90. The United Nations Charter is a masterpiece in Utopianism. It makes exhilarating reading, and its basic principles and precepts are unassailable. I strongly urge that the Charter be made mandatory reading in high schools, in the earnest hope that we may save future generations from the scourge of war and make them better citizens of our world community as well. But while doing so, we should be very careful not to deceive them with false hopes. We might perhaps write an addendum, warning them not to swallow it whole, that, wonderful as it may read, it is decades ahead of its time and does not represent the real world for the time being or for the foreseeable future. And as a consolation prize, it may be fitting to include in the readings of these high school students a brief compilation of the United Nations resolutions, endorsed by the overwhelming majority of Member States, expressing in unmistakable terms their strict adherence to the Charter and their upholding of its basic Articles in almost every just cause presented for consideration and judgement. But a proviso might be added that, in the most crucial issues, the voices, the conscience and the votes of this overwhelming majority of mankind remain unheeded and ineffectual, because power evidently lies somewhere else.

91. It is a sad tale which must be unfolded for the benefit of future generations.

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 88th meeting, paras. 6-31.

92. I shall now come to concrete issues, even though last year I had pledged not to speak on this annual occasion. The existence of the item on the Middle East stems from the Israeli aggression in 1967 against three sovereign States, namely, Egypt, Jordan and Syria. The territories occupied in the course of that war have already endured an entire decade of occupation, in spite of numerous United Nations resolutions, in spite of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, a principle enshrined in the Charter and sanctified by an aging Security Council resolution, 242 (1967), reinvigorated in 1973 by resolution 338 (1973).

93. But what in fact remains of the two resolutions is something else. While Israel has been claiming that resolution 242 (1967) should be the basis for a fair settlement, it has been undermining it in fact—and very considerably so—by persistently refusing to honour the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949,⁸ which provides for safeguarding the integrity and inviolability of occupied lands and the basic rights of their people. Only a couple of weeks ago, this Assembly almost unanimously adopted a resolution—with Israel alone casting a negative vote—in which it deplored the transformation of occupation into colonization [resolution 32/5], which is what has been happening for a decade in the occupied Arab, and particularly Palestinian, lands.

Mr. Anwar Sani (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

94. The new development, which Mr. Begin and his spokesmen have now come up with openly and which has introduced a new and ominous equation into the whole situation is the following—and the recent statements heard by many of us a couple of days ago have not dispelled the fears arising from these ominous developments.

95. Whereas, in the past, occupation, coupled with systematic and ruthless colonization, was explained away on flimsy security grounds, the spade has, at long last, been called a spade. Instructions have been issued to Israeli emissaries and government institutions to cease calling occupation “occupation” and to substitute for it the term “liberation”. But liberation from whom? From the rightful and indigenous inhabitants from time immemorial?

96. Should it be called “colonization”? Well, one Israeli Cabinet member provided the answer: how can you colonize your own territory? The Palestinians physically and visibly exist. After all, the Israelis even with blindfolds cannot possibly miss seeing them. But their eyes might mislead them and so, by an extraordinary mental exertion, the Israelis insist that what they see is a mirage and not Palestinians. The Palestinians would be tolerated for a while as residents, until the aged passed away, as is the fate of all mortals, and their offspring, either banished, or finding no lands to cultivate and no means of eking out a livelihood, would simply fade away.

97. The Israelis, with all the bounties which they have seized from those they forcibly dispossessed, are not content to stop there.

98. They evidently begrudge the Palestinians the awesome status of being refugees. And so Mr. Dayan in his statement before this Assembly claimed that the provision on the refugees contained in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) was intended—mild as it was—not only to restore their rights to the Palestinian refugees, but equally to the Jews, who were enticed and intimidated into leaving their ancestral homes in the Arab countries and elsewhere to take over Palestinian lands, homes, possessions and homeland in Palestine.

99. Can greed and blind prejudice extend to the point of coveting the unbearable suffering, despoliation and homelessness of the Palestinians? Evidently they do, and I cannot comprehend or explain this perverted phenomenon in human terms, as all of us understand them.

100. The Israelis may be very adroit in planning and are, admittedly, meticulous in execution. Because of emotional disequilibrium, however, they are easily prone to indulging in wishful thinking to an inordinate extent. It is within this context that they behave as though what they wish or will is what is or should be. In the short run, this seems to have worked.

101. Commonsense and history, however, have taught us that, while injustice may have its day of triumph, invariably justice eventually and eternally prevails. They are inexorable and often invisible dynamic forces which our Creator sets in motion in order that justice shall not be indefinitely trampled under foot. One might ask, Is it faith, or superstition or what? I firmly believe that it is a flawless universal and eternal law, which many of us fail to comprehend with our inherently limited faculties, but which does exist all the same.

102. I need hardly reiterate my Government's deepest concern and sorrow over the adamantly insoluble question of the Middle East and the fate of well over 3.5 million people of Palestine at present divided between dispersal and uprooting, on the one hand, and occupation, on the other. Their fate will always remain a deep wound in the conscience and hearts of humanity in its entirety. My Government's most profound concern is, I trust, understandable, considering that Jordan is so inextricably involved in the daily agonies and ordeals of this unending, three-decade-long tragedy.

103. The Palestinians will not simply fade away from the face of the earth. Before this century is out they will probably be in the range of 6 to 7 million uprooted people with a sense of injustice so intense that its bearing on the all-important quest for and maintenance of international peace and stability will become unavoidable and, needless to say, disastrous. Let us close this festering wound and forestall its potentially lethal consequences. I do not know how far in time statesmen formulate their strategies; some are short-sighted, others are identified with “muddling through”, which may or may not work out. But it is only the far-sighted who can see beyond their noses; let us hope that it is they who will prevail.

104. I am not unmindful of the fact that, while speaking before you, the impact of dramas elsewhere might dim any voice from this rostrum. But let me reiterate in sober tones

⁸ Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

and in profoundly sincere expression that what ultimately matters is the finding of just solutions with which all of us can live in good conscience and in real peace after decades of tantalizing uncertainty punctuated only by more strife and bloodshed.

105. We are willing and ready, as we have repeated categorically and unmistakably, to do our share in cutting this Gordian knot, provided Israel is willing to reciprocate by withdrawing from all the occupied territories, including, of course, Arab Jerusalem, and restoring the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

106. I realize that delegations have been placed in a kind of disarray and confusion in consequence of the instant and electronic instrumentalities of contemporary diplomacy. I therefore feel it my duty to appeal to my colleagues who have year after year given their unflinching support to our just cause not to be swayed by momentary events, whatever they may be, until concrete and tangible justice is restored and fulfilled. After all, your generous support has never been from any ulterior motives. It has always been inspired by your unwavering upholding of the United Nations Charter and your own resolutions derived therefrom.

107. The 150 million people of the Arab world cherish their pride and their heritage, a precious component of the common heritage of mankind, to which they are irrevocably and profoundly attached. Their attachment transcends their mortal existence. The commitment to a just and real peace must be sought and understood within this context and this context only. I want to make this as clear as I possibly can. It is equally consonant with our pledge to the United Nations, to which we all belong.

108. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I want to start my statement by thanking the Secretary-General for one of the most concise and, I should say, pithy reports about the situation in the Middle East [*A/32/240-S/12417 and Add.1*]. In two and a half pages or so he is confronting us with what amounts to a deadlock. Of course, it is written in diplomatic language, for which the Secretary-General is noted.

109. Indeed, the deadlock remains. Shall we let it drag on, by resorting, like Mr. Kissinger, for one, and like others, to step-by-step diplomacy, or by making use of such platitudes as saying that the conversations taking place here and there are gaining momentum? It was in fact three decades ago that Palestine was partitioned in 1947. I can never forget that day in Lake Success—I happened to be present. The Arabs tried very hard to see whether we could place Palestine under the Trusteeship Council, which was quite active in those days, in view of the existence of colonial Territories everywhere in Africa and in Asia. But we failed. We failed because it so happened that the President of this great country, the United States, was bothered so much by the Zionists—and also by reason of his political interests—and he got fed up and thought the best solution would be to partition Palestine.

110. We warned the world at that time that the problem would not be solved should there be a partition of Palestine. And I think we have been vindicated. Look at what is happening today: there is nothing new in the

picture, except that it is getting worse, because of Israel's constant contention that it is occupying its own land, the land of the Bible.

111. I have mentioned umpteen times that Zionism is a central European and eastern European ideology initiated by Khazars who were converted to Judaism in the eighth century A.D. and whose ancestors had never set eyes on Palestine. The Khazars were converts to Judaism. There is nothing wrong in that; Europe was similarly converted to Christianity; many Asian and African countries have been converted to Islam. These three religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—are Semitic religions, but there are different cultures and different peoples.

112. Suffice it for me to say that, ethnologically speaking, many Palestinians were Jews who, in the Byzantine era, embraced Christianity, and then, becoming disenchanted and disillusioned with the Byzantines, who used Christianity as the Zionists are using Judaism as a motivation for their own political ends, embraced Islam, another Semitic religion, when it appeared on the scene.

113. Therefore, as I have repeated time and again, in as much as those Zionists think they suffered in Europe because of discrimination and persecution, they always raise the hue and cry that they cannot feel free without a country of their own; and what do we find? We find the Jews very prosperous all over the world today. Perhaps if American Jews were to come back from Israel and be accepted as this country accepted the immigrants from Europe after 1848, they would rebuild New York. But they chose the hornet's nest.

114. And there will be no peace, because the core of the question—and it bears repetition time and again—is the Palestinian people; that is the crux of the question. There have been three or four wars, and God forbid that there should be more. But if there are further wars, they may, perhaps, be waged by those countries whose lands have been wrested from them, but they will be fought by the Palestinians, who are dedicated to the recovery of their land, in spite of the partition having been decreed.

115. Then what happened? Many of the Zionists said, "All right, we have a State." But the die-hards said, "Wherever Abraham and Jacob"—the biblical figures of the Old Testament—"set foot should be considered part of Israel"—hence, from the Euphrates to the Nile. That is their dream, which is turning into a nightmare, unfortunately, for them and for everybody else involved.

116. Now, had it not been for two Western Powers—the United States, and the United Kingdom before it—we would not have had any problem, because after the United Kingdom threw the Palestine Mandate into the lap of the United Nations as a result of the Second World War—when the British could no longer shoulder the expenses or endure the tribulations besetting them, because their soldiers had been hanged; one of their noblemen, Lord Moyne, was killed; and those central and eastern European Zionists were making it so difficult for the British that they had to disengage themselves—who took over? Our American friends.

117. I have mentioned Mr. Truman, who, when told by some members of the State Department that it was not in the interests of this country to alienate the people there, he said: "Gentlemen, tell me, How many constituents of Arab origin do I have? I have to answer to Americans of the Jewish religion"—who, needless to say, were activated by the Zionists.

118. Was the partition of Palestine based on justice, or on expediency? If we go by the yardstick of what you call holiness, in the sense that Jerusalem is a holy city to the Jews, so is it also holy to the Christians and to the Moslems. I shall not, in view of the short time at my disposal, go into detail on this. Suffice it for me to say that there are a billion Christians, 600 or 700 million Moslems, and only 16 or 17 million Jews. Why, if we are democratic, as many would like to be, should we allot Jerusalem to a minority among those religions? We may perhaps be generous and say that Jerusalem should be an international city accessible to all. I wish we had had the United Nations there: it could have been a United Nations capital rather than a Jewish or any other sort of capital. Perhaps the Christians have been so secularized that even those who are religious do not care any more. But let me assure you, speaking for one of the most Islamic States in the United Nations, that we in Saudi Arabia will never concede that because Judaism at one time prospered in Jerusalem it should be a Zionist city.

119. I am not talking now from a prepared speech. I do not have to. This question has been with me since 1922, when the League of Nations declared that Palestine had been placed under a British Mandate. Many of us rebelled. We thought that that was unjust, and it was that declaration that then made of me an anti-colonialist at the age of 17.

120. There is nothing new in the picture. It was a colonial incursion. We wish that it had been colonial as such; it was expropriation. Those converts to Judaism in the eighth century, the proponents and champions of zionism, have said time and again that God gave them Palestine. I do not think that we need to go into this fiction any more. As I said, even if we were fundamentalists, and did go into it, there was a Covenant—let the Israelis know—that was made between Moses and God, and the Jews of those days broke the Covenant I do not know how many times. Then God forgave them, and they say that God repented—it is all there in the Bible. But when He sent a prophet to them, none other than Jesus of Nazareth, they crucified him; and if he had been a bogus prophet there would not have been a billion Christians today who, whenever they are in trouble, have to resort to his teachings in order to find a solution of their ills.

121. Likewise, the Prophet Mohammed assured everybody around him that he was a human being, but in the Koran it says that Jesus was of the spirit of God. Therefore, why should the Jews enjoy exclusivity since, after all, Jesus was a Palestinian; he was an Aramean. The Arameans, the Canaanites, the Moabites and all those people lived there in Palestine and are Jews, not the Khazar converts to Judaism. Our Jews never politicized religion; they never had a sort of sacred mission to drive out the people of Palestine so that they could live there exclusively. They never did that.

122. In fairness to religious people it must be said that ideology, too, may sometimes be used for political and

economic ends: all sorts of "isms", such as socialism or capitalism. One thing is lacking which here should be our gospel, namely, humanism. But let me say—speaking from my humble experience in delving into the history of the region, and being also familiar with the history of the West, having spent a good part of my life in Western countries—anything that is founded on a flimsy foundation will sooner or later totter and fall. And in fairness to those Zionists, who are human beings, somebody should pump some sense into their heads, and make them see that they cannot, against the wishes of the people of the region from Morocco to the Gulf, lord it over a people with a common culture that is different from their own. All the same, if one day they are accepted there they should learn how to adapt and adjust to the people of the area, because otherwise there is no future for them there. In the long run—I will not be around but many of you young people present here will perhaps remember my words—the European as such and his culture has no future in the Middle East. He will disappear through the forces of osmosis and assimilation, just as the Crusaders disappeared, just like many nationalities that came to that area and disappeared. And what is wrong with disappearing and merging with the population and living in peace? But, no, unfortunately every one of those Zionists wants to keep his exclusivity and identity. There is nothing wrong with keeping one's identity, but the world is becoming one; barriers are falling away. Through electronics and the shrinking of distances through communications, anything that happens today that is of momentous importance reverberates to the four corners of the earth. So this Zionist ideology is *passé*; it is something that really belongs to the past.

123. Now I have a word to say to the two major Powers, so that I may make my intervention somewhat practical in nature—if I may dare to hope that it could be so. In the Secretary-General's report, we read about the two Co-Chairmen, from the Soviet Union and the United States. Tomorrow is in their hands and we find that there is a certain amount of goodwill between those two major Powers. They can end this deadlock tomorrow. But, unfortunately, the Zionists who control the mass media in this host country, the great United States of America, are always trying to make a bugbear of the Soviet Union. I am a monarchist. We are not Communists, but we are not afraid of the Soviet Union. But here every American is made to fear Soviet inhumanity.

124. But the man in the White House today is a man who is truly committed to the teachings of Christ that God is love, and he is treating the Soviet Union as if they were his brethren. Of course there are differences between brothers, but what are the Zionists doing? They are always trying to widen the gap. I do not say that either the United States or the Soviet Union is perfect. There is still much to be desired in their approach to a new international order. Petty national interests are still rampant not only in the Soviet Union and in the United States but in every one of our respective States. But the Soviet Union and the United States have a special responsibility because they wield world power. They have a special responsibility not only towards themselves but towards the whole world lest there be a global conflict that would spell the end of mankind.

125. Therefore, you, Mr. Carter in the White House, and you, Mr. Brezhnev in the Kremlin: show us your mettle and

show us that you can bring about peace by telling those Khazars who took Palestine that they cannot live there for always unless they live in amity with the Palestinians—and they do not want to recognize the Palestinians.

126. The Palestinians have fermented not only the Arab world but also the whole third world and many countries which are outside the third world. Now there is a new outlook on Palestinians, even on the part of Western Powers. How do I know? They come to me and say, "After all, we hope one day they will find a solution".

127. But now for your own sake, you Zionist Khazars, do not be like horses with blinders, seeing only what you want to see, because finally you may become a scapegoat through the emotionalism that can be aroused. By whom? By activists. And there is no dearth of activists in the world, whether for this problem or for other problems. If you want to live, let the Palestinians forthwith come and find out how they can carve out their future, as they were the original inhabitants of Palestine, ethnologically and indigenously. You came. Many of you are strangers. Many, it is true, were Jews who were of Semitic origin. Well, listen: inasmuch as there is no such thing as a *fait accompli* in history, live there. But live and let live. You cannot have settlements and say that this was Israel a thousand years ago.

128. Take this Manhattan which belonged to the Indians, this island which the Indians sold for \$24. In any court of law that purchase would be considered as invalid. Why do you not then, you Americans, give Manhattan back to the Red Indians?

129. All these fictitious reasons do not hold water. What would be the alternative? The alternative is that, under the influence of the Khazars—and I do not say our Jews—in the Western world, the Israelis could perhaps, if they develop a psychosis, relive the days of a Masada and bring about, not a holocaust of Jews that allegedly were killed in Germany, but a holocaust that would be world-wide. Is that what they want? As Samson the strong said in the Bible, when allegedly he took the columns of the building he was held in, and said: "Let the building fall on my head and let all those in it die; let me and my enemies die, O God." Is that the way we want it?

130. I hope that the two major Powers and those who have a community of interests with them, none other than

the Western countries and the Eastern socialist countries, will immediately find a drastic solution before things get out of hand. And let me say again from this rostrum what I have repeated. Arab Governments come and go, but the Palestinian people still remain. And they have a following in every Arab country that I have visited. Remember, they also have allies.

131. You call the PLO terrorists. Who started terrorism in the Holy Land? The Irgun Zvai Leumi, the Stern Gang, and so many others. I had better not think of them because what happened was really a tragedy: Deir Yasin, the King David Hotel. Who started all this? Those European Khazars. Our Jews were peaceful Jews.

132. I think that it is time to go to lunch and I shall reserve my right to continue my dissertation tomorrow. It is not a prefabricated speech; it is a dissertation on the question, hoping that it will throw some light on the matter, which I have gathered from my humble experience, hoping against hope that my message will reach the Israelis who, in the best Arab tradition, may be allowed to live there. How foolish they have been! But many of us are foolish. If they had come as immigrants before the First World War and sought residence, the Sultan of Turkey was a very reasonable man. I knew his family; I knew many of them. I was born an Ottoman. And just as they have been prosperous in Istanbul, in the Ottoman Empire, later without a flag, they could have permeated all Arab lands and prospered—as they had prospered here in this country, in the New World, as they had prospered in England.

133. Remember that the Sassoons, our Jews, went to England. They came from Bombay, but originally they were from Baghdad. What was Disraeli but a Jew? He prospered. And in Western Europe many were Jews and they prospered. They could have prospered, and without that rag called a flag.

134. And then we could have had peace. But this is an *arrière-pensée*, as the French say.

135. I shall resume this dissertation or this lecture, if I may call it so, at the convenience of the President and those who are here, at the proper time within the next two or three days.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.